

DIRK HOERDER

Arizona State University

EDUCATION FOR A TRANSCULTURAL LIFE-WORLD  
OR FOR A HEGEMONIC NATION? SCHOOLING  
IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE, IN FRANCE,  
AND IN CANADA, 1830s–2000s

To understand transcultural education in societies with children from many cultural backgrounds, this essay looks at socialization in colonial-hierarchical settings and uses the analysis of cultural impositions to discuss consequences and needs in present-day immigration societies. The analysis begins with an historical approach to intercultural education. In a first section, focusing on British as well as French and Dutch colonies it analyses memories as reflected in life-writings of colonized resident children in schools run by in-migrant – “third-culture” – imperial administrators and teachers – a remote-control education. Present-day constructs of mono-cultural national values may be equally remote to the life-worlds of many-cultured societies. The second part traces the migration of imperially-educated students and working adults to the (former) colonizer core with India-to-England (late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century) and Suriname-to-The Netherlands (1960s–2000s) as examples. In a third section, as an exemplary case for today’s multicultural cities, I discuss French-speaking university students from North and West Africa in Paris, i.e. migrant students facing a national/nation-centred/nationalist educational system. In a concluding part, I will interpret present-day Canada’s educational practices in terms of transcultural socialization. How did children and adolescents connect the “facts” learned in educational institutions to their everyday lives -- if they did so at all?

## THE NARROW WORLDS OF IMPERIAL EDUCATORS

Empires are expansive and, in traditional imperial historiography, have always been studied as such. In contrast, colonizer-empire builders' narrow self-enclavement is described in life-writings by those colonized: Macro-regional, even world-wide imperial spaces were ruled-administered by narrowly self-referential men (Halbwachs 1925). The power to define colonial education systems' broad frame of reference as well as specific schools' curricula rested with core-born and core-residing elites, predominantly men, though, in matters of education and social services, elite women could have an input. The power over curricula included the power to place oneself at the top of the social-cultural-racial hierarchy. This centre-periphery relationship has been discussed in terms of "white vs. coloured" or, to avoid the cliché that white is not a colour, white colonizers and other than white colonized. However, the colonizers were internally divided by gender, class, and region, as well as by being core-born and core-residing, core-born and colony-residing, and colony-born and colony-residing, the latter designated as "creole" – white creole, to be explicit. A further group were migrants from numerous European cultures living in colonies closely connected to the imperial centre like Britain's "white colonies" Canada and Australia or Algeria as *département* of France. The imperial ideologues assigned them the label "ethnics."

The colonized were, of course, even more heterogeneous than either colonizer or other migrants. Retrospective life-writings indicate that men and women, already as school-children, had to create their own frames of reference since neither were imperial long-distance curricula related to their life-worlds nor were the "natives," even if they accepted and reproduced what they had been taught, permitted to enter the colonizers' social enclaves. The self-referentiality of colonizer-imposed curricula conflicted with both everyday lives and diversity of the colonized. The imperial ideologues, administrators, and teaching personnel

- (1) as regards children of the allegedly inferior colonized cultures professed to intend to elevate them,
- (2) as regards the creole-born white-skinned descendants of their own "stock" or "race" assumed that these would remain mentally tied to "mother tongue" and "fatherland",
- (3) as regards migrants from other European cultural backgrounds posited that these, too, needed uplift to the imperial referential culture.

In addition to closely core-connected colonies like Canada and Algeria, this also concerned colonial societies which were considered extensions of the core like Dutch Indonesia, French Martinique and Guadeloupe, and British India and Jamaica.

The largest of empires, the British, will serve as exemplary case. While missionaries came to the colonies with a comprehensive body of religious texts, dogmas, rituals, and practices, state-side educators had no comprehensive view of educational goals, many-cultured lifeways, or needs of pupils. Britishness as “identity” seemed “natural” to them and no analytical stance ever emerged. Socialized gut-feeling called “National Identity” trumped intellectual questioning of cultural relations and interactions. Unquestioned notions of “the British nation” or “the superiority of the white race” in general and the Anglo-Saxon Whites in particular placed colonizers in a mental ghetto which most of them never left.<sup>1</sup>

In India, Thomas Babington Macaulay’s notorious *Minutes on Education* (1835), adopted as policy by Governor-General Lord Bentinck, proclaimed that “natives” were to be “English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (Stilz 1982: 56). In Canada, a century later in the 1930s, the Ontario Department of Education’s manual ruled: “The teacher should not fail to emphasize the extent, power, and responsibilities of the British Empire, its contributions to the highest form of civilization, the achievements of its statesmen and its generals, and the increasingly important place that Canada holds amongst the Overseas Dominion.” This program was formulated half a century after Canada’s Dominion status (1867) and after full independence (Statue of Westminster, 1931) – the gatekeepers of education had not noticed. They aimed at indoctrination of what they considered Britishness. Their reproach that Others, if “coloured,” were inferior or, if white like French-Canadians and Canadian immigrant ethnics, were culturally in limbo, folkloric, or clannish was but a rhetorical smokescreen to hide their own “clannishness” and, in the case of British-Canadian elites, their unwillingness to identify with Canada (Baldus and Kassam 1996).

