When Multiculturalism Appears Obsolete :
Multiculturalism and Hong Kong Immigrants in Canada

MORIKAWA, Makio

Canada is known to be the country that coined the word 'Multiculturalism' and has been successfully implementing the policy over nearly three decades. It is true that in these years considerable advancement was made in betterment of minority group situations, promotion of various cultural interactions, and above all, the general understanding of the ethnic issues among Canadian populace. Though prejudice against ethnic minorities and frictions among different group erupt from time to time, it is now very difficult in Canada for anybody to act in the way that may be taken as outright discrimination, and there has been few cases of ethnic conflicts or riots which was serious enough to endanger Canada's national or social security. In this respect, Canadian Multiculturalism can be said to be the 'model' case for other countries with similar multi-ethnic social compositions, and Canada could claim to be the most 'advanced' country in terms of management of the ethnic issues. Such positive outcome of the policy, however, does not mean that the concept of Multiculturalism is not without problems nor does it mean that the policy enjoys full support from each and every corner of the Canadian populace. On the contrary, the whole concept of Multiculturalism from its inception, was not without debates, and its legitimacy, efficacy and plausibility as a policy have always been cast into doubt.

Perhaps, the most known debates about Multiculturalism would be those between 'assimilationists' and 'liberals'. As the recent arguments between Gwyn/Bissoondath and Kymlicka (Gwyn 1999, Bissoondath 1999, Kymlicka 1998, 1999) clearly represents, the issue that has always been central to Multiculturalism was whether the tolerance and support of minority cultures embodied in Multiculturalism is detrimental or harmful for Canadian social unity. For critics of Multiculturalism like Gwyn and Bissoondath, the answer is unequivocally 'Yes'. For them, Multiculturalism simply allowed various minority groups (as well as Native Peoples) live 'monoculturally' (Gwyn 1999) with no respect for Canadian Mainstream tradition and no intension to interact and merge with other groups. Leaving this trend uncontrolled, they argue, what will come about is sheer 'compartmentalization of Canadian society along cultural lines', and this is nothing but setting a 'time bomb' to Canadian social unity. To them, what is needed is not Multiculturalism or emphasis on 'former homeland which is there' (Bissoondath), but sharing 'traditions and values of English Canada *which made Canada the most agreeable nation by UN ranking'* (Gwyn) or 'full loyalty to Canada which is *Here'* (Bissoondath). In their argument, assimilation of minorities to Anglo-Canadian culture which had been the national policy preceding Multiculturalism was the only way that will assure Canada as a society with unity.

Against such arguments, proponents of Multiculturalism, or 'liberals', emphasize positive effect

of the policy, and argues that Multiculturalism is the best way even for the future harmony and unity of Canadian society. 'Liberals' like Kymlicka ardently argues that Multiculturalism, while seemingly too favorable to minority cultures and hampering their social integration into Canada, is the only way which enable them to gradually engage into Canadian society, and outright demand of assimilation simply alienate them and exacerbate racial tension in the whole society. And as for compartmentalization and separatism, he argues that despite accusations by assimilationists, minorities do participate in Mainstream society, and it was only possible by cultural tolerance on both sides which Multiculturalism successfully brought about, and although minorities may retain their own cultures for some time, this may not lead to social disintegration since 'the basic Canadian values like democracy, individual rights and equal opportunity' are something that can be, and has actually been, shared by these groups (Kymlicka 1998).

Such debate, as the most recent one, has its own logic and new emphasis contrived by each disputant (like Gwyn's 'UN ranking'), but the basic issues involved are not new. In fact, similar arguments have been raised from time to time since the introduction of Multiculturalism as an official policy in 1971, and almost all the time debate was heated to the extent that the whole Canada seemed to take either of the sides. As a result of such recurring debates, the issue of whether Multiculturalism is detrimental to social unity seem to appear as if it is the only problem about Multiculturalism. It should be noted, however, that there are issues that were not raised in the poplar debates, and that are more critical than any other issues discussed in the debates. What was not discussed was whether cultural diversity should be re-

stricted for the sake of social unity, and whether the Mainstream Anglo-Canadian culture should be granted a special status as against other cultures. In this respect, seemingly confronting arguments between 'assimilationists' and 'liberals' turns out to be sharing common footing by taking these issues for granted ; not only critics of Multiculturalism are assimilationists but also 'liberals' are assimilationists in that they, too, think that the outright recognition of cultural diversity would lead to social disintegration and integration or social unity can only be achieved through minority's acceptance of Mainstream culture and values ('democracy, individual rights and equal opportunity'). Such attitude of the 'liberals', however, may not simply be taken as Mainstream intellectual's hypocrisy covering their latent belief in racial inequality by superficial tolerance and understanding of ethnic matters. Rather it is inherent in the idea of Multiculturalism. Quite contrary to the rosy public image of 'cultural mosaic' that Multiculturalism tends to create, Multiculturalism was never conceptualized as an outright recognition of cultural diversity. With the increase of various ethnic groups in Canada, and their protest against Anglo-Canadian conformity, Multiculturalism was devised as a policy embracing certain cultural tolerance, but at the same time, it could not be a policy that would endanger national unity in favor of cultural diversity. What resulted was somewhat compromising stance between diversity/unity axis in which cultural diversity was recognized only as a transitional phase for the immigrants until, as is stipulated in the official Objectives of Multiculturalism, they become 'full participants in Canadian society' (Canadian Government 1971). It is no need to say that in this definition Canadian society means the one based on Anglo-Canadian Mainstream

