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ABSTRACT

This project examines mixed unions in Canada from 1950-2010. These five decades are pivotal in terms of multicultural policy and government legislation. The project is divided into two sections: the literature review followed by the journalism focus in the online/video format. The literature review assesses 21st Century exogamous unions seem to be following a trend that scholars observe to be synonymous with power and higher income levels, when compared with endogamous relationships. The contemporary notions of hybridity, bi-racialism, miscegenation and métissage have deep roots embedded in the colonial Victorian England and American era. Emergence of a “mixed blood” race from unions between European fur traders and Natives are chronicled in annals of history. These themes are worked into an assessment of multiraciality that transcends beyond Canada and the U.S. towards a global trend. Recently U.S. President Barak Obama’s racialized persona taking the seat of power in the White House has further broken the stereotypes attached to mixed unions and their off spring. The journalism focus includes an online website in which the article discusses mixed couples have more money and more power. A mini documentary, a sound slide show and interviews with mixed race couples are featured on the website.
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1.0 Literature Review

1.1 Introduction:

Analyses of mixed race in interdisciplinary research are “constantly being (re)invented and contested in the present” (Ifekwunigwe 2004 17). Mixed unions while becoming an increasingly common trend in Canada are not a unique or new phenomenon. Teillet refers to the Metis Nation as an example of unions where interrelationships between French/Scottish fur traders and Cree, Ojibwa, Saulteaux and Assiniboine were consistent in the period (5). Thousands of individuals belonging to mixed Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal ancestry in Canada self-identify themselves as Metis. The number varies from 300,000 to 800,0001 (Ibid). The existence of mixed race populations has confounded the notion of separation of races for generations (Parker and Song 3). By 2017 one in five Canadians will hail from a visible minority group2. It is important to note here that reference to ‘mixed’ in this work is not only specific to white and/or black people but all combinations hailing from the crossing of different racial lines. The term mixed unions includes both culturally mixed marriages and common-law relationships in Canada.

In this scholarly review, I address two important periods in the study of mixed unions. First, I present an investigation of ways scholars researched mixed unions from 1950 - 1970. These decades are important as multicultural policies in this period focused on ‘ethnicity multiculturalism’ (Table 1.1). Second, I examine the changing trends in mixed unions since 1980 - 2010 as the policy focus had shifted to ‘race multiculturalism’

---

1 According to Teillet, the number of Metis existing in Canada varies due to “non-status” Indians and the constantly changing definition of the term “Indian” under the Indian Act (5).
2 As predicted by a report issued by the Government of Canada Policy Research Initiative. Jean Lock Kunz is the Project Director for this report. Full reference in Bibliography
Internationally assimilation, racial ideologies and mixed unions have been a subject of extensive debate by researchers often in stereotypical ways (Goldstein 1999 401, Kalmjin 1998 398). The case made here is mixed race individuals are now recognized as the powerful new emerging demographic. These individuals tend to be “younger, highly educated and mainly reside in urban areas” (Milan and Hamm 4).

In the latter sections I also discuss the effects of U.S. President Barak Obama on influencing mixed identities in the twenty-first century. Since its inception in 1971, Canada’s multicultural policy has evolved from “celebrating differences to institutional accommodation, and more recently to inclusion and full participation” (Fleras and Kunz).

The caveats to bear in mind here are that this research examines “mixed unions” which are not be conflated with mixed racial marriages, interreligious or interfaith marriages and merit independent discussion that is beyond the scope of this analysis. Similarly hybridity and bi-racialism are also not to be confused with “mixed” and appear to pose a problem when analyzing race relations.

Hybridity has become contested in academic work due to the tangent effects in colonial and post colonial understanding of the term (Ashcroft et al 118). The relationship between hybridity, mixed race and race in academic literature has yet to be elaborated clearly (Parker and Song 4). On the other hand bi-racials specifically point towards the offspring of black and white unions which restricts the spectrum of this review.