English-origin emigrants often did not expect that in “the colonies” any change of attitudes would be necessary; they moved across the world “under the Union Jack.” Rather than looking up a flagpole, they might have levelled their gaze to see and understand everyday life. Native-born Canadians, whether of English, Scottish, other European, Chinese, Sikh, or other background and who, under the alleged equality of Empire were British subjects, wasted little time to make clear to newcomers from the English segment of the British Isles that adjustment was necessary and expected. Caught unaware, many English-minded “old-stock” Ontarian and Maritime Provinces’ elite members remained imprisoned in self-referentiality, while those labelled “ethnics” commented on the incongruity of having arrived in Canada and being taught about Britain. Only some English, having considered themselves well informed through novels about “Indians”, did

---

<sup>1</sup> For a broad survey of education see Mangan 1993; for a long-term differentiated view of British personnel and merchants in India see: Lange and Pandurang 2003: 178–188.

realize that knowledge about Canada, including that of policy-makers, was close to zero. Such core-referential gentry-class Englishmen became a socio-ethnic group about whom their neighbours told more jokes than (in)famous Polish jokes were ever invented. English immigrant *women* adjusted and performed far better. To the colonized, the male colonizer elites appeared as misfits.

Immigrants from cultures other than the respective imperial one knew that their decision to migrate implied coming to terms with the new society. In what might be called an “early discourse analysis” they understood that the British-centred frame of reference had no relation to Canadian communities and life-worlds:

– When, at the time of World War One, the Province of Alberta, where bilingual schools for immigrant children existed, imposed monolingualism, immigrant parents angrily commented: “The minister of education lies when he says that Alberta is *an English province*. *Alberta is a Canadian province*, where everyone has equal rights.” In a poem, “English Culture” (1914), another immigrant complained: “We help Canada rise / In Commerce and all things.../ We will tell the whole world: / ‘English culture is peculiar.’” (Czumer 1942: 104–12, 118–119)

– Serafina Petrone, of Italian background, attending the Port Arthur (Ontario) teachers’ seminar in the 1930s disconcertedly noted: “Ontario education was British in substance. British and Canadian were synonymous.” She had to memorize British money, liquid and linear measures, achievements around the world: Magna Charta, steam engine, defeat of the Boers, Calcutta, Plains of Abraham, Waterloo, Khartoum (Petrone 1995: 165–91).<sup>2</sup>

– Helen Potrebenko provided a gendered perspective. In school texts British culture was male – men had built the empire and, Queen Victoria excepted, royalty and politicians were male: “I learned that everything English was good and the exact opposite of Ukrainian. So if Ukrainian men were chauvinists, English men were not. This led to a great many misunderstandings.” She *learned* that women were weak and boys were strong but she *experienced* that boys often were stupid. She was taught that English society was free and democratic unlike the Ukrainian autocratic paternalism – “I learned the truth” belatedly (Potrebenko 1981: 40).

State-side education and training had absolutely no coherent frame of reference. Ontario’s British-origin elite, if visiting London, would have been looked down upon as creole, as colony-born. This very same elite socialized children into a *British*-centred world and at the same time excluded them from British-Canadian social institutions.

Do modern nation-states, their well-established elites and tradition-ensconced administrators, clinging to a mythical past, do the same with immigrant or

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Russian-Jewish Canadian Fredelle Bruser Maynard 1964: 70–78; Canadian author Margaret Atwood (1972: 29) shared this experience in the 1960s.

third-culture-kids in the present? Are modern bureaucrats, well-paid and deeply entrenched, as distant to the lives of lower-income groups of resident and immigrant background as colonizer elites were to the colonized?

Immigrants had and have to negotiate several life-worlds: the frame of reference school-teachers taught and teach, the practices “national”-background elite members imposed and impose, and their own everyday lives. Such inconsistencies might have placed children “in limbo.” Life-writings, however, indicate a different outcome: The children became aware that no single cultural mould existed, that they had to question what was proposed to them.<sup>3</sup> The teachers’ rhetoric and the lived structure were mutually exclusive; their parents’ worldviews, norms and praxes differed from those in school; neither parents’ nor teachers’ worlds fit daily peer group practices and many-cultured exchanges. If the alternative, children overwhelmed by the contradictions, did occur, it was never mentioned by those who wrote autobiographies. Forced to question hollow mono-cultural rhetoric, they had and have to negotiate their lives through the contradictions and find their own way. Children’s peer groups, often considered immature or designated as “*sub-culture*”, are a generation ahead of their parents and their teachers! They will determine culture and history in the immediate future. They became, in the example, Canadian long before the elites who demanded Canadianization did. The elites were “provincial,” unable to come to terms with the wide, many-cultured world in front of their doorsteps, while the average immigrants negotiated many cultures – if often in conflictual exchanges.