culture and full participation means assimilation. In other words, Canadian Multiculturalism is a kind of 'prolonged assimilationism'. Once this basic assimilationist idea of Multiculturalism becomes clear, it is now not difficult to understand that the idea of Multiculturalism is not new at all. Far from the general image of the policy as modern and advanced, the idea goes back as far as over a century. It should be understood that in the history of Canada, and as well as that of US, assimilationism was not the idea that existed from the beginning. Up until late 19th century, the idea of cultural diversity has no negative association with social unity (at least inside British Canada, though in Canada, diversity made of Anglo and French Canadians had another meaning). Rather, it was innocent optimistic ideal of Melting Pot which Israel Zangwill merrily had projected in his play. For many, diversity was something that would bring the New World a 'new and superior nationality' (Gleason 1981 L). It was not until the turn of the century before the last that diversity came to be taken as clashing with social unity. The new immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe that came in in a big flow at that time had clearly different social and cultural characters than earlier immigrants, and their existence was closely associated with ethnic concentration, ghetto, inner-city crime and slum housing. In reaction to these immigrants, together with the fear in early 20 century that the new immigrants' Old World tie might threaten national security, some 'nativists' began the movement demanding immigrants' denouncing their old culture and quick and one-directional assimilation of them to Anglo-culture. It was rather a hysteric outcry of Anglo-supremacy and rude demand for Anglo-conformity, but it was not the only movement at that time. Along with the 'na-

tivist' movement, there was a movement of liberal intellectuals, social workers and progressive social reformers. In their view, since the problem of the new immigrants lied in their low adaptability (educational background, experience in modern cities, lack of English, poverty etc.), oppressive demand of assimilation would simply alienate them and further confine themselves in their own communities. What was needed instead was not to deny their cultures in a short run but, with the help of education and social training, gradually enhance their adaptability to the new environment in order that, in a long run, they could take part in the life of the Mainstream society. This is exactly where Multiculturalism originates and the only difference is that the latter became an official policy. And although this progressive reformism is, in contrast to the 'nativist' ideas, far more liberal and humanitarian, as far as the objective of the idea is to help immigrants 'take part in the Mainstream', the supremacy of Anglo-culture was presupposed.

Perhaps, this century-old presupposition of Anglo-supremacy and its accompanying idea that diversity should be restricted for the sake of one culture/one unity are what make Multiculturalism appear as dubious and deceiving to some minority groups. Indeed, from the onset of the policy, not a small number of minority intellectuals showed distrust and turned their back to the policy arguing that Multiculturalism was nothing but a device that allows minorities express themselves only in cultural spheres to some extent while keeping the hegemony of Anglo-Canadians in political, economic and other areas, and thus, continuously marginalizing minorities (Li 1988, Moodley 1983). Such criticism, which might appear to be charged too much of minority politics, and also might appear to be the statement made out of resent-

ment, has, in fact, a strong logic. The logical strength of this criticism comes from the fact that it straightforwardly points out that Multiculturalism is discriminatory. By granting Anglo-culture a special status as against other cultures, it is clearly discriminative against any other cultures. To such criticism, Multiculturalism may assert its legal legitimacy as a practical administrative policy, but on the level of individual rights, it cannot hold legitimacy in that it treats cultural background of the citizens differently. Even though such differential treatment of the cultures be allowed on the basis of some national charter defining national cultural identity, it may still violate the right for equal opportunity since under Multiculturalism minorities have to carry extra burden of adapting to Anglo-culture in order to be 'participants in Canadian society' which Anglo-Canadians are exempt by definition. What this criticism makes clear is that, ironically, the idea of Multiculturalism is incompatible with the basic Canadian values of 'democracy, individual rights and equal opportunity' that all kinds of assimilationists, be they 'nativists' or 'liberals', unanimously think to be the most important cultural values. For example, a common nativist argument that Canada's history and tradition which were mostly of British origin should be respected by new or latecomers does not hold as the basis for demanding assimilation. Although it may be good for everyone in Canada to know the nation's history and tradition, it does not necessarily mean that tradition should not be changed for good, neither does it mean that new comers should not bring in new cultures and traditions. Just as old comers do, new comers, too, have citizenship rights, and once it is acknowledged, the demand for assimilation which is the demand by earlier immigrants to later immigrants on the basis of vested right lose its basis, since, by principles of democracy and individual rights, the difference of earlier immigrants and later immigrants cannot claim superiority over the equality among Canadian citizens. To such argument, some 'liberals' may raise other causes in defense of Multictilturalism/assimilationism. They may argue that it is perfectly in accord with democracy for Anglo-culture be given superiority as Anglo-Canadians are majority of the nation, and without a culture that can be the common basis of the people Canada will lose its unity. They may also argue that since, as compared to minority cultures most of which originate from the third world, Anglo-culture is most modern and advanced culture which even other groups wish to join, it is natural for this culture be given a special status (see Kymlicka 1998 p. 39). These arguments, though seemingly plausible, do not firmly support their position. Again, if great Canadian values should be given the first priority it is obvious that choosing one majority culture as the national culture at the cost of all other cultures is not the only democratic way. One may think, instead, of a Canadian culture made up with something like 'proportional representation' of cultures where each group in Canada bring in their cultures according to their size, power or whatever else. Taking this way, there will be no 'single culture that can be the common basis', but a single culture is not the only way to realize social unity, the idea of Melting Pot which preceded the assimilationist ideas was something very close to 'proportional representation' and people thought that it was the way to unity! And by asserting the last cause that Anglo-culture is most advanced, liberals would take the risk of self-negation, since should cultures other than Anglo-Canadians' turns out to be equally or more modern

and advanced, it is a natural course of logic that Anglo-Canadians step down from the special status they have enjoyed and become one of Canada's many groups; a situation which they would never accept. In the later part of this paper, I will raise these issues again and show that these seemingly unimaginable situations have actual importance for the future of Canadian Multiculturalism but here suffice it to say that once this kind of basic criticism is cast, Multiculturalism reveals itself to be a policy which is full of ideological causes but with few logical basis. In this respect, for those who propose such basic criticism, enactment of Multiculturalism is, in a way, far from progress in Canadian ethnic situations but regression in that it legally stipulates inequality of different cultures in the form of official policy.

