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**Overview**

Chapter introduces and argues for “deep diversity” – basis on Quebec in Canada, but also links to questions of multiculturalism and aboriginals in Canada

**Background**

* The value similarity across Canada – as they relate to political culture – have not always been there. 50 years ago it appeared there were serious differences between the two groups as far as political culture was concerned.
* This difference has disappeared today – one might say that “French Canada has rejoined English Canada,” though more accurately one might say that the forces within Quebec that were always striving for a liberal society have won out.
* Yet, very ironically – at the same moment in time when Canadians agree upon so much, we are so close to breakup – though our values have never been more uniform
* How are Cdns distinct? – often related to differences in political culture with the US that rest on two key differences: (1) law and order; and (2) collective provision
  + (2) can be logically extended outwards into a principal common objective in the Cdn federation in recent decades (3) the equalization of life conditions and life chances between regions
* Cdns have seen their society as less of a melting pot than the US (Cdn mosaic) – and this too has become an answer to the distinctiveness question (4) multiculturalism. A further point of unity is (5) the Charter of Rights and Freedoms
* Much of (1) – (5) is seen as a “good thing” in Quebec, however, some things come into conflict:
  + The most problematic of them being (4) multiculturalism. As a federal policy, multiculturalism is sometimes seen as a device to deny French-speaking minorities their full recognition, or even to reduce the importance of the French fact within Canada to that of an outsized ethnic minority.
  + (5) the Charter was viewed favourably until it came to be perceived as an instrument for the advancement of the uniformity of language regimes across the country
  + The formal recognition of Quebec’s autonomy and special status for Quebec runs against (3) regional equality – perhaps in rhetoric more than in reality
* Why now? With the demise of Meech, something snapped, and Quebec no longer was content living in a structure that did not fully recognize their national goals
* To build a country for everyone, Canada would have to allow for second-level or “deep” diversity – in which a plurality of ways of belonging would also be acknowledged and accepted.
  + Pessimists of this model would not see how a country such as this could have a sense of unity – for them, the model of citizenship has to be uniform, or people would have no sense of belonging to the same polity
  + Pessimists should keep three things in mind:

1. Deep diversity is the only formula on which a united federal Canada can be rebuilt, once we recall the reasons why we all need Canada (see reasons (1) – (5))
2. In many parts of the world today, the degree and nature of difference resemble those of Canada rather than those of the US. The world needs other models to be legitimated in order to allow for more humane and less constraining modes of political cohabitation
3. Finally, after dividing for form to polities with uniform citizenship, both of the successor states would find that they have failed after all to banish the challenge of deep diversity – the only way they can do justice to their aboriginal populations is to adopt a pluralist mode

**Conclusions**

* Are there divergences of value between different regions in Canada? In a sense, these are minimal. There appears to be remarkable similarity throughout the country and across the French-English difference when it comes to things in life that are important.
* The road to uniformity (the road to nationalism) goes beyond the ironing out of differences between two major cultures
  + Road to uniformity must be based on acceptance of the principles of “deep diversity”