To the 1950s this self-enclavement under a common flag occurred in Britain’s other “white colonies” and among colonial elites in general. An English-language and English-minded school system had first been imposed on Gaelic-language Ireland. Later, Australian elite families had self-colonized: Jill Ker Conway (1989: 96–104) was forced to learn about Britain rather than Australia as were African-Caribbeans in Jamaica, Indians in South Asia, others elsewhere.

– In Jamaica, pupils learned values in school “under the title of the ‘British Way of Life’” and received “a sanitised version of British society and manners which was made to appear the very height of excellence” (Pilkington 1988: 11).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> In 1940s and 1950s Canada, when the U.S. Chicago Men’s School of Sociology’s paradigm of immigrant dislocation still reigned paramount, sociologists Helen MacGill Hughes and Everett Hughes in Montreal argued that no society offered newcomers only one road to acculturation (E.C. Hughes 1948; Hughes and MacGill Hughes 1952). See Hoerder 2010: 138–66, and Hoerder, forthcoming 2015.

<sup>4</sup> When Afro-Jamaican men were sent to the U.S. during World War Two as agricultural labourers, they did take advantage of their Britishness to demand from their racist employers free weekends and cricket grounds (Hahamovitch 1997). Michelle Cliff, in her novel *No Telephone to Heaven* (1996: 95 *passim*), took up the issue of education in a colonized setting. See also Andrea

– In India, the British supremacist school administrators imposed a British view of individual lives and of the world.<sup>5</sup> Author Bharati Mukherjee, later living in the U.S. and Canada, remembered her 1950s education in Calcutta – i.e. after independence: The British mission school to which all Indians, who could afford to, sent their children, “taught no Indian history, culture, art, or religion” (Blaise and Mukherjee 1986: 170–71). Vijay Agnew, who came as a foreign student to late-1960s Canada, realized that she had no answers when asked by fellow students about her country and culture of origin (Agnew 2003, 2005). Cultural theorist Arjun Appadurai (1991:1) commented after his migration from Bombay to Britain and North America, “I gradually lost the England that I had earlier imbibed in my Victorian schoolbooks.” Queen Victoria had died in 1901 – more than half a century later her Age’s frame of reference lived on in schoolbooks meant to educate children who would live well beyond 2001.<sup>6</sup>

– In Egypt, Edward Saïd, educated in British-run schools in the 1940s, recalled the disproportionate emphasis on the Battle of Hastings and other such “fascinating” events (Saïd 2002: 65–84, 95, 113, 131, 135, esp. 69). In Alexandria, the English in general – like the French – were considered arrogant and unwilling to become part of the multi-ethnic society (Awad and Hamouda 2006: 122).

British and nation-states’ expansiveness of rule and provinciality of thought clashed throughout imperial and national history. White English-speaking “colonials” could talk back and demand rights or step-by-step independence while non-English-speaking “non-white” colonials could talk only among themselves. The colonizer elite like the modern national education-systems bureaucrats lacked intercultural competence. Thus, it required wars “for independence” to send the British back to the province they called THE imperial “centre”. Imperial expansiveness and national monoculturalism never achieved transculturality and local embeddedness.

All of this was similar in the other empires. Aminata Traoré, a cultural producer of national renown in present Mali, formerly part of French West Africa, noted that in this part of *la francophonie*, late 20th-century Maliens have to learn from modern African authors, “que nos ancêtres n’étaient pas les Gaulois, comme on nous l’avait enseigné à l’école primaire, mais des hommes et des femmes debout qui avaient résisté aux descendants de ces derniers.” In

---

Levy (1999: 175), describing her (black female) experiences in 1970’s London. Her Jamaican parents had left on a banana boat in 1948.

<sup>5</sup> Also documented is the former British imperial practice to hide insane colonizing personnel in special asylums for whites so that the coloured colonials might never see a demented British (Ernst 1991).

<sup>6</sup> See also Ghosh 1993. Mir (2010) discusses how the colonizer state and missionaries endeavoured to prune “unruly languages” to fit their ideological as well as print technology imperatives.

Martinique, the anti-colonialist activist and writer Aimé Césaire also had learned the infamous cliché: “Nos ancêtres les Gaulois avaient les cheveux blonds et les yeux bleus...” Throughout the colonies, French educators, as provincial as those of other empires, imposed this snippet of “knowledge” that was wrong even in France.<sup>7</sup> Traoré entitled her book “the rape of the imagination” (Traoré 2002: 31; Césaire 2006: 36). To “destroy the African soul” in order to impose a modern [i.e. nationally French] education on the colonized, had been the goal of French imperial educators in the West African societies (Dravie-Houenassou-Houangb 1988). The Dutch case, with Suriname as example, will be discussed below.

Thus educators, seemingly expansive and definitely hegemonic, taught about themselves, passed on their childhood socialization, and assumed their superiority as “natural.” They epitomized an imperial provinciality unable to understand movements for cultural affirmation or, in political terms, independence, in human terms, self-determined lives. This raises many questions:

– Would not only the colonized but also the empires have been served better by a “human capital”-approach in training and education, geared to develop capabilities to the best rather than inculcate ideology?

– Would not, under a “social capital”-approach, both sides have benefited from cultural exchange and transcultural capability?