Up to recent days, however, such fundamental criticism has never gained popularity among Canadian populace, and the issues raised by this criticism has never been seriously discussed in the milliards of 'Multiculturalism debates'. One of the reasons may be that many minority group members were reluctant to openly criticize the policy. They did notice that Multiculturalism was full of contradictions, but looking at the long history of ethnic prejudice and discrimination against minorities in Canada, Multiculturalism was a 'progress' in that it was something that was 'better than nothing'. But no matter whether minorities were reluctant or not, it was the deep-rooted conventional notions about ethnic diversity and nation state that covered the whole course of Multiculturalism debates. As discussed so far, the 'nativist' thinking that 'Canada is Anglo-country', Canada is best and advanced country and therefore 'citizenship is a favor granted from the hosts' type of logic were something shared, though with different

degrees, by many Anglo-Canadians, and 'liberals', too, shared the idea of Canada as a country with advanced Anglo-culture. And not only for 'nativists' and 'liberals' but for many other Canadians, conventional notions of nation state that a nation state should have a cultural identity through which national unity is attained; that that culture should be provided by a dominant, majority group; and that therefore cultural diversity should be limited and controlled, seemed more than natural. Under such circumstance, it seemed there were no other way in Canadian ethnic situation than Multiculturalism/assimilationism. And this was especially so in Canada where national unity has long been afflicted by Quebec separatism.

Such is what has been about Multiculturalism debate. And it is still so as the argument between Kymlicka and Gwyn/Bisoodath in late 1990s shows. But not in debate but in concrete reality, things seem to have been changing. In the past fifteen years or so, there have been tremendous changes in Canada as well as in the outer world, and by these changes, the very basis of Multiculturalism/assimilationism assumption seems to be gradually undermined. One of such changes is that the dominance of Anglo-Canadians is becoming unclear. In terms of population, they are no more a majority. With the large number of immigrant who came in in the past several decades, together with a small reproduction rate of Caucasian populations in Canada, Anglo-Canadians now occupy some 1/3 of national population and in major cities where changes are in larger scale, they are becoming 1/4 or less. Although they are still the largest as a single group, they do not dominate the nation. In terms of culture, this clearly affects what Canadian culture is. It is true that even

though Anglo-Canadians are not the majority, many others who are of multiple origins do share Canadian culture which is basically of Anglo origin. However, as people of various origins, theirs are 'Canadian' culture loosely defined and in various ways mixed with other cultures. At least, they are less laded with a single history or tradition of Anglo-Canadians. Along with the decrease of Anglo-dominance, the Multiculturalism/assimilationism assumption of the supremacy of Anglo-culture as modern and advanced is also being eroded. In this contemporary world with diversified value systems, uprising of non-western countries as equally modern and advanced, and various post-colonial thoughts, simple developmental model of history with Euro-Americans running ahead does not hold anymore and people are less prone to accept the ideas like Western Hegemony or Supremacy of Anglo-culture. Not only the assumption of the supremacy of Anglo-culture eroded, another assumption of Multiculturalism that national or social unity should be given precedence over cultural diversity seems to be losing its basis. When supremacy of the nation state was widely accepted, people's ethnic identity was easily conceptualized as secondary to their nationality. It was easy for the nation to demand its people full loyalty to the nation and suppress or marginalize ethnic identity for the sake of national unity. But in this world of globalization where people move and interact transnationally, ethnic identity is conceptualized not only within a framework of nation state but across national borders. It is now not unusual for many people to have multiple identities like being a member of particular ethnic group that extend across national borders and at the same time a citizen of particular nation, and in many cases neither one of which is considered to be

superior or subordinate. We may be able to add still some more changes that undermines the existing assumptions about Multiculturalism. But it may already be clear that what the changes mentioned above means is that the whole assumption of Multiculturalism which once seemed self-evident does not hold as the basis for contemporary Canadian ethnic situations, or at least it is losing its basis in a substantial way. Perhaps, time is near that Canada should rethink and reconceptualize the whole relation between its culture, diversity and social unity in a new and unconventional ways. And, in fact, there are minority groups that challenge the Multiculturalism ideas in a new way. The recent Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong is a good case.

II.

In Canada, immigration of the Chinese from Hong Kong has a long history. Since sizable Chinese immigration began in 19 century, the major source area of emigration was southern China and many came from Hong Kong and adjacent areas and still many came from other areas but emigrated through Hong Kong. Even in the post-second world war era, there was continuous immigration from Hong Kong at about the level of 7,000 per year (Morikawa 1990). Such steady flow of immigration, however, suddenly changed in mid-80s. The talk between British and Chinese Government about the future return of the colony abruptly began in early 80s and the final decision in the form of Joint Declaration concluding that Hong Kong would be returned in 1997 came out in 1984. During this period, the fear about the future of Hong Kong under Communist regime grew large in the mind of Hong Kong residents, and this fear lead to the mass emigration from Hong Kong in the

late 80s and on. Of this large flow of Hong Kong Chinese, Canada was the major destination accepting about a half of emigrants each year. Up to the end of the century Canada had accepted about 300,000 Hong Kong Chinese and with them, the Hong Kong Chinese population in the major Canadian cities like Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton and Calgary grew up to some 5% of the total population.