---

3 Anne Milan is a Senior Researcher and Brian Hamm is a senior technical officer with Statistics Canada. Authors of the report entitled “Mixed Unions” published in 2004. Catalogue No: 11-008. This article basis its findings on the 1991 and 2001 Censuses of population to examine the trends of mixed unions in Canada. Full reference in works cited.
1.2 A working definition of “mixed”:

In order to address this topic it is important to derive a working definition of mixed marriages. Framing the conceptual basis of ‘mixed’ lies in crossing many barriers as the range of the term spans many categories, compositions, identities and groups. Qian and Lichter observe mixedness is a socially constructed boundary that can be “crossed, blurred or shifted” over time or across generations (70). They borrow from Alba and Nee’s definition of “boundary crossing” as movement from one group to another without any changes to the boundary (Ibid). This blurring of boundaries creates greater chances of diminishing ethnic or racial differences amongst groups until they can no longer distinguish themselves as separate or dissimilar. The groups responsible for this diversity are also becoming more heterogeneous (Snipp 584). Acker examines intersectionality as class relations are embedded within societal processes which themselves create and recreate gender and race relations (47). Ifekwunigwe refers to *metisse* and *metissage* for “describing individuals who according to popular folk concepts of ‘race’ and by known birth parentage embody two or more worldviews or in genealogical terms, descent groups…and reading of their phenotype” (2004 xxi). Mahtani and Moreno focus on ‘mixedness’ as being broader than black and white parentage. They acknowledge the existence of non-white mixed races where the, “binary logic of race, in which the world is perceived in terms of oppositions (white versus non-white) encodes a hierarchy, with the first term of these oppositions superior to the second (2001 71). Anzaldua (1987, 4)

---

4 The term “mestiza consciousness” was first introduced through Anzaldua’s work in 1987 which is a concept of borderland as a coping mechanism one needs to develop in order to thrive in another place. This
1990, 2003) defines mixed race as people of the future who embody most directly the transgressive theoretical motifs of hybridity, nomadism and border crossing. She provides the term “mestiza consciousness” as an explicit validation of living with multiple allegiances and the creative tensions that might arise (181). Jacobson considers the long history of race mixing makes the phenomenon a “norm” but is “effaced by the ‘multiracial’ category, which posits ‘mixture’ as only an occasional phenomenon in a setting otherwise characterized by racial purity” (260). Hereafter, the treatment of ‘mixed’ for the purposes of this essay is a mix between two different racialized groups “that does not necessarily involve any white ancestry or experience” (Mahtani and Moreno 2001 65) but is dependent on “mobile paradoxical spaces” (Mahtani 2001 185) and embodies, “by known birth parentage two or more world views, or in genealogical terms, descent groups” (Ifekwunigwe 2001 46)

1.3 Historical perspective: The merging of colour lines:

“The most common designation imposed on mixed race people of all ancestries is the interference that they are fragmented beings…and in a race conscious society, serve to reinforce the ideology that the mixed race individual is some how less than a whole person” (Mengel 101). Literature on multiraciality between 1950-70s demonstrates a gradual shift in awareness regarding the issue of race (Richard 3, Spencer 51, Spickard 47). These two decades are examined due to civil rights movements in the U.S. and the

________

notion has been used again in 1990 and 2003 and has become an inspiration for her many works. See Bibliography for full references.

5 Mahtani’s derivation of the term “paradoxical spaces” has been built upon the work of feminist theorists Gillian Rose (1993) and Elspeth Probyn (1996) where the metaphor gets at the “mobility and simultaneity of particular subject positions”… “spaces which are, all at once, multidimensional, shifting and contingent” (Mahtani, 2001, p.181).
immigration/multicultural policy changes in Canada that changed the face of mixed unions.

Ifekwunigwe asserts during the slavery era, ‘mixed race’ communities were socially engineered and managed (2002 323). Spickard refers to a Gallup poll conducted in 1958 where 92 per cent of Northern and Western whites and 99 per cent of southern Whites were opposed to interracial unions (293). At one point 38 U.S. states had passed anti-miscegenation laws to discourage mixed unions. Miscegenation is defined by the Oxford Dictionary as “mixture of races; esp. the sexual union of whites with Negroes”. Bratter and King, Sollors, Parker and Song reflect on anti-miscegenation laws in the United States to reflect on mixed race unions6. It was only recently in 1999 the state of Alabama defeated their law against interracial marriages. (Bratter and King 165 , Sickels 3).

The 60s saw major milestones achieved in immigration legislation when in the year 1962 restrictions to non-white immigrants were amended to educational and skill qualifications (Parai 449). Canada made its first move towards breaking the racial lines in immigration policies in 1962-63 when it admitted Chinese refugee families and orphans from Hong Kong, Ceylon, Pakistan and India (Parai 452). With the findings of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1962, a policy framework emerged to fit minority cultural differences into a workable national framework (Mahtani 2002 69). Subsequently, the introduction of the point system in 1967 as the criteria for immigrants in Canada7 resulted in skilled and educated professionals settling here (Burnet 201). Changes in the immigration qualifications led to a more diverse population while

6 Full reference provided in works cited section of the Bibliography
7 Immigrants were judged on nine areas: education, skills, personal characteristics, occupation and employment opportunities and knowledge of the national languages (Hawkins 1988).
favouring, ‘the highly educated who have been shown to have higher propensities for ethnic unions and intermarriage’ (Richard 9). Pierre Trudeau then Prime Minister announced the Multicultural Policy of 1971. One of the points he emphasized was, ‘to promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity’.

In the latter part of 70s the U.S. saw a self-understanding of racial identity in mixed children born to black and white parents to be black or bi-racial as discussed in academic literature (Brown 336, Brunsma and Rockquemore 227, Herring 32, Morten and Atkinson 159). In the same year the U.S. racial data from the census bureau played an unprecedented role in the affairs of the national government (Snipp 571). In 1970, racial profile of the United States was considered sufficiently important that data for Blacks and Whites were included along with other characteristics of the population (Ibid). However it was not until 2000 that race officially became a category for analysis and investigation in the census. Aspinall discusses ‘fractional assignment’ was integrated as official data in the U.S. where “the methods of tabulating the population for the first time were allowed to select more than one race in US 2000 Census…” (56). Further a statistical analysis in 1970 showed 0.7 percent of all marriages in the continental United States were interracial, as compared to 1994 where 2 percent of Americans married outside their race (Korgen 1).

1.4 Multicultural policies in Canada:

Multicultural policies in Canada have been pivotal in defining the government’s stance on cultural diversity since in inception in 1971. Mahtani observes since the late

---

1980s, there has been an explosion in the use of the phrase ‘mixed race’ to observe people whose identity includes the awareness, acknowledgment and affirmation of multiple racial, cultural and ethnic ancestries (2002 471). Elliott and Fleras state multicultural policy was partially a result of perceived challenges due to the influx of ethnically diverse immigrants into Canada (55). While Mahtani advocates increased diversity led to subsequent demands for cultural protection and social equality among which made the Canadian government rethink its relationship with ethnic minorities (2002 69).

In 1988 Bill C-93 known as the Canadian Multiculturalism Act became the first formal legislation for Canada’s multicultural policy. Canada became the first country in the world to pass and enforce a national multiculturalism law (Dewing 6). The Act sought to “preserve, enhance and incorporate cultural differences into the functioning of Canadian Society, while ensuring equal access and full participation for all Canadians…” (Ibid).

In the U.S. there is no formal multicultural policy on a federal level. Legislations preventing interracial marriages were enforced. This is indicated through the controversial landmark case of Loving vs the Commonwealth of Virginia. Considered a crucial moment in legal history of mixed race marriages in the U.S. as this case, “invalidated a law that made interracial marriages a crime” (Korgen 20). Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 resulted in equality under the law for blacks and other racial minorities (Ibid). Sollors writes, “the decision in the Loving case shows the distance twentieth-century American courts had travelled” (202). Scholarly literature is divided in a “distinction between multiracial people prior to the mid-1960s and
multiracial people after the mid-1960s- a distinction tied explicitly to the 1967 *Loving* decision, which invalidated state laws against interracial marriage in the United States” (Spencer 63) which makes it pivotal in the history of mixed unions.

1.5 Fighting the legal war: Loving vs Commonwealth of Virginia:

The Civil Rights Movement followed subsequently by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had a major impact on black identity and interracial relations (Elliott 63, Klarman 70). Korgen reflects, “What is not well known is that this movement also played a major role in the transformation of racial identity among biracial individuals” (43). Some scholars observe a softening towards mixed unions after the late 1960s. This distinction has its roots embedded in the *Loving* case as detailed below (Sollors 26, Spencer 63).

The case involved the marriage of a white man Richard Perry Loving, a white man and Mildred Jeter, a woman of mixed Indian and African descent. Both were residents of Virginia. The couple obtained a marriage license in Washington D.C and returned back to their modest home in Virginia. They were arrested early the next morning, abruptly awoken from their bed for ostensibly violating the State of Virginia’s anti-miscegenation laws. The state law not only prohibited interracial marriages, there was also a decree that illegalized Virginia residents from marrying interracially out of state and then returning back. The couple was eventually found guilty for violating the Virginia Racial Integrity Act of 1924. They were given the choice of either leaving the State of Virginia for 25 years or serving a prison sentence. In his decision, the judge claimed that, “Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement

---

9 This is summarized on the accounts written by Spencer in his work Challenging Multiracial Identity on pages 63-71. See Bibliography for full reference.
there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix” (Henriques 25). Marrying across racial lines became legally credible (Maillard 15). The case of Loving vs Commonwealth of Virginia established a new context for mixed/interracial marriages in the United States by reinforcing the legal authority of the anti-miscegenation regime that preceded it (Ibid). Sollors observes “Nothing more vividly describes the American racial pathologies than the tendency to use power especially state power to discourage interracial love (143).

1.6 Why does Canada have a higher rate of mixed unions than the United States?

There is empirical evidence available that Canada has a significantly higher rate of mixed unions as compared to the U.S. According to the Gallup Poll released in 2007 by University of Lethbridge¹⁰ for the Canada Survey Series Canadians particularly those under 35 years of age are more accepting of interracial unions than their American counterparts (Bibby). The study indicates 77 per cent of Americans approve of marriages between blacks and whites, a figure that has remained constant in recent years. However in comparison 92 per cent of Canadians approve of mixed unions. Pattern reflects greater acceptance of interracial unions in Canada (Ibid).

The latest census figures in 2006 indicated the province is at the forefront for mixed unions in the country at 5.9 per cent which is higher than Ontario (4.6 per cent) and Alberta (4.2 per cent). In the year 2001 out of the 14.1 million couples 452,000

---

¹⁰ Reginald Bibby is the Research Chair in the Department of Sociology at the University of Lethbridge. He found out that Canadians are more likely to approve of mixed unions than Americans. Full reference in bibliography. Online URL: http://www.reginaldbibby.com/images/PC_9_RACIAL_INTERMARRIAGE_AUG2907.pdf
people were joined in mixed unions. This is a significant increase since 2001 when mixed unions were a mere 3.3 per cent of couples in BC (Milan and Hamm 2).

British Columbia has a long history of mixed marriages shaping the cultural landscape of the province. Renisa Mawani traces the history of mixed-bloods and interraciality in her work, *Colonial Proximities: Crossracial Encounters and Juridicial truths in British Columbia 1871-1921*. She draws parallels between mixed unions in British societies with those in BC. “During this period, interracial heterosexual relations between aboriginal women and white men and the products of these intimacies provoked serious questions among colonial authorities in British Columbia. Upon first glance this seems hardly surprising. Fears of interraciality and of mixed race bodies were common and even universal throughout the British Empire” (166). It seems that Mawani feels the contemporary notions of these unions comes from a long history of crossracial encounters in a single colonial contact zone. Scholars have provided a myriad of reasons to explain why Government elites\textsuperscript{11} were so frightened by mixed- blood peoples on Canada’s west coast and other parts of the country.

Mawani substantiates this by, “Colonial authorities in British Columbia often drew unevenly on a range of racial epistemologies and strategies of racial-legal management that were borrowed from other colonial settings, including those that geographically proximate the United States as well as those farther distant like North Africa” (8). These factors contribute to a higher rate of mixed unions in Canada compared to the U.S.

### 1.7 Problematizing hybridity:

\textsuperscript{11} Mawani discusses this in her article “In Between and Out of Place: Racial Hybridity, Liquor and the Law in Late 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} Century British Columbia” (10). See Bibliography for full reference.
Scholarly post-colonial literature focuses on the nature of post-colonial hybridized culture as a strength than weakness. Ashcroft observes, ‘Hybridity and the power it releases…allows a means of evading the replication of binary categories of the past and developing new anti-monolithic models of cultural exchange and growth’ (183). The term has its roots in the Latin word *hybrida* which means the offspring of tame sow and a wild boar. The word means “mixture” in its simplest form. Experts find this concept rather convoluted in the way it has been treated in scholarly work (Bhabha 13, Werbner, 22, Young 180). Bhabha defines hybridity in the context of “cultural hybridity” where, “liminal space, in between the designations of identity…the connective tissue that constructs the difference between upper and lower, black and white. The hither and thither… this interstitial passage… that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy” (4). Papastergiadis associates hybridity with the effects of multiple cultural attachments on identity or the process of cultural mixture where, “Both the effects and processes of mixture can also lead to a critical form of consciousness (40).

In *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, Robert Young states, “Culture has always carried these antagonistic forms of inner dissonance within it: even ‘Englishness’ has always been riven by its own alterity. And so too, racial theory, which ostensibly seeks to keep races forever apart, transmutes into expressions of the clandestine, furtive forms of what can be called colonial desire: a covert but insistent obsession with transgressive, inter-racial sex, hybridity, and miscegenation” (xii). Young argues these theories today repeat and revisit those from the Victorian racial theories and have been less fixed and stable than uncertain, speckled with a desire of otherness (62). But hybridity has connotations of “heterosis, the inherent biological superiority of mixed

---

12 As defined by Oxford Dictionary. Accessed online from UBC library website.
race” as Anzaldua refers to the crossing over of races that provides, “hybrid progeny, a mutable more malleable species with rich gene pool” (377).

1.8 Do mixed unions last?

Rodriguez argues mixed couples and their offspring deal with multiple localizations and cultural backgrounds rather than experiencing a “clash between two cultures” (403). He states it would be a “mistake” to pretend that multicultural links do not exist and they cannot be revitalized and functional (Ibid). Mahtani asserts people of mixed race origins move beyond these polarities. The tension lies in their offspring torn in the struggle to find their identities or become the poster children for a post-racial future (Tzeng 321). Contrada et al conceptualize out of all the aspects of ethnicity appearing to influence psychological processes, a large number are attributed to psychological stressors. Those are perceived threats to physical or psychological well-being (136). They contend the three most common psychological stressors are ethnic discrimination, stereotype confirmation concern and own group conformity pressure (Ibid). Further Leivens quotes Surkyn and Reiners in his study who point towards the formation of “transplanted communities”. These communities are able to, “uphold social, cultural and normative structures imported from the region of origin…” (120). He applies this concept to mixed unions where each partner brings with them their own set of cultural insights, education, possibly power and wealth (Ibid).

1.9 Communication and interracial contact:

Education and educational institutions have also played a unique part in increasing interracial contact and mixed unions. These places provide an opportunity for acceptance and amalgamation on a more intellectual and open minded platforms than any
where else in society. Johnson and Jacobson argue this candidacy comes from a two fold aspect: learning greater tolerance and equal status contact with members of different groups (388). There is evidence of a greater approval rate of interracial marriages among college educated individuals. A direct position correlation is found between education and racial tolerance, where educated individuals contact culminated in interracial unions (Jacobs and Labov, Heaton and Jacobson, Qian, Kalmjin, Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan). Media has spotlighted the emergence of a post-racial era with the popular election of Obama in the United States which will put the above discussion into context regarding mixed individuals.

**1.10 Barack Obama: the new legacy of “mixedness”:**

“Contrary to the claims of some of my critics, black and white, I have never been so naïve as to believe that we can get beyond our racial divisions in a single election cycle, or with a single candidacy- particularly a candidacy as imperfect as my own.”

--- Candidacy Speech (Obama 2008)

When President Barack Obama became the 44th and first black president in the history of the United States, his mixed ancestry was a subject of debate. Allen describes Obama as one of the children of globalization. He quotes Obama’s victory speech on the night of the election, “This victory alone is not the change we seek. It is only the chance for us to make that change” (34). And America benefits from the presence of such individuals who bring a mix of talents and capabilities to the economy. Allen describes the issue of job opportunities (in the government, banking, NGOs, cultural organizations and the media in America that has a severe need of personnel to fill up these slots.

---

13 This quote has been cited by Lugo-Lugo and Bloodsworth (2009). However this is from his candidacy speech, “A more perfect Union” broadcast live by CNN on March 18, 2008 in Philadelphia, PA. Accessed online on Feb 25, 2010 from [http://my.barackobama.com/page/content/hisownwords](http://my.barackobama.com/page/content/hisownwords)
On the other hand, Ball views Obama election as “a statement to us all that ‘change’ is not coming, but has come” (37). In Ball’s opinion Obama is the perfect solution to “calm potential rebellion” while “appeasing white notions of him as the exception which proves the rule” (36). An offspring of a mixed union Obama defies some racial bindings that once held the country apart on ethnic lineage showing signs of change. Yet he has experienced moments of racism since his inauguration. Krause II anticipates Obama is uniquely positioned to reduce the perceived difference between the government of America and people of colour around the world (236).

Further, Obama is both a challenger to and a product of increasing permeable cultural barriers defined by race, economics and location (Ibid). Lugo-Lugo and Bloodsworth sum up that, “the questions in the public imaginary about his patriotism, … along with his race as a Black man, all contributed to the browning of his public persona. During the 17 months he was immersed in the primary campaign, Barack Obama was cast as threat to (white) America, to tradition, to the American way: Obama was indeed seen as a new kind of terror.” (120). Korgen states it is still not socially acceptable for a biracial person who appears white to identify racially as white. They are, however, now able to define themselves as both black and white (43). At this particular moment in U.S. history Obama has broken through the racial colour lines where being “mixed” has greater acceptance.

1.11 Bi-Racial or mixed- Delineating the two phenomena:

Obama’s racialized persona leads into the discussion about the variances between mixed and bi-racial identities. These terms are often conflated but treated suspiciously by a few critical mixed race scholars. Research demonstrates these are different concepts in
race studies. The 2000 Census in the U.S. was the first which gave formal recognition to the increasing multiracial population with ‘check all that apply’ option. Nearly seven million American checked more than one race in Census 2000 (Pellegrini 535).

In the United States, a study conducted on 177 bi-racials with one black and one white parent by Brunsma and Rockquemore yielded results that the relationship between skin colour and identity is “salient within individuals who grew up in pre-dominantly black pre-adult contexts” (240). The study provided evidence that black community sees shades of colour whereas Whites see only two colours: black and white. However, bi-racials with darker skin tones growing up and socializing in predominantly black contexts chose a singular black identity. Phenotype and genotype play a significant role in the ways people are racialized and whether or not they identify with a single ethno-racial group or as biracial or multiracial. Whereas, those bi-racials with skin tones ranging from light to medium and, “who were socialized in primarily Black contexts are more likely to say that they understand themselves as Bi-racial, but they experience the world as a Black person (Ibid). Based on the data from the same sample Rockquemore and Brunsma provided approaches to issues faced by bi-racial women towards identity construction. They emphasize, “… (1) there is no single ideal racial identity for multiracial people, (2) biracial people choose between a variety of distinct racial identities, (3) their choices are profoundly governed by the degree of interactional validation that they receive (or fail to receive) from others in their social contexts, and (4) the potential for any individual to experience difficulty in obtaining validation for their chosen identity is compounded exponentially by additional marginal statuses” (97).
Along similar lines, Childs discovered the invisible tension present that interracial marriage is “fundamentally deviant” and “racial segregation is reproduced through everyday discourse”. The data analyzed included interviews and focus groups from 15 interracial couples to conclude the resistance to mixed unions is based on the conviction that Whites and Blacks are different and disparate. Childs observes the White antagonism questions the whiteness of the racial lines thus lowering the family’s status. While black opposition to an interracial marriage is based on unpleasant historical experiences, racism, rejection and isolation (89). Nakashima observes, “if a person, by birth, belongs to and identifies with more than one racial and cultural group, the monoracially ‘hegemonic’ American culture is forced either to adjust the system to make room for the person or to adjust the person to fit into the system” (164).

1.12 ACS Case study:

A 2005 study conducted by Association for Canadian Studies indicates mixed couples generate higher average income than those marrying within the same ethnic group. The study based on the Statistics Canada Census data from 2001 demonstrates “mixed ethnic couples earn more than their endogamous counterparts” (1). Out of the 16 groups analyzed it was found that when men or women married outside their racial group their total income exceeded those marrying within their ethnicity.\(^{14}\). The table data demonstrates that when an Aboriginal, South and East Asian, Central and East European married an exogamous partner all 16 indicated a rise in income. Similarly, 14 out of 16 individuals belonging to Canadian origin, marrying outside their background saw a rise in income. A contrast was found for males of American origin who stated that marrying

\(^{14}\) Refer to Table 1.0 on Page 23
outside their group was less beneficial. While women stated marrying outside their racial group generated less financial gains. This study provides evidence that exogamous unions lead to better financial status than those in an endogamous relationship.

**Conclusion:**

As seen from the discussion above, it can be concluded the perceptions towards mixed race marriages have evolved. The 1950s, 60s, 70s and 80s provided frameworks that brought landmark multicultural policy changes in the shaping of mixed unions in Canada. The study of race relations remains incomplete without an examination of interracial romances, interracial friendships, interethnic employees in a workplace, interracial children that can be used to study the successful accomplishment of goals in a multicultural society. There is scholarly literature available on immigration, interracial marriages, socio-economic forces together create challenges and opportunities for a mixed society that a same-race nation might not envision. Mixed marriages have created a pressing need to break the racial lines beyond black and white to be recognized, recognize and celebrate mixed race individuals as a powerful demographic.
Table 1.0

Number of gains in exogamous relations with 16 groups versus endogamous relationships based on mean income of couple, Canada, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couple Total Income: Mean couple income $</th>
<th>Ethnic Husband/Wife Other Origin Husband</th>
<th>Ethnic Wife/Husband other origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal origins</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian origins</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British origins</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French origin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European Origins</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Western European origins</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern European origins</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian Origins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern origins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asian origins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian origins</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian origins</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asian origins</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African origins</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin, Central and South American origins</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean origins</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American origin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1

Evolution of Multiculturalism in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Ethnicity Multiculturalism (1970s)*</th>
<th>Equity Multiculturalism (1980s)*</th>
<th>Civic Multiculturalism (1990s)*</th>
<th>Integrative Multiculturalism (2000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Celebrating differences</td>
<td>Managing diversity</td>
<td>Constructive engagement</td>
<td>Inclusive citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Point</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Society building</td>
<td>Rights and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Race relations</td>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Source</td>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>Systemic discrimination</td>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>Globalization, security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>Employment equity</td>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>❏</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Metaphor</td>
<td>‘Mosaic’</td>
<td>‘Level playing field’</td>
<td>‘Belonging’</td>
<td>‘Two-way street’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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