Under “imperial provinciality” practices, the powerful in the metropole as well as in the colonies could afford a narrow frame of reference and punish subalterns (whether classes, women, children, “ethnics,” or “colonials”) who did not accept their assigned place and behaviour in it. Subalterns had and have to pay close attention and negotiate multiple frames of reference to avoid punishment. Only the powerful can afford to restrict themselves to mono-cultural intellectual and social capabilities, to self-enclave. Subalterns need to be better equipped. A (brown) “boy” of a British officer in India or a (darkish) Ukrainian immigrant in Alberta needed many-cultural capabilities. The powerful could rest on their monopoly over societal resources.

Imperial mono-referentiality led to single-lane scholarship and to the so-called master narrative. Those who could switch between frames developed discourse theory, introduced subaltern studies, and created post-colonial theory. They could accommodate multiple narratives. Of the theoretical innovators and discourse theorists, most had been socialized in bi- or many-cultured experiences in their own lives,<sup>8</sup> for example by migration from Lucknow to Oxford or from Algiers

---

<sup>7</sup> This identity-construct has recently been challenged in the exposition, “Gaulois, une expo renversante”, Cité des Sciences et de l’Industrie, Paris, Oct. 2011 – Sept. 2012, and the catalogue Malrain and Poux 2011.

<sup>8</sup> Of the French-language theorists, Roland Barthes had lived in Romania and Egypt, Frantz Fanon in Martinique and Algeria, Jacques Derrida and Pierre Bourdieu in Algeria. Other theorists

to Paris. They came to understand the limitations of a single frame of reference. Similarly, working-class immigrant children in Winnipeg's schools and highly educated upper-class Indians at British universities, from experience, "knew" that, in many respects, their teachers were uninformed, narrow, or plain wrong. This awareness provided a potential for developing views and life-trajectories of their own and for resistance.<sup>9</sup>

#### IMPERIAL EDUCATION AND MIGRANTS' REALITIES OF LIFE IN THE (FORMER) CORE OF THE EMPIRE, 1870s–2000s

From the education of resident subalternised children by educators of foreign imperial cultures we now turn to the migratory experiences of younger and older adults to the imperial core societies, Indian students and intellectuals to late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century Britain (Lange and Pandurang 2003: 177–200) and Surinamese domestic and caregiving workers to The Netherlands, 1960s–2000s (Marchetti 2010). Having accepted British or Dutch education and norms, they were English and Dutch – so they had been told. Both carried their frames of mind with them but, in contrast to the colonizers, did not have the power to assume their own superiority.

"[British] Men in an enclave ruled a society they did not understand [in India] and, in turn, alike numbers of the colonized society migrated to England both to comprehend their rulers and to gain university degrees that permitted entry into the global-imperial-colonial system of administration and thought. Just as Europeans who carried their frame of mind and their power with them, Indians carried their different frame of mind with them. Both influenced, subverted, distorted, and fertilized each other." (Lange and Pandurang 2003: 178) The cultural characteristics the British educators pressured their students to imbibe were, however, not necessarily internalized. The British imperial interest was clear – since India's many cultures as a whole could not be controlled by British in-migrating personnel a "local," i.e. sub-continental, buffer-class of British-educated elite members had to be created and formatted to execute the mercantile, racial, cultural, and political goals of the distant core. The intended passionate admiration for British (or European) qualities of character, however,

---

experienced two (or more) regimes in one society: Antonio Gramsci and Mikhail Bakhtin, for example, the transformations to fascism and Stalinism respectively. In Britain, Stuart and Catherine Hall, the former of Jamaican origin, questioned imperial-national discourses.

<sup>9</sup> This assessment is based on children with capabilities to discern. In some families, classes, or cultures infants in the decisive first three years of socialization are prevented from developing capability to discern.



was inculcated in an increasingly imperially impoverished society. The result could be a “brown *sahib*” or a critical observer, even an anti-colonial activist.<sup>10</sup>

Coming, i.e. being admitted, to British universities as students, Indian young men wanted an intellectual relationship but at the same time demanded independence from paternalism, duplicity of rhetoric and practice, supercilious whiteness implications. The British administration’s practices seemed not as impartial and rational as the imperial rulers announced and, perhaps, believed. “The mythology of England as a place of law, culture and scientific rationality” collapsed when the young intellectuals experienced and empirically observed their treatment as brown men at white English institutions. Numerous future leaders and theoreticians of independence studied and practiced at prestigious English institutions. Their “mentors” did not “see” this intellectual-political development right before their eyes. The imperial *gaze* served as *blinder* while the subalterns’ experiences and perceptive analyses incorporated more than one perspective and thus opened vistas and options. Out of the attempt to be incorporated into a flawed system came non-cooperation as a first step towards independence. Teaching is a two-way process, perhaps even a multi-directional one, not merely an adult-to-child, white-to-“coloured”, first-world to third-culture kid one.