In the early stage of immigration, it was thought that it was the immigration of millionaires or extremely rich people looking for a temporary shelter or new passport for security. The appointment of David Lam, who was enormously rich businessman from Hong Kong, to the office of Lieutenant Governor in British Columbia, and the one-time purchase of former Expo-site in Vancouver by a Hong Kong billionaire Li Ka-shing, both of which occurred in 1988, strengthened such image. However, as immigration continued and the total number of Hong Kong emigrants reached up to 600,000 which is nearly 10 % of the Hong Kong population, and half of which emigrated to Canada, it turned out that, although those relatively better off tend to be represented because of immigration restrictions, it was the migration of people from almost all track of lives in Hong Kong, and it was the immigration not simply looking for temporary shelter but with the intention of long-term settlement as a real part of the Canadian society.

Though not at all billionaires, those immigrants had diacritically different characters from the old-time Chinese immigrants. Whereas old immigrants were peasants from rural traditional, and definitely under-developed, China, the society they were from were of totally different sort. Through the tremendous economic growth in the period from mid-70s to mid-80s, Hong Kong had attained the status of highly advanced and modernized capitalist society. In the beginning of 1990s, its GDP exceeded that of its Suzerain, Britain, and Hong Kong was far from under-developed area but one of the leading world cities. It was a society with a gigantic economic system, highly efficient urban system, a thick layer of urban middle-class with high standard of educational and occupational career and nearly-to-decadence urban culture with abundant consumer culture and sophisticated civic life-styles.

As a group of immigrants with such background, their adaptation to Canadian society, too, was unique and unprecedented. Especially in their economic life, they proved to be exceptionally successful. With their capital they had brought in, their high level of education which was substantially higher than average Canadians, their occupational skills and high command of English they had acquired in Hong Kong, and their thorough knowledge of advanced capitalist social systems, they could rather easily attained their status as white-collar workers, various professionals, engineers, entrepreneurs and investors. Although some status-dislocation according to their migrating to a new soil was unavoidable, they could keep it in minimum and realized middle-class status that was similar to those they had enjoyed in Hong Kong. Such high level of economic adaptation, however, did not lead them to acquire Canadian middle-class life-styles, and through which, thoroughly merge into Canadian middle-class lives. It does not mean that they did not get along with other Canadian middle-class people. In fact, they associate with others in their work places, live next to other groups in suburban middle-class areas, and they do share Canadian life-style

with other groups to some extent. But what they did was, in addition to such sharing, they created in their new soil their own environment where they can fully enjoy their Hong Kong life-styles. In the beginning, it was just a few small-scale shopping malls selling Chinese grocery and food stuff (cf. Lai 1988). But within a few years, they created almost everything they needed. With the sufficient capital they had, they brought in Hong Kong based banks (one of which now became one of the leading banks in Canada patronized both by Chinese and local Canadians), established TV and radio stations, insurance companies, car dealers, clinics, restaurants and even herbalists and *fen-sui* geomancers. Such trend was so large in scale and so quick in pace, in some cities like Vancouver, there were accusation and resentment that Hong Kong Chinese, being far from trying to merge into local community, but constructing and expanding their own ethnic enclave and turning the city into their own (Cannon 1989). However, it should be noted that, although Hong Kong Chinese brought in and created their own institutions, it has little to do with the ethnic 'enclave' defined in traditional manner. Though appears similar to a careless look, the present institutions has no traditional Chinatown-type characters, nor have they any mutual-aid or self-protective functions. What they provide is modern functions that any other institutions have in the Mainstream community. The only difference is that they provide those functions to the taste of Hong Kong Chinese. At this point, what Hong Kong Chinese brought in are basically of luxury sort, and in this way, they provided for themselves an alternative way of modern (Hong Kong) life-style alongside and parallel to the existing (Canadian) life-style. Or, for Hong Kong Chinese themselves, they expanded what

is called the modern life so that they could choose either one to their taste or, could benefit from both.

Such creation of Hong Kong-style institutions and realization of Hong Kong-style life in the new soil has another important meaning not only to Hong Kong immigrants but also to people of Hong Kong irrespective of where they live. The above-mentioned change was not limited to Canada. Hong Kong migrants brought in similar changes in almost all destinations and this, consequently, has changed the whole concept of 'Hong Kong society'. This was, indeed, the outcome of Hong Kong people's exceptional ability and of tremendous amount of energy and effort. At the time Hong Kong's return to China was decided, pessimism and desperation about the future of Hong Kong was all that was shared by its people. A grim scenario that Hong Kong economy and society would be suffocated under China's rule, and Hong Kong would become just a lifeless, inert Chinese town, was what people sorrowfully prepared for. But what occurred was the total reverse. Those who left Hong Kong soon and successfully recreated a new Hong Kong environment not only in major cities in Canada, but also in US, Australia and New Zealand. Hong Kong itself was not down even after takeover. Despite the loss of human resource caused by emigration, Hong Kong still could survive and flourish. And against the forecast that Hong Kong would be 'Chinicized', what happened was 'Hongkongnization' of surrounding Canton area. As I pointed out elsewhere, (Morikawa 1999) neighbouring Shenzhen quickly became virtually a part of Hong Kong, and the same change expanded to southern Canton and even further coastal areas. As the result of such expansion of new Hong Kong, a vast area that can be called 'Greater Hong Kong' emerged. It

is the area connecting various points in North America, Oceania and Asia with Hong Kong as its hub, and within this area Hong Kong people can feel at home, and they feel the whole area as one 'life-zone' within which people of Hong Kong, with or without passport, can freely move along. It does not mean that they are transient. As in Canada and elsewhere, they are well settled as full citizens, yet it can be said that they are not tied down to one location. As Hong Kong people they also belong to this Greater Hong Kong of which Canada is a part.

As such new type of Asian/Chinese immigrant group, their attitude toward Multiculturalism and multi-ethnic situation in Canada is a unique one. In fact, it clashes, challenges and undermines the conventional ideas of Multiculturalism in many ways.

As a recent minority that naturally has to be sensitive to the ethnic situations in Canada, the existence of Multiculturalism which, if at all, advocate tolerance and respect for minority cultures, seems to be welcomed by them. However, the attitude of Hong Kong immigrants toward Multiculturalism is generally negative, or at least, they are indifferent. They seldom appeal to Multiculturalism in soliciting subsidy for ethnic activities ; seldom engage in any kind of Multicultural events or programs ; even for heritage language course held in local schools, parents are not enthusiastic in sending their children. In order to keep their kids' language, they would prefer sending them to private courses even with some costs. Part of the reason may be attributed to their wealth since most of the immigrants are well off enough to take care of themselves and their cultural activities. But this is not the only reason. Quite often they say that Multiculturalism is for weak minorities to which they do not belong, and what they need is

not Multiculturalism but equal treatment, and this reflects what they think of their own culture, Canadian Mainstream culture and the relation between them. What is important to note here is that, unlike most other minorities that preceded them, they do not think that their culture is of parochial, traditional, weak kind, that, therefore, needs to be protected. Such understanding comes directly from their experience. One aspect of such experience is the one they had in Hong Kong. As briefly mentioned earlier, Hong Kong had passed through tremendous economic growth during 70s and 80s. Naturally accompanied to this was an unprecedented scale of social change. Throughout that period, Hong Kong changed from a town that more or less resembled to towns in pre-war Canton province to an ultra-modern Capitalist world city ; after this change, people's life was no more of old Canton but of urban middle-class life symbolized by modern high-rise apartments, internationalized business activities in Hong Kong's hundreds of skyscrapers and world-class shopping malls and restaurants. Within a short period of time, traditional ties like those based on common locality or descent that was once so strong in binding people together waned, and modern values and ethos like stress on individual ability and attainment, on self-responsibility, efficiency, cleanliness, privacy and civil politeness, all of which are more or less common to modern capitalist societies, came to be shared as natural and important. Through these changes, it was natural for Hong Kong people to come to an understanding that their society is a highly modernized sort that can be on a par with any other modern societies. It should be recognized, however, that this understanding or confidence is not a simple confidence in their attainment in 'Westernization'. Along

with this was their confidence in uniqueness. In fact, just as Japan's modernization was not a simple Westernization, that of Hong Kong was also unique. Although highly modernized, they never imagined of accepting rigorous western-type individualism, nor did they think that minimal core-family is ideal to their society. What they chose instead was 'moderate individualism' that does not leave people in total solitude, and a certain 'familism' which 'is strong but does not oppress individuals' (Luk 1995). And this uniqueness is true to other cultural aspects as well. As Cantopop and Hong Kong movies vibrantly exemplify, Hong Kong has created an urban culture that are highly modern but still have strong cultural and esthetic tints that even non-Chinese would value (Morikawa 1999). It was such modernity and uniqueness that Hong Kong people became confident of, and their confidence was with firm backing. As early as in late 1970s when restriction on the interaction between Hong Kong and Mainland people loosened which enabling Hong Kong people see Mainlanders first time since the war, they just saw their folks as total strangers or as the Chinese from a different world!.

Such Hong Kong people's confidence and pride in their own culture did not change but, in a way, further strengthened after their immigration to Canada. There might have been some doubt in the immigrants' minds that their pride could be an illusion that would dissolve when they confront the 'real Western modernity'. But such doubt did not last long. What Hong Kong immigrants found was that there was nothing surprising in their life in Canada. Everything they saw in Canada was more or less familiar to them ; the traffic system, communication system, civil service system and any other urban sys-

tem were no different from those they had in Hong Kong and some like mailing system were far less developed than what they use to have ; the economic system and the way business was run were more or less the same, and in this respect, they found Hong Kong system were a bit advanced due to its position as the cross-road of international economy, and because of this, they came to know that their job career was generally transferable. They also found that the values Canadians have were civic values that are basically not quite different from theirs. Even patterns of family life were mostly similar ; both Canadians and Hong Kong Chinese commute to the city center for work, do shopping in one of neighborhood malls, watch TV at night and spend weekends with family members. There are, of course, some differences between two cultures like Canadians go to the cottage on weekends while Chinese go to *Yam Cha* restaurants, or hockey for Canadians while football is for Chinese, or Canadians spend long summer evening out in the porch with beer while Chinese play marjong. But for the Hong Kong immigrants, these are differences due to the reason that each culture has its own tints, and as such they are nothing more than, so to say, parochial idiosyncracy of each culture and, as such, either group can simply stick to its own likes and dislikes and there is no point for either group to change its habit. All in all, what they found was that Canadian society and culture are just as modern as those of Hong Kong and there is nothing like superior/inferior relations between them. To their eyes, there may be goods and bads in both cultures : to Hong Kong Chinese. Canadian democracy and human right protection are something that they admire, but on the other hand, the same culture is far short of historical depth and their individualism too excessive

as compared to their own. But it does not mean that either one is superior or inferior, since both of them are equally modern, such differences are, so to say, 'local variations' of modern cultures.