Experiences of common people, women and men, who migrated to the Netherlands from Suriname (independent from 1975) in the 1960s, were similar: “Look, in Suriname you were raised as Dutch. Your language is Dutch. Your school is Dutch. You know some places in the Netherlands: The Hague, Amsterdam, Utrecht. You learn about them. You learn how the Dutch experienced the war. You learn all about food. You learn also how they dress. [...] But when you arrive here, then you know something: they are white [...] we were black [...] and only the river, the sea, divided us from each other. But exactly the same education that you had there, you had it here. So, you are a ‘black Dutch’. Only, you are born in Suriname, South-America” (Marchetti 2010: 72 quote from interview). As in the British and Indian juxtaposition, the post-migration lifeway experience did not fit the curriculum-culture. This raises questions, in particular in men and women who had believed from their own interest and life-projects that, what they had learned, equipped them for travelling and for getting a job and supporting themselves. Actual racism and hierarchization had not been part of the Christian schools’ teaching. From the late 1940s on, the colonizer government in Surinam had increased options for education and for learning of the Dutch language. As a result, and positively, migration became an additional option for life-courses. But the mythology of Western societies as equal and as offering non-

---

<sup>10</sup> Schools for women, including those of lower caste, were set up only by (women) missionaries.

discriminatory labour markets collapsed upon arrival. Afro-Surinamese women expressed bitterness and frustration in their feelings about The Netherlands' reality which betrayed their – curriculum-grounded – hopes and life-plans. The school-developed Dutch cultural capital turned out to be useless in Dutch society: They knew everything about Dutch life and state as long as they were in Suriname and nothing once in Dutch society – as one interviewee put it (Marchetti 2010: 113). In an inferiorizing process, the Dutch state pushed them into low-rung labour market segments. In addition – like their upper-class Indian counterparts – they had learned nothing of the history and institutions of Suriname. A further grievance was that their Dutch “hosts” – or hostile employers – knew nothing about Suriname and did not intend to learn. This asymmetry was experienced as societally embedded unfairness.

Beyond the Indian and Surinamese experiences we might ask, how immigrant Chinese pupils and students – dispersed in a global diaspora – digest teachings about Western culture: They arrive in Western societies with knowledge of the barbarity of the opium wars in which the British government imposed drug consumption (1840s) and of the destruction and looting of the royal summer palace by western soldiers (1860). Colonizer barbarity is in the minds of the descendants of those who suffered from it, but not necessarily in the minds of present-day children as descendants of those who perpetrated it. Memories of those ruled and of those ruling are different.

If migrant acculturation, the way they use their human capital to the best for their own life trajectories and the way societies benefit from immigrant capabilities, is restrained by unfairness, hierarchization, and low wages, alienation and cynicism develop. The policy goal – in proclaimed, avowed, or rhetorical versions – is, however, belonging and embeddedness. Politics of rule, education in myths, immigration policies of exclusion and subalternization sap the very foundations on which people intend to build their lives *and* upon which western liberal states proclaim to rest (Anderson 2013).

#### COMPARISON ACROSS TIME: SCHOOLING AND LIFE-WORLDS IN TODAY'S MULTICULTURAL CITIES<sup>11</sup>

While the education in imperial contexts seems absurd in retrospect, *national* value-education still seems pertinent in particular to conservative educators even

---

<sup>11</sup> The subchapter is based on research in Hamburg (Nora Räthzel), Bremen (Irina Schmitt), London (Phil Cohen, Les Back, Michael Keith, 1996), Paris and Toronto (Dirk Hoerder), Calgary (Yvonne Hébert et al.), and on studies by other scholars on other cities.

though societies are many-cultured. Many youth in schools as well as students in universities in today's post-colonial – post-colonization – cities come from former colonies or they are the children of immigrant parents. In Germany<sup>12</sup> and Austria as well as other states without a colonial past they are often considered as “in between” cultures, not embedded in either one. In France, Britain, and the Netherlands, migrants from the colonies usually arrive with (perfect) knowledge of English, French, or Dutch. They usually also speak the language of their culture of origin fluently and, sometimes, a third language. They are linguistically better skilled than children of mono-cultural national parents. Based on two research projects, I will discuss students at a university in the suburbs of Paris and pupils in schools in Germany, England, and Canada.

Self-referentiality (i.e. nation-centred culture) as a paradigm of education is costly. It requires power and institutional hegemony to impose such one-way culture on children having been socialized as infants in multi-directional cultural options. Multi-referential or transcultural capabilities permit negotiation and translation and avoid the cost of an enforcement apparatus. Such capabilities, belatedly, are being developed in modern post-imperial colonizer core-turned-immigrant societies. In the post-imperial age, both metropolitan residents and post-colonial migrants in the metropolises send their children to the same schools unless municipalities can impose (or residence patterns result in) segregation. Pupils and students may face (the remnants of) a mono-cultural British or French or other imperial or national master narrative, but they live multicultural exchanges in their respective peer group. Nation-state school curricula often still emphasize the culture – narrow, open, or even diverse – of the receiving society. Children and adolescents may face mono-cultural and self-referential teachers or open-minded ones.

In France, young people *issues de l'immigration* – who have left the segregation of the *banlieues* or as immigrant middle-class adolescents with French citizenship have entered the universities – do not consider themselves as “ethnically slotted” but as engaged in a self-determined trajectory with options both beyond the two frames of reference, their family and the receiving society, and with options beyond this dichotomy. Their worlds are cosmopolitan or open-ended. “Je suis donc imprégnée des deux cultures, qui m’ont toutes deux servi à forger mon identité,” said Samira L., a student at the Université de Paris 8 – Saint Denis-Vincennes. Nihat, a boy of Turkish parents born in Hamburg, Germany, commented about his neighbourhood: “[It] is multicultural. Everywhere you go you are accepted [...]. I mean, if you look at that line of shops, the Turk starts there,

---

<sup>12</sup> The German Reich's colonies, acquired from the 1880s, were taken over by the Allied Powers after World War One.

and there the Albanian ends. And where the Albanian ends, the Yugoslav starts with his shop. And I mean, living together here – if we would look at Greece or Turkey and here, where the Turkish ends, you see only Greeks and they are fully satisfied with it. I am also learning Greek.”

However, next to this empirically grounded picture, parallel non-embedded spaces exist. First, young people, usually boys, who want to control a territory and form groups of alleged mono-ethnicity: “the Turks” vs. “the Russians” in Hamburg.<sup>13</sup> They rely on force and rule and do not develop capabilities and options. Second, young people with no chance in the job-market – because of discrimination as much as lack of human capital – feel (and are) cornered and often turn to aggression like the media-hyped, in fact small, riots in Paris *banlieues* in 2005. Both groups (like empires) are constructed by bullying weaker ones and, often, include young men of different cultures (like the imperial cores). Like all expansive-provincial imperialists they fight for control over a territory, their own bordered province in which they live their narrow identity. Third, children, again boys more than girls, from “problem” families, in which the parents did not manage the *métissage* from one society to the other, in which children have neither supervision nor role models, and for whom educational institutions have neither resources nor will to help, may turn to delinquency or withdrawal. All three groups lack individual and social capital to move between perspectives, cultures, and options – their limitations force them into self-referentiality (Räthzel, Hieronymus, Hoerder 2000; Hoerder 2004, 2007).

In present-day France, the French-born children of immigrants complain that colonialism and slavery are not part of what they learn in school – the curricula remain *patrimoine*-enclaves in a multicultural society. They, like their French-origin peers and young immigrants in 1930s Canada, are denied access to their parents’ past and, thus, to the reasons for their presence in France. France’s curricula are as national-provincial as the British ones were imperial-provincial. One young woman described the negative result as *honte et haine*, self-denigration and self-hate (Kerchouche 2003; Theliam 2004). Pupils, realizing that *their* past is being short-changed, sometimes turn against other ethno-cultural-religious groups accorded pre-eminence in curricula: French curricula do not mention colonialism but emphasize the holocaust and the Dreyfus affair and North African-background youth complain about the Jewish stuff, “les trucs des juifs,”

---

<sup>13</sup> “The Turks” is a label for “guestworker children” of several cultures like “Pakis” in Britain, “the Russians” refers to people of widely varying cultural background having (been) migrated (by their parents) from the post-Soviet Union territories to Germany under presumption of a “German-ness” derived from ancestors who migrated eastward from the Germanies many generations ago.

which – seemingly – is as irrelevant to the many-cultured Muslim-French youth as their past is to Christian and Jewish French.

Such students neither demand a complex multicultural education nor deep excursions into history but information “à temps reel” relevant to their lives. This was also the implicit demand of children in the British Empire: Education that fits their lived space and provides options for a life-course rather than one that transforms-brainwashes them into an imperial-provincial dead end. Labelling such construct – like French *la patrimoine*-provincialism – “mainstream” or “master narrative” only serves to increase cynicism. Young people living in a many-cultured local or glocal world are far more perceptive than pretentious masters of empty narrative. Depending on their socialized capabilities, students leave such “education” with the capability to switch codes and frames of reference or with imbued provincialism or with a cynicism critical of cheap ideology but without perspectives. Self-referential provincialism, whether of self-enclaved immigration societies or of self-enclaved immigrant families, prevents young people from leaving assigned slots and taking advantage of options. Imperial curricula, whether in colonies or imposed on internally colonized, are useless.

#### TRANSCULTURAL EDUCATION IN MULTICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN THE PRESENT: THE CASE OF CANADA

In Canada the policy of multiculturalism was announced in 1971 – a clear case of politics catching up with reality. “Diversity is our strength” became a proud motto – still unimaginable in France or Germany and many other societies. In education this implies that no hegemonic Canadian values would be taught – a step easy to take since the two dominant, self-styled “founding nations” had never been able to agree on a single master narrative of nationhood and national identity. A first move involved development of curricula that were committed to “democratic” practices and values. All Canadian citizens regardless of gender, cultural background, or colour of skin (“race”) were to have the same chances – no privileges for values and master narratives of founding nations. “Citizenship is defined by the way we see the world around us, local, [regional,] national and global, and by the part we choose to play in it.” Thus citizenship education is a whole way of action for teachers and educational institutions; it is neither mere knowledge of institutions nor is it a celebration of – alleged – historical achievements (Osborne 1988: 118).

Since “democratic” practices refer to the political sphere and the state, the “whole way of action” needed to be expanded to include societal and economic aspects as well as basic human values – universal human rights rather than

particular national adaptations. In 1982 the Constitution Act incorporated as Part I the “Charter of Rights and Freedoms.” While groups could live their traditions, these could not constrain the rights of individuals – in many cases a protection for women and children under 18 years of age. Group cultures were to contribute to the whole of society – thus they need to be translated in creative encounters to other groups, a process of adjustment to neighbouring cultures in itself. Sharing was the premise, not protection of ethno-cultural particularities, not a “mosaic” with parts fixed in a pattern but a “kaleidoscope” with ever changing constellations. Pupils and students during their crucial development years – and sometimes their parents – were to acquire a sense of responsibility for each and all regardless of differences in culture, ethnicity, gender, social class, sexual orientation, religion, and ability/disability. Difference was to be accepted and appreciated rather than merely recognized and tolerated. Cultural groups, whether Polish-Canadians or South Asian-Canadians or other, could not, in the name of tradition, demand unconditional adherence. An “exit option” had to be available to members born into a cultural group permitting departure for a culture of their choice.<sup>14</sup>

While the term “multi-“ or “inter-cultural” assumes distinct cultural entities to exist, the concept of *transcultural* emphasizes overlapping spaces, continuities, adaption or *métissage*. Educational materials and practices are thus based on a scholarly Transcultural Societal Studies that integrate the study of a society and its patterns and institutions (“social sciences”), all types of representations of it (“discursive sciences”), and the actual practices (“lifeway or habitus sciences”) in the context of legal, religious, and ethical norms (“normative sciences”), the somatic-psychic-emotional-spiritual-intellectual characteristics of individual men and women (“life sciences”) and the physical-geographic context (“environmental sciences”). Transculturation is the process of individuals and societies to change themselves by integrating diverse cultural life-ways into “dynamic” new ones (Hoerder 2010; Hébert 2001, 2003; Cohen 1999). Education is for children, not for empires or nations. Its values are universal human ones, equal for first-, second-, or third-culture kids.

## REFERENCES

- Agnew, V. (2003), *Where I Come From*, Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press.  
 Agnew, V. (2005), *Diaspora, Memory and Identity: A Search for Home*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---

<sup>14</sup> In Canada, the major institution of development of new curricula was the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). Texts in the U.S. include among others Manning and Baruth 1991, Gollnick and Chinn 1990, Grant and Lei 2001, Davidman and Davidman 2001.

- Aimé Césaire: une longue amitié, propos recueillis par Jean-Michel Djian (2006), “Jeune Afrique”, hors-série Vol. 11, p. 30–37.
- Anderson B. (2013), *Us & Them? The Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Appadurai A. (1996), *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimension of Globalization*, Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Atwood M. (1972), *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*, Toronto: House of Anansi.
- Awad M., Hamouda S., eds. (2006), *Voices from Cosmopolitan Alexandria*, Alexandria: Bibliotheca Alexandrina.
- Baldus B., Kassam M. (1996), ‘Make Me Truthful, Good, and Mild’: Values in Nineteenth-Century Ontario Schoolbooks, “Canadian Journal of Sociology”, Vol. 21, p. 327–358.
- Blaise C., Mukherjee B. (1977), *Days and Nights in Calcutta*, New York: Doubleday; repr. Markham: Penguin, 1986.
- Bruser Maynard F. (1964), *Raisins and Almonds*, Markham, Ont.: PaperJacks, repr. 1973.
- Cliff M. (1987), *No Telephone to Heaven*, New York: Penguin-Plume, repr. 1996.
- Cohen P. (1999), *Rethinking the Youth Question. Education, Labour and Cultural Studies*, Durham: Duke.
- Cohen P., Keith M., Back L. (1996), *Issues of Theory and Method*, London: Centre for New Ethnicities Research, Univ. of East London.
- Conway J.K. (1989), *The Road from Coorain*, New York: Vintage.
- Czumer W.A. (1942), *Recollections about the Life of the First Ukrainian Settlers in Canada*, transl. by L.T. Laychuck, Ukrainian orig., 1942; Edmonton: Canad. Inst. of Ukrainian Stud.
- Davidman L., Davidman P.T. (2001), *Teaching with a Multicultural Perspective. A Practical Guide*, New York: Longman.
- Dravie-Houenassou-Houangb K. (1988), *L'éducation africaine face à l'école coloniale: Dualisme de l'éducation dans les pays de la côte ouest-africaine*, Lomé: Éditions HaHo.
- Ernst W. (1991), *Mad Tales from the Raj. The European Insane in British India, 1800–1858*, London: Routledge.
- Ghosh S.C. (1993), ‘English in taste, in opinions, in words and intellect’: Indoctrinating the Indian through textbook, curriculum and education, in Mangan, J.A. ed., *The Imperial Curriculum. Racial Images and Education in the British Colonial Experience*, London: Routledge, repr. 2012, p. 175–93.
- Gollnick D.M., Chinn P.C. (1990), *Multicultural Education in Pluralistic Societies*, New York, Toronto: Macmillan.
- Grant C.A., Lei J.L. (2001), *Global Constructions of Multicultural Education: Theories and Realities*, Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Hahamovitch C. (1997), *The Fruits of Their Labor: Atlantic Coast Farm Workers and the Making of Migrant Poverty, 1870–1945*, Chapel Hill: UNC Press.
- Halbwachs M. (1925), *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, ed. Gérard Namier, rev. ed. Paris: Michel, 1994.
- Hébert Y. (2001), Identity, Diversity, and Education: A Critical Review of the Literature, “Canadian Ethnic Studies”, Vol. 33, Issue 3, p. 155–85.
- Hébert Y.M., ed. (2003), *Citizenship in Transformation in Canada*, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.
- Hoerder D., ed. (forthcoming 2015), *Uprooted or Acculturating: A Revisionist Assessment of the Transcultural Beginnings of U.S. Migration History*, with contributions by Donna Gabaccia, Henry Yu, Claudia Rösch.

- Hoerder D. (2004), Cultural Transfer or Cultural Creation: A Case Study of Students 'issues de l'immigration' in Paris, in: Hoerder, D., Hébert, Y., Schmitt, I., eds., *Negotiating Transcultural Lives: Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspective* – Transkulturelle Perspektiven 2, Göttingen: V&R Unipress; repr. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2006, 147–63.
- Hoerder D. (2007), Jugendliche *issues de l'immigration* in den Pariser Vorstädten: Versuch einer Einordnung, „Sozial.Geschichte“ NF Vol. 22, Issue 2, p. 68–81.
- Hoerder D. (2010), *“To Know Our Many Selves”: From the Study of Canada to Canadian Studies*, Edmonton: Athabasca Univ. Press.
- Hughes E.C. (1948), The Study of Ethnic Relations, “Dalhousie Review”, Vol. 27, p. 477–482.
- Hughes E.C., MacGill Hughes H. (1952), *Where Peoples Meet: Racial and Ethnic Frontiers*, Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Kerchouche D. (2003), *Mon père, ce harki*, Paris: Seuil.
- Lange B.-P., Pandurang M (2003), Dialectics of Empire and Complexities of Culture: British Men in India, Indian Experiences of Britain, in Hoerder, D., with Harzig, C., and Shubert, A., eds., *The Historical Practice of Diversity: Transcultural Interactions from the Early Modern Mediterranean to the Postcolonial World*, New York: Berghahn, p. 177–200.
- Levy A. (1999), *Fruit of the Lemon*, London: Review.
- Macaulay T.B. (1835), *Minutes on Education*, [http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt\\_minute\\_education\\_1835.html](http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt_minute_education_1835.html) (accessed 8 April 2013).
- Malrain F., Poux M., eds. (2011), *Qui étaient les Gaulois?* Paris: Cité des Sciences.
- Mangan J.A. ed. (1993), *The Imperial Curriculum. Racial Images and Education in the British Colonial Experience*, London: Routledge, repr. 2012.
- Manning M.L., Baruth L.G. (1991), *Multicultural Education of Children and Adolescents*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Marchetti S. (2010), *Paid Domestic Labour and Postcoloniality. Narratives of Eritrean and Afro-Surinamese Migrant Women*, PhD dissertation: Utrecht Univ.
- Mir F. (2010), *The Social Space of Language: Vernacular Culture in British Colonial Punjab*, Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Osborne K.W. (1988), *Educating Citizens: a Democratic Socialist Agenda for Canadian Education*, Toronto: Our Schools / Our Selves Education Foundation.
- Petrone P. (1995), *Breaking the Mold. A Memoir*, Toronto: Guernica.
- Pilkington E. (1988), *Beyond the Mother Country*, London: Tauris.
- Potrebenko H. (1981), Ethnicity and Femininity as Determinants of Life Experience, “Canadian Ethnic Studies”, Vol. 13, Issue 1, p. 37–42.
- Räthzel N., Hieronymus A., Hoerder D. (2000), Safe and Unsafe Spaces: Young People's Views of Urban Neighbourhoods in Hamburg, Germany, conference Toronto, March 2000, [http://ceris.metropolis.net/events/conference\\_rathzel.htm](http://ceris.metropolis.net/events/conference_rathzel.htm)
- Said E.W. (2002), *À contre-voie. Mémoires*, trans. from the English *Out of Place. A Memoir* (1999) by Brigitte Caland and Isabelle Genet, Paris: Serpent à Plumes.
- Stilz G (1982), *Grundlagen zur Literatur in Englischer Sprache – Indien*, Munich: Fink.
- Thehiam V. (2004), Histoire scolaire / Mémoire collective: La construction identitaire chez les jeunes issues de l'immigration, Maîtrise: Univ. Paris 8 – Saint Denis-Vincennes.
- Traoré A. (2002), *Le viol de l'imaginaire*, Paris: Pluriel.