The Hong Kong immigrants' such confidence and pride in their own culture is reflected not only in their view about superior/inferior relation between the two cultures but also in their view about the position of their culture in Canada. In fact, they do not think that their culture is a minority culture at all. Just as their culture is not parochial, traditional and weak culture but an advanced, modern capitalist culture, Hong Kong culture is, for Hong Kong immigrants, far from being a minority culture that needs to survive under strong pressure of dominant majority culture and that may need support from political device like Multiculturalism, a part of world modernity that emanates from Hong Kong and now encompass Hong Kong, South China, part of Southeast Asia and part of North America. In this respect, Hong Kong culture is perfectly on a par with Canadian culture in that the latter, too, is another part of world modernity that covers Europe, North America and Oceania, and in that both are, unlike most minority cultures that tends to be anemic and self-protective, vigorous, powerful culture which is always in the process of self-creation and further sophistication.

Thinking in this way, it is more than obvious for the Hong Kong immigrants that Canadian Multiculturalism and its underlying assimilationist assumption is far from applicable to them but the whole concept is utterly misguided. To them, it is the idea that came out of obsolete self-complacent Euro-centrism and ignorance that cannot even imagine that there be other modern cultures, though not to say

that there be a situation in which they have to get assimilated to another culture. And once the fact that Canadian and Hong Kong culture are equally modern and, therefore, there is no way for either one to get assimilated to the other, is understood, so they contend, Hong Kong culture, while, as a modern culture, having many traits in common with Canadian counterpart and while being far from alien, hazardous or disruptive to Canadian unity, can be accepted as an important part that, hand-in-hand, enforce and enrich Canadian society to come. And according to some Hong Kong immigrants, it is something that Canadian people, willingly or reluctantly, has already accepted, and it is already realized in the current Canadian way, since otherwise Mr. David Lam who is a first-generation immigrant from Hong Kong would not have been appointed to the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia nor would have Ms. Adrienne Clarckson, who, too, is from Hong Kong and who used to call herself Ms Eng, become the present Federal Governor of Canada!

Such view of Hong Kong immigrants is also reflected in what they think of ethnic identity and citizenship. Although majority of Hong Kong immigrants applied to and were granted Canadian citizenship it is clear that they keep strong sense of ethnic identity as Hong Kong Chinese. It should be noted that it does not mean that citizenship is unimportant to them nor does it mean that they do not care much about their being Canadian citizens. On the contrary, they are rather sensitive to their image of being good Canadians. There is a tendency among them to pay good attention to make themselves appear as ordinary as many other Canadians. And, in general, there is a tendency for them to be low profile in Canada; even very rich people among the immigrants dare not

to buy Rolls Royce that they were most familiar in Hong Kong, and instead buy decent Mercedes in Canada so as not appear to be conspicuous, and ordinary immigrants, too, are well-conscious enough to make themselves appear as nothing but independent, hard working, law-abiding people. In this respect, they are deliberate enough not to appear even as a group ; they tend not to pursue their group interests, tend not to organize any ethnically oriented associations and they even try to dissociate themselves from other group of Chinese background. In this way, they are asserting that they are no minority but modern, independent Canadian people to whom only equal treatment should be applied. However, such immigrants's sense of being Canadian citizens does not negate their being ethnically Hong Kong Chinese. On the contrary, in the mind of immigrants there is no intention to suppress their ethnic identity in favor of citizenship. Though they frankly and naturally associate with other Canadians in work places, in their private life they would never change their Hong Kong ways of life ; they speak Cantonese, eat Chinese, read Chinese papers, watch Chinese TV programs and mostly they associate with fellow Hong Kong immigrants. And in this respect, it is important that their sense of belonging is not limited to the Hong Kong community within Canada, rather they think they belong to a wider worldwide network of Hong Kong Chinese discussed earlier. In this way, they speak Cantonese, eat Chinese watch Chinese TV not as a minority contained in a small enclave caring only themselves but as members of wider Hong Kong society ; they read Chinese papers and watch TV not for the sake of knowing what is going on in their community in Canada but to know what is going on in the *whole* Hong Kong society. In their mind, even Hong Kong is just a part of this 'society'. Though Hong Kong is the biggest and most important part, where they belong is far much wider than Hong Kong proper. Such sense of belonging is most obvious in their occupational life. As discussed earlier, Hong Kong immigrants have well adapted to Canadian labor market, but whenever immigrants think about job opportunity their prospective market is not limited to Canada. It is more than natural that they think of opportunities in terms of 'Greater Hong Kong' including, say, Hong Kong. China, Malaysia or Taipei, as well as Toronto or Vancouver and they do pursue their career in this manner. In the extreme cases, they can even become so-called 'astronauts' (*Tai fun yan*) who hold their citizenship and immediate family in Canada while they themselves station in Hong Kong or elsewhere and 'commute' across the Pacific. To some Canadians, it is exactly this attitude and way of life that they accuse Hong Kong immigrants as disloyal, 'unmeltable' or getting Canadian citizenship as 'insurance'. But on the side of Hong Kong immigrants, such accusation is pointless and misguided. In the first place, in their mind, having certain ethnic identity and holding a citizenship at the same time is possible and not incompatible. If, as they have argued, Mainstream culture is superior to any other culture in Canada, becoming Canadian citizen means more or less implies that immigrants should denounce their cultures. But since Hong Kong culture is no inferior to Mainstream culture, holding Hong Kong culture is not incompatible with holding citizenship. But the real accusation does not lie here but in the point weather having ethnic identity that cuts across and, extends beyond, national border is compatible with holding a citizenship of a certain nation. To this more seemingly plausible accusation,

the Hong Kong immigrants quite often refute, in somewhat teasing way, that the situation is not so different from the case of expatriate Canadians who contribute to their land of settlement while keeping their Canadian identity. And since no accusation has been heard about them, it would be absurd to accuse when an immigrant group behave in a similar way. But apart from this rhetorical confutation, they would push the argument further. They would argue that in this contemporary world of international migration and globalization people tend more and more to have multiple ethnic and national identity and the simple idea that citizenship can claim full loyalty over the other cannot hold anymore. It should rather to find the way to accommodate other identities and theirs is exactly the case. They would say that they are migrants not in the age of nation-state but the international migrant in the global age, and as such, it is natural for them to find optimum between ethnic identity and citizenship, and they would also argue that it was practically accepted by Canada since they were accepted not as ordinary workers but as experts in Pacific trade, professionals with internationally transferable skills and investors in the world trade, all traits of which can only be acquired as being migrants of global age. They would even say that they contribute to Canada most by doing business in Greater Hong Kong as Hong Kong ethnics bringing money as direct profit or in the form of tax. In this argument it is absurd for Canada to demand them full loyalty on the basis of citizenship and it simply means that the whole concept of Canadian citizenship does not catch up with what is going on in the world. And this argument seems to be justified to a great extent in the country like Canada that basically approve double nationality, and that actually solicited

Hong Kong immigrants by establishing new immigration categories like 'entrepreneurs', 'investors' and 'professionals'.

Along this line of thought, and with such global-migrant identity, some Hong Kong immigrants began to think of citizenship in diacritically a new manner. Though only tacitly expressed, not a small number of Hong Kong immigrants point out that the idea of citizenship as something to be granted by a 'charter group' or Mainstream as a favor to prospective immigrants is already obsolete since it is the idea that can only be justified when everything good is in Mainstream's hand and immigrants are waiting for the share. They point out that it is not a fair idea since even in old days immigration was not only profited immigrants but also brought benefit to the host community in the form of new labor, new knowledge and technology and even in the form of better age proportion of the nation's population, and it is more so in this world of international migration where, more often than not, not only the nation choose immigrants but immigrants have advantage of choosing nations. In such situations, the relation between immigrants and a nation should be changed toward more equal relations where citizenship is exchanged by immigrants' loyalty and contribution on fair basis. What they propose along this line of thought is the idea of citizenship that is, quite unlike the concept of citizenship that demands citizens' full and lifetime loyalty, considered in the manner of shareholding of the stock. In this concept, people invest their resource, be they material, mental, experiential or whatsoever, to certain nationality expecting good returns. If the nation cannot secure good returns people withdraw and switch to another, but if the nation could prove to be reliable, shareholders will be

more loyal to the nation. And according to somewhat cynical commentator, it is exactly 'where unity emerges'!

III.

The case of Hong Kong immigrants, their attitude and opinion described so far, clearly object the whole concept of Multiculturalism and its underlying assumption about diversity, cultural unity and Canada as a nation state. Instead of explicit or implicit assumption of the supremacy of Anglo-culture, they clearly deny its superiority and postulate their own culture as an equal counterpart ; instead of nationality and citizenship as having supreme right to demand full loyalty, they propose a new interpretation in which nationality and citizenship are something negotiable with other identities ; and they propose social unity not as something brought about by a dominant group but as an outcome of the engagement of different groups. All these may appear, to many Canadians, to be unrealistic and the case and attitude of Hong Kong immigrants exceptional and unacceptable. Some may take it as a rebellious idea that jeopardize the very basis of Canadian nation and national identity, and there would be others who contend, in more moderate tone, that, unlike Hong Kong immigrants, majority of ethnic groups in Canada even today are weak in terms of economic and social conditions and it is still important for them to be culturally recognized and supported by the nation rather than asserting cultural equality and equal treatment. For them, what Hong Kong immigrants say would appear as an arrogant and self-complacent opinion of strong minority that does not need any help. There is, indeed, some truth in these views and it is exactly why Multiculturalism has been able to claim its success as an advanced ethnic policy. It should be noted, however, that the issues raised by Hong Kong immigrants, being far from those by eccentric and isolated small minority, is becoming critical to Canadian society and nation as they are situated in this contemporary world of internationalization and globalization, and it will be more so in the near future. Obviously, the contention that Anglo-culture has supremacy over others is getting more and more difficult to maintain. In this respect, Hong Kong immigrants are not alone. Their views are, although with various degrees, widely shared by Chinese immigrants from Malaysia and Singapore and similar recognition are shared by other groups like professionals from India, Middle East or Latin-America. These groups represent their own version of modernity and modern value systems and are claiming that Western or Anglo version is not the only one. Such trend is not limited to above groups. In this world of electronic communications, even those from the third world can easily understand what modernity and advance society are all about and quickly catch up and will claim that they should be treated not as members of weak minorities but as full agents of modern Canadian society. Also as for citizenship, the same groups of middle-class or professional background do not accept the conventional concept of citizenship. As jet-set, transient, or to use Richmond's word, 'transilient' (Richimond 1994) migrants with internationally transferable skills who can easily migrate elsewhere, they only accept the concept of citizenship which is fully compatible to their sense of ethnic or other identities. What is crucial of this situation to Canada, or to any other advanced countries, is that they are not the additional, neglectable category of immigrant groups. In the cut-throat competi-

tion of high technology and business activities world wide, it is becoming critical weather a country could get the best talents not only from domestic labor market but internationally. Moreover, the very same logic applies to other groups. In contemporary world as well as in Canada, it is getting more common for less privileged groups like immigrants laborers from the third world, too, to retain ethnic identity as separate identity from citizenship as the whole system of immigration is getting more and more two-directional or circulating type (Basch, Schiller and Blanc 1994). Under such circumstance, again, it is getting more difficult for a nation to demand full loyalty to the immigrants at the cost of their ethnicity since, just like in the case of professionals, it is crucial for a nation to have these low-cost labor force in order to survive international competition.

All these new changes create the situation in which conventional concepts of ethnicity, citizenship and national unity difficult to be maintained in its present form, and especially in Canada, this situation will be further accelerated since the proportion of ethnic minorities which now already comprises some 40% of the total population will be far over 50% very soon. Under this trend, the day will soon come that Canada has to face the possibility of finding herself running far behind other countries unless it rethink, revise and redefine the whole concepts concerning its ethnic policies, and at that time, the change will certainly be in the way very close to what Hong Kong immigrants has proposed, ie., in the way that citizenship is considered in the manner

of stock-holding, with equal treatment and equality of cultures of the stock-holders as the logical concomitants. It should be recognized that such changes would not necessarily lead to 'compartmentalization' and to 'time-bomb' exploding. As shown in the case of Hong Kong immigrants, various modernities brought in by immigrants would not clash. Being modernities, they could coexist and accommodate to each other. And which modernity or what part of modernities will survive in the long run will be in the hand of cultural 'market mechanism'. And the same will be true for pre-modern, traditional cultures brought in from the third world. Although they would clash with existing Canadian culture(s) as they has been, again, the 'market mechanism' would work. Since as Kymlicka pointed out earlier, if modernity is good and beneficial to all, even those in minority culture would join. In all these respects, the change would be from 'preserving existing unity' to 'seeking unity to be' and this is not new in Canada. As has been pointed earlier, the Melting Pot was the ideal of seeking 'unity to be', and even through the era of assimilationism and the days to come, unity is always something 'to be' in the country made up of immigrants like Canada. And in this respect, Multiculturalism which was at least a serious endeavor to find out an optimum between diversity and unity *within* the framework of nation state should, sooner or later, give way to the new ideas and endeavor to seek unity in Canada in globalizing world where all the concerning concepts of diversity, citizenship and nationhood appear relative.

Bibliography

Basch, L. Schiller, N and C Blanc,
  1994   *Nations Unbound : Transnational Projects, postcolonial Predicaments and Deteritorialized Nation-States,* Gordon and Breach, Amsterdam.

Bisoondath, N.,

    1994　*Selling Illusions : The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada,* Penguin Books, Toronto.

Cannon, M.,

    1989　*China Tide : The Revealing Study of the Hong Kong Exodus to Canada,* Harper & Collins. Toronto.

Government of Canada,

    1971　*Statement by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, October 8, 1971*

Gleason, P.,

    1981　'American Identity and Americanization' in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups,* ed by S. Thernstrom, Harvard University Press.

Gwyn, R,

    1995　*Nationalism without Walls : The Unbearable Lightness of Being Canadian,* McClelland and Stewart, Toronto.

Kymlicka. W.,

    1998　*Finding Our Way : Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada,* Oxford University Press, Canada

Lai, D.C.Y.,

    1988　*Chinatowns : Towns within Cities in Canada,* University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.

Li. P.,

    1988　*Ethnic Inequality in a Class Society,* Thomson Educational Publishing Toronto.

Luk, B.,

    1995　'Hong Kong Peoples Perception of Their Identity' *The Identity of Hong Kong : Proceedings of a Workshop Canada and Hong Kong Project,* Joint Center for Asia Pacific Studies, York University and University of Toronto.

Moodley, K.,

    1983　'Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 6(3) : 320-32

Morikawa, M.,

    1990　'Toronto no Honkonjin Imin' in T. Ayabe (ed.) *Bunkajinruigaku* 7, Academia Shupan. Kyoto. (in Japanese)

Morikawa, M.,

    1998a 'Migration from Hong Kong and Asian Modernity : Perspectives from Canada' in S.C.H. Cheung (ed.) *On the South China Track,* The Chinese University Press, Hong Kong

Morikawa. M.,

    1998b 'Kindaisei no Keiken : Honkon Aidenttiti Saikou' (Experience of Modernity : A Second Thought on Hong Kong Identity), in *Minzoku de Yomu Chuugoku* (China from Ethinc Perspective). Asahi Sinbunsha, Tokyo (in Japanese)

Morikawa, M. (ed.),

    1998c *Senjuumin, Ajiakei, Akadian* (Natives, Asians and Acadians) Kourosha, Kyoto (in Japanese)

Richmond A. H.,

    1988　*Immigration and Ethnic Conflict,* MacMillan, London.

Skeldon, R. (ed.),

    1994　*Reluctant Exiles? : Migration from Hong Kong and the New Overseas Chinese,* Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong