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Montreal serves as an important case study to examine issues of socio-economic and spatial differentiation. It embodies relevance to the study of national identity, socio-cultural policies, immigration, and the conceptual discourse concerning race, ethnicity, and racism. The paper explores the legacy of nationalist tensions that played a significant role during much of the development of Montreal, impacting upon the diverse and cosmopolitan population. Using the rich data provided by Census Canada, levels of differentiation are defined and assessed. The empirical data offers a detailed snapshot of Montreal and its social formation. Based on census surveys and utilizing empirical models of analysis, levels of dissimilarity are established. The differentiation is atypical, in terms of its high degree, and social and spatial differentiation patterns of certain groups were found to be unique in comparison to other cities, particularly Toronto and in U.S. cities. This phenomenon is a product of Canadian, and particularly Quebec’s, historical development. This is due in part to the specific constructions of national identity and notions of ‘otherness’ in Quebec and Canadian society.
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The purpose of this paper is to examine social and spatial differentiation in the Montreal urban context, a subject essential in understanding the current conflict in Quebec and Canadian society. Montreal is a city that has transformed over the last several decades. In fact, it could be argued that this transition has gained momentum in recent years. It is a city that is the heart of the Quebec economy, a society attempting to choose a path regarding the national question.

Despite living in the shadow of the United States in the North American context, Canada’s particular history and efforts to address socio-cultural policies and notions of national identity provides a perspective different from that of its large neighbor to the south. For instance, Canada unlike the United States, has long acknowledged notions of group rights in policy and legislation, as a means to foster integration. It is a perspective often overlooked by the international community of scholars, and provides a context with different processes and realities in terms of understanding issues of socio-economic and spatial differentiation in the city. In addition, Montreal constitutes an excellent case study for several other reasons. It is a truly multicultural or cosmopolitan city. In fact, in one region of the city, Cotes des Neiges, its population
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is purported to be one of the most diverse in the world (Shahar, 1991). Perhaps more significantly, since the politics of ‘culture’ has played such a crucial role in the development and sustaining of Canada as an entity, it is fitting to assess the city which characterizes those developments, and personifies the contemporary contradictions of Canadian society. Montreal embodies in its urban and cultural space the legacies and influences of socio-cultural policies from two different perspectives: those represented more generally in Canadian society by Ottawa (English) and Quebec City (French). Montreal, therefore, is useful for assessing the differing effects in the areas of social integration. Does language, culture, race, or ethnicity dominate in the drive to achieve successful integration in Canadian and Quebecois society? Clearly, Montreal provides a dynamic case study for addressing questions and the ramifications of social policies in relation to urban differentiation.

This article intends to make a contribution to the literature through the exploration of a case study that is vital to the Canadian national project and one that has been often overlooked. Through the analysis of urban differentiation in Montreal, levels and forms of segregation will be depicted, which are different than what exists in the United States, as well as, to an extent, than other major Canadian cites. Given the unique socio-economic history of Montreal, original observations and insights are offered to this field of study.

The first section of this paper will overview briefly the significance of the case of Montreal, followed by an introductory remark concerning the current political and economic background, and an examination of the social and historical formations of Montreal’s population. The second section provides a brief overview of the Canadian census surveys, a remark concerning the contemporary population composition in Montreal and the region, a detailed analysis of the social and spatial differentiation in Montreal, and a discussion concerning the ‘real’ and ‘perceived’ levels of differentiation.

MONTREAL—HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND

The Significance of Montreal

Montreal provides a valuable location for examining the complex mixture of spatial and cultural issues pertaining to urban socio-economic differentiation. Montreal embodies the essence of the Canadian national experience. It is a unique city in terms of its population composition and socio-economic development, and is representative of the Canadian national experiment. Inherent in the history of Montreal is the very nature of the Canadian attempt to remain unified and forge harmony among the competing interests of both the French and English, as well as the ‘Others’, within the Federation of Canada. Montreal, the dominant city for most of Canadian history and the center of these tensions, or at times conflicts, is indicative of this national experiment.
Montreal has been a bilingual city of English and French speakers since New France was conquered by the British in 1760. Between 1830 and 1850 a large group of immigrants from Britain temporarily created an English majority in Montreal. It was the only time in the history of the city that the English constituted the majority. In every census since 1871, however, French speakers have been in the majority, accounting for at least 60 percent of the population (Levine, 1990). For more than a century, Montreal has been one of the largest French speaking cities in the world, second only to Paris. Despite this fact, for much of the last one hundred years Montreal has been dominated by the English minority in terms of socio-economic indicators, politics and culture. Reflecting this dominance, that clearly existed at least until the 1960s, Jacobs (1980) asserts that Montreal appeared “... to be what it had been for almost two centuries: an English city containing many French speaking workers and inhabitants” (Levine, 1990:1).

The reason for the ‘English feel’ to the city was due to the unchallenged dominance of Anglophone residents, particularly economically. Much of the Canadian national economy was controlled and directed from the headquarters of many major corporations located in Montreal, and the city was the most important urban setting in Canada until the 1970s. It is important to realize, that until the mid 1970s, Montreal led the economic, financial, political, social and cultural development of Canada as a whole (Levine, 1990).

During the 1950s and 1960s, Quebec entered an era of change in which the predominantly Catholic society underwent a process of modernization. This period, the ‘Quiet Revolution’, witnessed the decline of the Church’s influence on the lives of the vast majority of French speaking Catholic Quebecois, while the modern welfare state came to replace its authority. The French Quebecois became more educated and entered sectors of the labor markets once entirely controlled by the English. With the nationalization of many large corporations, such as Hydro Quebec, and the expansion of the bureaucracy the (Provincial) state offered the French Quebecois employment and career opportunities never before available. These processes led to a generation of French Quebecois, with a greater ability to control their own destinies in the society in a socio-economic, political and cultural sense. This period also saw the growth and development of a capable nationalist movement. This nationalist element forms the context in which all current considerations and decisions are made in Quebec, and in the rest of Canada for that matter.

Throughout the history of relations between Canada and Quebec, Montreal has been the focal point of the majority of conflicts and tensions as well as attempts at rapprochement. In terms of social policies concerning ‘cultural’ issues, Montreal provides the crucial urban context especially in relation to the Canadian national question. From the time of Confederation in 1867, when the English and French negotiated the unity of the nation, Montreal was a center of power and influence. When notions of Anglo-conformity began to wane during the 1940s and 1950s, it was the intellectuals and politicians from Montreal who shaped the post-World War
II society, so as to reflect the pluralistic composition of Canadian society. Due to the fact that they reflected the interests of a powerful component of the confederation, it enabled them to fulfill many of their national objectives. Towards the end of the 1960s, a group of young French Canadian intellectuals and politicians went to Ottawa and joined the Liberal Party of Canada, ultimately taking over its leadership. Led by Pierre Trudeau, this group had great influence in shaping the future of Quebec and Canada. To this day many of the same people are still influential actors, their legacy profoundly influential in the contemporary political reality of Canada.

Background

Montreal has changed during the last several decades in socio-economic and political terms. This shift can be categorized as a general decline. This is reflected in the general state of social relations. Perhaps this is particularly true in the wake of the October 1995 referendum, on Quebec sovereignty, when Quebec society split over its future status and direction. The referendum result, according to the popular vote, was 50.6 percent in favor of remaining in Canada, while 49.6 percent opted for sovereignty (Small, 1996). Montreal is the center of the Quebec economy and home to the vast majority of the Province’s minority communities. It is in this urban context that the socio-economic fallout over the political question has its greatest impact.

Within Montreal visible signs of economic and political decline are evident. Bankruptcies are up and are the highest in the country, and growing at an alarming rate. Many individuals are selling property and moving assets out of Quebec (Small, 1997). The West-end of the city, home to many minority communities, seems to be particularly hard hit. The mood in Montreal has changed, with an increase in political and social tensions. Recently released census statistics by the Federal Government confirmed what has been apparent to Montrealers: the flight from the city by residents has accelerated substantially in the aftermath of the referendum. In fact, the exodus of Quebecers during the first six months of 1996 was approximately three times greater than for the same period in 1995. According to an opinion poll conducted by Alliance Quebec, more than 30 percent of the English speaking population intended to leave in the near future. The numbers in similar polls indicate that a higher percentage of Montreal’s Jewish Community intend to leave Quebec. This is also true of other minority communities, particularly the African-Canadian (Small, 1996). Recently, when asked why he felt so many Quebecers were leaving, Premier Lucien Bouchard simply stated: “Your guess is as good as mine” (Small, 1998).1 Statements such as this indicate that ‘les autres’ are not a pressing concern for the Premier.2

Many youth are leaving Quebec, particularly minority youth, mainly due to the economic situation and the general uncertainty. Experts, community leaders and lay people have expressed concern over the future viability of minority communities in Quebec. Youth unemployment crisis in Quebec is prevalent among minority
communities, especially the African-Canadian population. Among Haitian youth in Montreal, for example, unemployment figures reach approximately 30 to 40 percent. The unemployment figures for Black Anglophone youth in Montreal is even higher at a staggering 50 percent. This can only cause further suffering and instability within the community and for Montreal as a whole. The exodus of Jewish youth from Quebec in search of employment and political stability is also a serious issue threatening the very future of the community itself (Small, 1998).

Social Formation of Montreal: A Brief Examination of Economic Development

The period from the mid-1800s to the early 1960s witnessed the rise and fall of Montreal as Canada’s economic center. During its pre-eminence, it ushered in the Confederation, and was at the forefront of national modernization during the post WWII era. Its dominance coincided with Anglo hegemony over the city. With the Francization of Montreal and the political upheavals it precipitated, combined with the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway in the late 1950s and the subsequent loss of economic power to Toronto, its socio-economic prominence in Canada declined from the role of metropolis to that of a provincial center (Small, 1996). The growth of Montreal’s industrial sector, during the mid- and late 1800s, occurred within a framework of the development of a Canadian transportation infrastructure, a waged labor force, rural specialization, and growing state intervention. The transportation network created, integrated, and expanded the national market. It attracted foreign capital and generated a fixed infrastructure, establishing spin-off effects throughout the economy (Palmer, 1983).

The St. Lawrence River is a vital east/west transportation link, enabling shipping to gain access to the North American interior from the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes. In the 1880s it played a central role in the economic development of Montreal, as the head of ocean-going shipping during the ice-free months (McNaught, 1988). It was, therefore, the key entrepôt of eastern Canada. Modifications were completed on the river by 1848, making Montreal a warehousing center for staple products for trade throughout the North American interior. By the 1960s, however, it ultimately contributed to the city’s economic decline (Small, 1996). During the 1950s the Canadian and Quebec governments agreed with the United States to build a deep water route through the entire St. Lawrence. Officially opened in 1959, the Seaway is only frozen for three months a year. The project advanced the integration of the U.S. and Canadian economies, marking the end of reliance on Montreal’s warehouses. Trade bypassed Montreal to Ontario and U.S. cities along the Great Lakes. Combined with the 1959–1961 recession and rising nationalism, Montreal’s decline began (Small, 1996). It was the last occasion in which the Queen would officiate a ceremony on Quebec soil (McNaught, 1988). The opening of the St. Lawrence made it possible to exploit Quebec’s mineral resources, essentially benefiting Ontario and U.S. industry (Fitzmaurice, 1985).

During the mid- to late 1800s Montreal emerged as Canada’s major urban economic center, and consolidated the place of English in the city’s economy (Levine,
At that time Montreal was under English and Scottish Protestant hegemony. The migration of Britain’s dispossessed also meant that Anglophone Montreal no longer consisted solely of a handful of wealthy merchants, becoming more diverse both along class and ethnic lines. By the 1840s, the Irish constituted 20 percent of Montreal’s working class (Levine, 1990).

The 1920s witnessed a large influx of investment capital, due to diminishing natural resources and steady rise of labor costs in the northeastern U.S. (McRoberts and Posgate, 1980). During WWII an economic renewal occurred, facilitating development in Quebec’s interior. Quebec’s raw materials contributed to Canadian economic development. Since 1935, the industrialization of Quebec has been characterized by a rapid development of industries related to natural resources, further developing its natural resources and expanding secondary and tertiary activities (Milner and Milner, 1973). Agriculture, once a major source of employment, diminished in importance due to mechanization, though it generated higher levels of revenue. Resources were transported mainly by railway and through the St. Lawrence Seaway (McRoberts and Posgate, 1980). Historically, Quebec industries have been largely controlled by U.S. and English Canadian interests, at times establishing monopolies. They were especially prevalent prior to the era of nationalization in the 1960s and 1970s (Fitzmaurice, 1985).

During the second half of the twentieth century hydro-electric power and mining became the two major contributors to Quebec’s economic growth. Hydro power was cheap and plentiful, and derived from the interior of the province. It was a crucial factor in the growth of processing industries, such as pulp and paper, aluminum smelting, and manufacturing. Prior to the Liberal Government establishing the Quebec Hydro Electric Commission in 1944, power production was entirely controlled by private monopolies, mostly U.S. corporations. In 1963, all hydro electricity was nationalized (McRoberts and Posgate, 1980).

Unlike the primary activities, manufacturing is concentrated in Montreal. Manufacturing in Montreal was historically dependent on primary extractive industries, and played a crucial role in economic development. Pulp and paper, the most important manufacturing industry, was followed by smelting and refining, aircraft production, textiles, clothing, and tobacco products. Many of these sectors had roots in small labor intensive operations, characteristic of Quebec industry, before the growth of highly capitalized resource-based industries (McRoberts and Posgate, 1980).

From the 1960s to the 1990s, Montreal’s economic development centered on service sector activity, such as banking, insurance, and tourism (Levine, 1990). Structural changes contributed to the post-Francization Montreal economy. In the late 1960s the economic focus shifted away from Canadian markets towards the Quebec region. The displacement of Montreal as Canada’s pre-eminent urban economic center accelerated after the 1960s, as growing numbers of Canadian corporate head offices and U.S. branch plants moved mostly to Toronto (Levine, 1990). Montreal’s manufacturing investment slightly exceeded Toronto’s in 1961. By the 1970s, Toronto’s stock exchange surpassed Montreal’s in volume and value. At this time,
Toronto clearly became Canada’s national economic heart, while Montreal functioned increasingly as the urban node of the Quebec regional market (Levine, 1990). Interestingly, Montreal and Quebec were, historically, controlled from the vantage point of Westmount. It is still the wealthiest census tract in Canada (Small, 1996).

It is also important to note that in Quebec and Canada, capital is linked to ethnic differences. This is expressed within the Federal political party structure and development strategy (Ornstein, 1985; Small, 1996). A deeper understanding of Canada’s ruling elites can be reached if the perspective includes the acknowledgment of a fragmented bourgeoisie with a solid Anglo-Saxon fraction as the hegemonic partner (Niosi, 1983). As assessed in the next section of this report, these socio-economic cleavages play a central role in the development of the Quebec economy and the ongoing conflict.

The Historical Formation of Montreal’s Population

Urbanization in Quebec, mirroring its economic development, was dominated by Montreal and Quebec City. Montreal became the center of trade and commerce, while Quebec City remained a smaller administrative and educational center. Montreal became the focal point of industrialization, attracting rural French laborers. The city’s population tripled between 1861 and 1891 to 265,000, then doubled again to 530,000 by 1913 (Small, 1997; McRoberts and Posgate, 1980).

As early as 1831, Montreal had a British majority. According to the 1851 census, 55 percent of the city’s 60,000 residents were of British ethnic origin (Levine, 1990). The French Quebec population, however, remained less urbanized than English Canadians. At the turn of the twentieth century the vast majority of Francophones were rural, and the Roman Catholic Church still dominant (Small, 1996). However, in the 1860s, Montreal’s linguistic balance changed significantly and, demographically, the city became French speaking. The economic crisis in rural Quebec, combined with the dynamic growth of Montreal’s industrial economy, attracted thousands of rural Francophones to the city (Hamelin and Roby, 1971). Montreal grew from 90,000 to 800,000 between 1861 and 1931 (Levine, 1990).

As demonstrated in Table 1, significant changes occurred in the demographic composition of Montreal from 1871 to 1961. In 1871, only 22.6 percent of Quebec’s Anglophones lived in Montreal, while in 1931, 61.4 percent lived in the city, and 74.3 percent by 1961. As illustrated in Table 2, by the 1960s, Montreal became the demographic center of both Quebec Anglophone and Francophone populations, a phenomenon that contributes to increased linguistic tensions and conflict (Levine, 1990).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, French Canadians emerged with a strong ideological and political belief based on cultural survival, pertaining to their relationship with the rest of Canada. This became especially relevant with regard to the radical legacy of Papineau, remaining an integral aspect of Quebec politics throughout the 1900s (Small, 1996; McRoberts and Posgate, 1980). The processes of urbanization and industrialization of Quebec, and the growing awareness of social and economic conditions, affected the collective social and political consciousness of French Canadians (Small, 1996).
Table 1: Percentage of Quebecers living in Montreal, 1871–1961.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Quebec Anglos in Montreal</th>
<th>% of Quebec Franco in Montreal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2: Ethnic composition of Montreal, 1871–1961.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The distinction between the ‘Two Founding Fathers of Confederation’, or the Charter Groups, and their competing interests, shaped the history of Canada, from colonial times to the present (Small, 1996). The notion of the ‘Two Founding Fathers of Confederation’ is used in the B and B Report, the foundation ‘multiculturalism’. It refers to the British and French ethnic groups, (B and B Report, 1969). This terminology, which is problematic in terms of gender issues, has also been criticized for its ethnocentricity. It collapses Canada’s history in terms of the contribution by the ‘Others’, most notable, perhaps, the First Nations. Throughout Canadian history, Montreal was the focal point of these tensions and the center of economic and political power (Small, 1997). The conflict was mainly played out in Montreal, due to the competing interests within the city, mainly between the English and French, then later the ‘Others’. On the one hand Montreal is unique in terms of its population composition, though it reflects and embodies the central contradictions of the Canada Federal experiment.

After 1900, Montreal’s ethnic and linguistic balance was affected by new sources of international migration. As late as 1901, Montreal’s population still consisted essentially of British and French. Only 4.5 percent of the residents were not of French or British stock (Table 2). Between 1901 and 1961, Montreal became a multi-ethnic city, due to two significant waves of immigration. In 1931, with the migration of Jews and Italians predominately, 13.5 percent or 135,000 of Montreal’s population was not of French or British ethnic stock. By 1961, as the post-WWII
immigration accelerated from southern and eastern Europe, the non-French, non-British population reached 350,000 or nearly 20 percent of the total Montreal population (Levine, 1990). For the first time ‘Others’ outnumbered the British on the Island of Montreal (Small, 1996). In fact, if the current trends continue, ‘les autres’ or non-Francophone Quebecoïds, will become the majority on the Island of Montreal during the next decade.

As early as the 1940s, the new ethnic amalgam began to influence Montreal’s linguistic dynamics. Until then, Anglophone Montreal was still vastly British. However, as non-Anglophone and non-Francophone immigrants arrived and chose English as their new language, Anglophone Montreal became ‘multicultural’ (Small, 1996). By 1971, as Jews, Italians, Greeks, Portuguese, Caribbeans and ‘Others’ joined the English speaking community, British Montrealers comprised only 61 percent of the Island’s Anglophone population, and only 37 percent of Montreal’s entire non-Francophone population (Levine, 1990).

The ‘multiculturalization’ of English speaking Montreal had two important effects: i) as immigrants opted for English, they bolstered the demographic strength of the English in Montreal; ii) the ethnic diversification of English Montreal transformed Anglophones into a statistical category instead of a communal social grouping (Small, 1996; Levine, 1990). By 1960, English speaking Montreal was a collection of sub-communities: a British community from Quebec, consisting of English, Scottish and Irish; English-speakers from elsewhere in North America; Jews and Italians, southern and eastern Europeans, and Caribbeans. These differences meant that Anglophones often fought among themselves, for example, British Protestants discriminated against Jews (Levine, 1990). The history of discrimination against the Jewish community by English Montrealers is abundant. This includes quotas at McGill University for Jewish students which only ended during the 1960s, Jews were not permitted to purchase homes in Hampstead, the Town of Mount Royal, Westmount, nor enter Anglo-owned ski resorts or golf clubs, etc. (See Anctil, 1992: Small, 1996; Levine, 1990). It took the politicization of the language question during the 1960s and 1970s to generate a common linguistic community out of these diverse groups (Levine, 1990). Traditionally, Quebec and its institutions did not absorb as many migrants as the other parts of Canada. Since 1946, Quebec received 20.7 percent of the total of Canadian immigrants. Only 12 to 13 percent of the immigrants came from French-speaking countries. Of these French-speaking immigrants, 90 percent integrated into the English community of Quebec (Hawkins, 1988).

During the 1970s, especially with the 1976 Parti Quebecois Government, an effort was made to integrate immigrants into the French milieu. A move away from bilingualism to Francization occurred during this time. Some of the laws that established this phenomenon were: Bill 63 (1969), that created the watchdog Office de la Langue Française; Bill 22 (1974), the Official Language Act, instituted the primacy of French in schools and places of work; and Bill 101 (1977), making French the official language of Quebec to the exclusion of English (Brown, 1986; Small, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970–71</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974–75</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976–77</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977–78</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982–83</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987–88</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989–90</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991–92</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4: Distribution of Allophone students by language of instruction in Montreal, 1970–88 (in percentage).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970–71</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973–74</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976–77</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983–84</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984–85</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985–86</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986–87</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987–88</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As evident in Tables 3 and 4, Bill 101 had a profound effect on the educational system and the non-Francophone community in Montreal. It accomplished its goal of turning English education in Montreal into a privilege for a narrowly defined community of Anglophones, not a system that integrated immigrants. This has been perceived by Montreal Anglos as a threat to its continuity (Levine, 1990).

The language issue, especially pertaining to education, was central to the Francization of Quebec. The focus of the linguistic conflict was Montreal. Successive Quebec governments, from the late 1960s to the 1990s, understood that the future of a French Quebec was based in the school system (Brown, 1986). English instruction for the children of Anglophone Quebecers was not at issue. The right of newcomers, however, to have their children educated in the English school system, was firmly restricted legislatively (Brown, 1986). Since 1977, immigrants to Quebec must send their children to French language schools. Substantial levels of enrollment for English language schooling has been lost to Anglophone out migration, the loss of Allophone enrollment, and a significant number of Anglophone parents deciding to send their
children to French schools even though they are eligible for English education (Small, 1997). It should be noted that the term ‘Allophone’ is unique to Quebec politics. It is a term invented by the Quebec government, and used when referring to Quebecers that are of neither French nor English origin, regardless of the actual language they speak.

SOCIAL AND SPATIAL DIFFERENTIATION

Using Canadian Census Surveys to Measure Differentiation

This section examines social and spatial differentiation in Montreal. It relies on raw data provided by Census Canada (1986) surveys to portray an in-depth snapshot of Montreal's social and spatial population distribution. This section offers an empirical examination of Montreal, and should be understood within both the historical and conceptual contexts.

The Canadian census material provides an excellent source of data, not found in other countries. Especially since 1981, with the wide availability of computerized data down to individuals, it is possible to conduct systematic analysis of issues pertaining to ethnic origin and class. In fact, Canadian censuses provide the most extensive and widely used data source for studies in ethnic stratification and inequality (Li, 1988a,b). Yet, weaknesses exist. For example, the criteria for assigning origin to respondents by Census Canada (1986) have been ambiguous pertaining to race, ethnicity, mother tongue, and birthplace. Historically, definitions assigned to groups change. It is, therefore, problematic to compare ethnic groups from one census to another (Li, 1988a,b).6

Population Composition and Map Representation

Montreal holds the key to national unity and the viability of Canada as a nation. The total Canadian population is approximately 30 million. The majority of Canadians are of British descent, followed by French, Italian, Jewish, Greek, Black, Portuguese, and others.7 The total Quebec population is 6,532,460. The majority of Quebecers are of French origin, followed by British, Italian, Jewish, Greek, Black, Portuguese and others (Choinière, 1990). As demonstrated in Table 5, the total


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>Montreal region</th>
<th>Rest of Quebec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2,119,266</td>
<td>3,661,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2,188,570</td>
<td>3,841,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2,116,850</td>
<td>4,118,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2,029,195</td>
<td>4,409,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2,036,745</td>
<td>4,495,715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Choinière, 1990.
Figure 1: Montreal - French population location quotient.
Figure 4: Montreal - black population location quotient.
The population of Montreal is 2,036,745. From 1981 to 1986, the city's population remained steady, with an increase of only 0.4 percent, or an additional 7,550 inhabitants.

The historical linguistic divisions in Montreal are clearly reflected in the city's social geography. Montreal is a divided city. In macro terms, the east of the city is Francophone and the west is fundamentally Anglophone. Figure 1 illustrates that the eastern part of Montreal is highly over represented with the French population in relation to its percentage of the city as a whole. The east-west division of Montreal is explicitly demarcated along St. Lawrence Boulevard, the traditionally and popularly perceived dividing line. Figure 2 demonstrates British over representation. It is essentially the mirror image of the first map, with British over representation in the west end of Montreal. Recently, there has been some young professional Francophone migration to the established Anglophone areas of Notre Dame du Grace (N.D.G.), with some concentration evident on Figure 1. Young Anglophones recently established themselves in the extreme western edge of the city, in Dollard des Ormeaux and Kirkland. Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate extremely high concentration levels of the Jewish community in the middle western section of the city. They are clearly the most highly segregated group in Montreal. The Black community, on the other hand, is spread out, with extremely low levels of concentration.

**Dissimilarity Analysis**

The most effective way to measure residential segregation is to utilize the index of dissimilarity (I.D.). The I.D. measures levels of residential separation and segregation between groups, usually in the urban context (Massey and Denton, 1988). It indicates levels of possible social contact and the degree of ‘institutional completeness’ that could be indicative of the boundaries of population groups in the city (Driedger, 1987; Duncan and Lieberson, 1975).

**Table 6: Index of Dissimilarity in Montreal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Portugue.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>52.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>66.29</td>
<td>54.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>86.91</td>
<td>90.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>73.94</td>
<td>78.54</td>
<td>77.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>56.17</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>51.88</td>
<td>76.23</td>
<td>67.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugue.</td>
<td>71.16</td>
<td>56.73</td>
<td>65.29</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td>73.19</td>
<td>67.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40.68</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>58.94</td>
<td>69.79</td>
<td>53.72</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>60.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D.</td>
<td>41.55</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>49.08</td>
<td>77.67</td>
<td>64.70</td>
<td>46.11</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>32.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS.</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>44.91</td>
<td>53.95</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>63.72</td>
<td>47.04</td>
<td>54.90</td>
<td>36.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census Canada, 1986 (20 percent survey); calculations by Small, 1996.
As clearly illustrated throughout Table 6, the levels of segregation in Montreal are striking since they are substantially different from those typically found south of the border in the U.S. The two Montreal majority groups, the French and British, have levels of dissimilarity that are double levels of white groups in the U.S., as demonstrated by Leiberson (1980). The degree of Black segregation in Montreal, conversely, is less than half that found in the U.S. Jewish segregation in Montreal, on the other hand, reaches levels associated more closely with African Americans in the U.S.

Montreal is a unique city in terms of its historical development, embodying the Canadian experience of the British-French conflict. The socio-cultural policies have, therefore, been contested with an intensity not found in other cities in the country. This has facilitated distinctive levels and patterns of dissimilarity, both spatial and socio-economic, manifested in the city's population distribution. In fact, Montreal's two dominant groups, the French and British, have high levels of differentiation. French I.D. is 18.05, however, when taking into account I.S. French segregation is 44.91. The British I.D. is 41.55, while the I.S. is 45.56. When comparing these degrees of dissimilarity to dominant groups in other cities, it explicitly points to the exceptional Montreal condition. In the case of the U.S., for example, levels of dissimilarity of majority groups are significantly lower. In Chicago during the 1930s and 1950s, the English and Welsh population had I.D. levels in the high 20s and low 30s (Duncan and Lieberson, 1959). This illustrates the striking difference that Montreal embodies.

Levels of dissimilarity are also significantly higher in Montreal in comparison to other Canadian cities. Krait (1986), in his analysis on behalf of Census Canada using the 1981 census survey and the Gini coefficient, demonstrates that Montreal's level of differentiation is higher than Toronto's. The dominant French population in Montreal had a differentiation level of 0.159, based on Gini coefficient, while the British majority in Toronto was 0.121. The British in Montreal reached 0.477, while the French in Toronto were 0.213.

The high levels of differentiation of the French population must be understood in relation to the historical domination of Quebec by the British, the late urbanization and modernization of the French Catholic population, and the political discourse of nationalism. In a real sense the French majority population possesses social patterns and behavior more typical of a minority group (Weinfeld, 1986).

The group with the highest level of dissimilarity, or the group most segregated in Montreal, is the Jewish population. The I.D. for the Jewish population is remarkably high at 77.67, while the I.S. figure is 81.54. In comparison to New York in 1910, for example, Montreal Jewish dissimilarity is unique since Russian (Jewish) I.D. was only 34 (Lieberson, 1980). Interestingly, Italians in Chicago during the 1930s and 1950s, another minority group, had I.D. levels in the 50s (Duncan and Lieberson, 1959). Italian I.D. in Montreal at 49.08, and the I.S. at 53.95, is comparable to Duncan and Lieberson's figure. In contrast to Toronto, according to Krait's (1986) Gini coefficient based on the 1981 census survey, Jews in Toronto scored 0.816,
while in Montreal it was somewhat higher at 0.895. Darroch and Marston (1972) examined dissimilarity in Toronto, and demonstrated that the I.D. level for the Jewish population is 75, similar to the above findings, though Montreal is moderately higher. It should be noted, however, that Darroch and Marston examined Jewish population as a religious entity, as opposed to an ethnic group.

Given historical anti-semitism in Montreal and throughout Quebec society by both the British and French, this phenomenon is understandable. According to Weinfeld (1986), classical sociologists contend that this type of social phenomenon is essentially due to a response to exclusionary behavior on the part of the majority group. He, however, suggests that this segregation is also partially voluntary, since many Montreal Jews signify their identity by socializing with other Jews (Weinfeld, 1986). Here again, it is essential to examine critically Quebec history, the treatment of the Jewish community and other minority groups, as well as the socio-cultural issues in order to understand differentiation in its proper context.

Jewish segregation is even more striking when considering the diversity within the community itself. Approximately 70 percent of the Montreal Jewish population is of Ashkenazi (i.e., European descent), while 25 percent is Sephardi (of oriental dissent). The remaining five percent include various other groups, such as the largest Ethiopian Jewish diaspora community (Elazar and Waller, 1990; Shahar, 1991). Of the Jewish population approximately 55 percent list English as their mother tongue, 25 percent French, 11.3 percent Yiddish, and the remaining 20 percent list other languages (Shahar, 1991). With the high degree of diversity within the Jewish population, the levels of dissimilarity are that much more striking.

The Montreal Jewish community has a reputation of being one of the best organized in the diaspora. This is reflected in the high amount of Jewish education received by members of the community. On average 80 percent of the Jewish population receive some formal Jewish education. One hundred percent of Montreal Jews between that ages of 18 to 29, according to the survey by Shahar (1991), receive some formal Jewish education; 76 percent of those thirty years and over obtain Jewish education. This suggests that among young adults, in particular, there is a keen interest for receiving Jewish education. Interestingly, Jewish education increases with the level of household income. Some 87.1 percent of Jewish households with incomes over $80,000 (Cdn) receive Jewish education, while 78.4 percent of households with incomes below $40,000 (Cdn) acquire Jewish education (Shahar, 1991).

According to the survey by Shahar (1991), anti-semitism appears to be a major concern within the Jewish community. When asked to identify reasons for leaving Quebec, 72.9 percent refer to the political situation, 66 percent mention the economic situation, while 65.2 percent claim anti-semitism, 53.4 percent the language policy, 35.2 percent for joining family, and 28 percent for a better education. In terms of anti-semitism, it seems that Jewish Montrealers are quite concerned. In fact, indicative of the instability of Montreal in general, and the Jewish community specifically, more than 40 percent of the Jewish population between the ages of 18 to 29, think that they will leave the Province permanently during the next five years, while the
figure for the entire Jewish population is 20 percent. Ten percent of Jewish Mon­
trealers think they will live in another province, five percent in the U.S., five percent
in Israel, two percent in another country, while 21 percent think they will leave, but
are not sure where they will move to (Shahar, 1991).

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, violent anti-semitism re-emerged in
increased by two hundred percent (Mock, 1992). In 1992, a total of 196 incidents
of anti-Semitic vandalism and harassment was reported. This represents a 22 percent
decrease over the previous year, mainly due to a rash of anti-Semitic acts attributed
to the Gulf war. The 1992 findings, however, represent an 11 percent increase from
1989. The 1992 League Report places blame for the increase on the rise of the
political right (League for Human Rights, 1992).

In 1990, an estimated 400–600 neo-nazi racist skinheads were based in Montreal
(Shipman and Kagedan, 1990; Prutschi, 1989). Montreal has become a center for
skinheads, with numerous fascist and white supremacist organizations. Skinheads
maintain a high level of visibility in the East End of Montreal. Montreal neo-nazis,
among their contemporaries, have the reputation of being the most violent in the
country (McFarlane, 1994). Despite their violent activities they face little interference
from law enforcement agencies (La Ligue des Droits et Libertes, 1989).

An escalation of attacks against minority communities throughout Canada, and
specifically in Montreal, occurred during the last several years. While the Jewish
community is the prime target, African-Canadians, Asians and Gays have also been
the victims of skinhead violence (Shipman and Kagedan, 1990). In 1992, for example,
skinheads brutally beat to death a man suspected of being Gay in central Montreal’s
Angrignon Park (CCRP, 1993).

Notably, the Black population is not as highly segregated as one would suspect,
especially in comparison to the U.S. Black I.D. in Montreal is 46.11, while the I.S. is
47.04. This is remarkably low. In Chicago, for instance, I.D. levels for the Black
population, during the 1930s and 1950s were in the 80s (Duncan and Lieberson,
1959). Black differentiation, according to Kralt’s Gini coefficient based on the 1981
census survey, is higher in Montreal at 0.573, while in Toronto it is only 0.452
(Kralt, 1986). Given the well-documented social problems experienced by African-
Americans in the highly segregated U.S. society, this is not a positive phenomenon,
since there is not a strong sense of place for the Montreal Black community. There
are several areas of Montreal in which the Black population is spread out over, and
they are consequently far from one another.

The fact that ‘Black ghettoization’ has not occurred in Montreal is due to several
reasons. First, and most relevant, in keeping with the general socio-historical trend,
the African-Canadian population, like the city in general, is divided along linguistic
lines. Second, the Black population is diverse. There is the old established Black
community founded over three hundred years ago, and immigrants from the U.S.,
throughout the Caribbean, Africa, and Europe. The census definition of Black does
not account for these differences. These subgroups tend to live in close proximity to
one another. Third, socio-economic status and religious affiliations play a role in the dispersal of the population. Fourth, racial discrimination, particularly in Montreal’s housing market, significantly affects and distorts the typical patterns of social mobility and spatial location, in comparison to other immigrant populations. In addition, state sponsored accommodation in Montreal is usually located in areas outside districts often inhabited by the African-Canadian community (Williams, 1989). The fact that there are few African-Canadian ghettos, throughout the country, contributes to the popular perception that there is little racism in Canada, especially in comparison to the U.S. This assumption is not accurate. It seems that the Jewish population, although possessing linguistic and socio-economic differences, are an exception. They live in close proximity to one another, especially in comparison to other groups, such as the Black population. This is clearly demonstrated in the location quotient maps.

Currently, racism against the African-Canadian community is structured in Montreal society (Foster, 1991). Racism affects Black socio-economic mobility, and remains a serious obstacle for the community. At the institutional level, racism marginalizes Blacks from the mainstream of society (Williams, 1989).

In housing, racial discrimination against the Black community is widespread, posing a rampant structural problem. Research in this area, however, is limited (see Cambridge and Roberts, 1986). Garon (1988) demonstrates the existence of high levels of racial discrimination in Montreal housing, by measuring responses of landlords to visitations of potential white and Black tenants (Garon, 1988). According to Berube and Teitelbaum (1981), racism in the Montreal housing market against non-whites is not directly related to socio-economic position. Attainment of a minimum level of economic stability does not ensure that similar gains will be acquired outside the workplace. They conclude that there are high levels of racial discrimination in Montreal housing. However, there exists little information on issues of discrimination in the Montreal housing market.

Within the educational system African-Canadian students are disproportionately streamlined into vocational courses (Brand and Bhaggyadatta, 1986). In employment, Blacks are also discriminated against and enjoy less social mobility than others. In 1983, the Ontario Human Rights Commission discovered that throughout the country, African-Canadians earn 25 percent less than whites for the same work (Walker, 1985).

In the early 1980s a major scandal emerged in Montreal’s taxi industry. It involved four companies, and reflects the state of racism in the city (Commission des Droits de la Personne du Quebec, 1984). The companies attempted to avoid hiring Black drivers, particularly Haitians. They treated their Black employees poorly, not sending them clients, giving them wrong addresses of clients, and refusing to permit them to use certain taxi stands. The companies claimed, with a degree of truth, that their clients felt uncomfortable driving with Black drivers (Commission des Droits de la Personne du Quebec, 1984). However, under Quebec law it is illegal to discriminate. Clients are not permitted to request drivers by ethnicity. The Quebec Human Right
Investigation uncovered blatant racism in the industry, and sanctioned companies guilty of practicing discrimination (Commission des Proits de la Personne du Quebec, 1984).

In Montreal, like other major North American or European cities, the criminalization of young African-Canadians is endemic. Police have been accused by the Montreal African-Canadian community and human rights groups of harassment, false arrests, and blatant expressions of racism. This resulted in the police shootings of numerous young Black men, during the last several years. As of 1990, there were only six Black police officers in the entire Montreal force of more than 4,500 (Levine, 1990). Incredibly, ethnic minorities in the Montreal municipal and Quebec provincial bureaucracies consist of less than two percent in both (Small, 1998).

The coroner’s report, prepared by Judge Yarosky, for the inquest into the 1991 police shooting death of Marcellus Francois, was critical of the force. Yarosky concludes that racism played a role in the shooting, and there is

...the continued presence within the Montreal Urban Community Police Department of an attitude toward members of the black community that is completely unacceptable (Yaroski, 1992:72).

In 1987, Anthony Griffin, a young African-Canadian man, was shot dead by police officer Allan Gossett while in custody. He was detained for a dispute arising from a five dollar taxi fare. Gossett was tried and acquitted of manslaughter. Several thousand Montrealers marched in protest, prompting the formation of a commission to investigate police treatment of racial minorities (Levine, 1990). The commission discovered widespread discrimination by the police, and that Blacks were much more likely to be arrested than whites (Commission des Droits de la Personne du Quebec, 1988).

Real or Perceived Differentiation

As mentioned the French and British are the least segregated in comparison to the other groups in Montreal. Interestingly, they are followed by the Black population with the lowest level of differentiation. The Black population possesses the lowest level of differentiation among minority groups. Given the ‘racial’ tensions and their poor economic ranking in Montreal, they are not able to control urban space in the Montreal area. The Jewish population with socio-economic success and a strong sense of community, in a society that provided anti-Semitic tendencies, has been able to control their own space and create a sense of place for themselves.

Philpott (1978) reveals that immigrant ghettos are often fictitious, both in urban mythology and studies. In U.S. cities, most European groups actually did not live in immigrant ghettos. The Irish ghetto for example, assessed by Burgess (1923), was discovered by Philpott (1978) to actually consist of only three percent of Chicago’s entire Irish population (Massey and Denton, 1993). The Black ghetto, however, comprised 82 percent of the city’s total Black population, constituting an important
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distinction compared to other group areas. Only a quarter of the total Irish population was, by comparison, within the area (Massey and Denton, 1993). Lieberson (1980) confirms Philpott’s critique of Burgess’s work, by examining the spatial isolation of various ethnic groups, comparing them to the African-American population in several U.S. cities. His findings demonstrate that African-American levels of isolation are higher than other ethnic groups. These factors illustrate a weakness in Park and Burgess’s argument, as well as the Chicago School in general (Massey and Denton, 1993).

In Montreal, the popularly perceived Jewish area of Cote St. Luc, Hampstead and parts of Snowdon and Outremont, are in fact heavily concentrated by the Jewish population. During the last decade or so, Hasidic Jews moved into Outremont, a traditional immigrant enclave combined with an old wealthy French Canadian community. As the Hasidic community expanded, this has caused tensions. The mayor of Outremont recently refused to issue permits for synagogues, claiming there were too many Jews and that they take up too much space. Commonly perceived Anglophone Black areas, such as Little Burgundy and Cote des Neiges/Snowdon, have significant amounts of the Black population, though they also possess high degree of other groups. The Francophone Black population, conversely, is more concentrated, however, significant levels of other groups also live in the vicinity. High levels of Jewish concentration and Black dispersal is depicted in the maps using the location quotient. This is interesting, given the striking differences of the two groups’ spatial distribution in the city. In the case of real differentiation of the Montreal Black population Philpott’s (1978) argument that ghettos are often fictitious clearly applies. In the case of real Jewish segregation, however, high levels of differentiation obviously exist.

As shown in Table 7, dissimilarity, in comparison to expected levels of dissimilarity, within the urban context of Montreal, demonstrates important social phenomena. As previously examined, the Jewish population is highly segregated, however, only 6.1 percent of the differentiation is due to economic factors. In other words, 93.9 percent of Jewish differentiation is due to other reasons. This certainly points to historical issues, such as socio-cultural policies and the place of minorities in Quebec and Canadian society. In the past, French and British tensions have been played out with the highest level of intensity in Montreal, affecting the Jewish population considerably. Anti-semitism and nationalism, which the Jewish community is sensitive to given their diaspora experience, and was exposed to it longer than any other minority group in Quebec, reacted by creating their own space within the city. This illustrates, practically, the legacy of Quebec society’s non-acceptance of its Jewish Quebecois population. Certainly, the Montreal Jewish population has positive reasons to be closely affiliated with their community and culture. Nevertheless, high levels of dissimilarity, in comparison to U.S. cities and Toronto, points to the uniqueness of Montreal, as examined earlier, particularly the exclusion of the Catholic society.
In comparison to all the groups in Montreal, the most significant proportion of Black differentiation is due to economic factors. 18.2 percent of the dissimilarity of the Black population is due to economic considerations. Black differentiation, when taking into account the percentage of the expected and observed, is incredibly low in Montreal. In a society that places high value on the promotion of ethnic identity, the Black population fails to meet this Canadian ethos, representing a failure based on these standards. This is undoubtedly due to the complex social phenomenon of racism and diversity within the Black population, even though the complete opposite transpires in the U.S., with a highly segregated Black population. Segregation in the U.S. is often blamed for the widely known, negative socio-economic ramifications. This points to issues such as racism in the labor market and in other institutions such as education. Since high levels of Black differentiation are due to economic factors, combined with the low levels of I.D., especially in comparison to the U.S. and to an extent Toronto, the I.D. in Montreal is most striking.

Among the French and British Montreal population, only 3.7 and 1.4 percent of dissimilarity is due to economic factors. This is the lowest level of any group in Montreal, demonstrating the British and French dominance of the city and their contentment to live separately from ‘les autres’. It is important to understand that the Quebec context is unique in many ways. French levels of segregation are remarkably high, especially in comparison to dominant groups elsewhere. In a sense the French Québécois, in terms of dissimilarity, act as a minority. They are, after all, a minority in the North American context, a notion constantly upheld in social and political discourse. It is subsequently important, as previously stated, to recognize that Quebec does not possess classic minority-majority relations. The dominant French group is exceptionally marked by minority characteristics (Weinfeld, 1986). The high levels of French segregation point to this.
CONCLUSION

This paper set out to define and examine the levels of social and spatial dissimilarity in Montreal. Utilizing the Index of Dissimilarity, Index of Similarity, and the expected versus the observed value, levels of dissimilarity were firmly established. The findings illustrate that Montreal is severely segregated. The differentiation was found to be atypical in terms of its high degrees, and the social and spatial differentiation patterns of certain groups were found to be unique in comparison to other cities, particularly in Toronto and the U.S.

It was ascertained that levels of spatial dissimilarity in Montreal were extremely high for the French and British groups. In the case of the French it was most striking, in comparison to other dominant groups in the U.S. cities and Toronto, since their patterns of dissimilarity is more indicative of a minority group. This phenomenon is a product of Canadian, and particularly Quebec’s, societal historical development.

Of all the Montreal groups, Jewish dissimilarity was the highest. Despite its general economic success, the Jewish group is heavily segregated from the rest of the population. This is certainly due to the history of anti-semitism and nationalism in Quebec. With economic capacity, the Jewish community developed a highly organized community. A small portion of Jewish differentiation is due to economic factors. Montreal Jewish dissimilarity, compared to the levels found in the U.S. cities and Toronto, is significantly higher.

The Black population was the least segregated minority group, according to the I.D. in Montreal. In comparison to U.S. cities and to a degree Toronto, Black Montreal differentiation was extremely low. Of the differentiation, however, a significant segment is due to economic factors. In fact, Black differentiation is mostly the result, in comparison to any other group, of economic factors. This is certainly the result of the Black population's poor economic standing, as ascertained in the two percent extended survey. They are unable to create their own space in the city in a similar fashion to other groups. The economic deprivation of the Black community is significantly due to racism structured throughout Canadian society, and certainly manifested in the Montreal context on many levels.

In light of the above mentioned issues, Montreal serves as an important and insightful context for a case study. It embodies the relevance to such issues as national identity, socio-cultural policies, immigration, and the conceptual discourse concerning race, ethnicity, and racism, all directly influencing the levels of social, economic and spatial dissimilarity.

In terms of future research questions and issues, Montreal will continue to serve as a rich case study. Historically, nationalist politics in Quebec has been based upon a bipolar conflict between English Canada and French Quebec. As this paper demonstrates, the reality in Montreal, the most important urban center in Quebec, and the most contested space historically, is in fact cosmopolitan. Subsequently, Montreal, like most cities, contains a population that is not reflective of the simplistic bipolar conflict so often portrayed. Perhaps if more social scientists, urban planners
and politicians acknowledge this diversity in policy, some of the problems confronting the people and economy of cities like Montreal could be addressed effectively.

Throughout much of the world the state, particularly in the realm of social policies, is becoming less active, as the functioning of ‘free’ market policies and ideology becomes more entrenched. In the recent past, the state often played a key role in this context, having intervened directly in terms of economic integration or marginalization. This relates directly to issues of national identity, notions of ‘otherness’, belonging and citizenship, with important economic and social implications for the urban context. Throughout the world cities have been at the center of these new tensions. As cities become more crucial, not least as for political and economic administration, significant socio-economic, spatial and demographic changes are becoming apparent, along with the very role of the city itself. We are beginning to witness the city as a shared space of different levels of citizenship, and peoples with contradictory destinies. The gaps between the affluent and deprived are expanding at alarming rates. What then will be the fate of cities like Montreal that have been divided along cultural lines for long periods of time, prior to these new processes? How will the nationalist discourse of those marginalized change? Or those who enjoy access to global institutions, practices and culture? These questions, combined with the reality of existing levels of differentiation, will make future analysis of Montreal informative and challenging.

NOTES

1. It should be noted that, in the aftermath of the referendum and Premier Jacques Parizeau’s racist comments blaming minorities for the loss of the referendum, which forced him to resign, several episodes served to increase social tensions with minority communities in Montreal. For example, Justice Jean Beinvenue insensitive remarks concerning the Holocaust; Schwartz’s Delicatessen became a focal point of the language debate and tensions; the Roux affair and his Nazi sympathies during the past re-awoke old wounds of anti-Semitism within the Quebec nationalist movement; the Matzah-Gate affair, which occurred when the Office de Langue Francaise, during the 1996 Jewish holiday of Passover, discovered illegal labeling of food products required for the holiday; the public attack on the bilingualism of the Jewish General Hospital by a well-known journalist; and the threat of violence by former FLQ activist Raymond Villeneuve against Jewish community leaders for not supporting the nationalist cause. These events increased concern in minority communities and among those involved in human rights in Quebec (See Libman and Scheinberg, 1997; Small, 1996; 1998).

2. As Quebec changes and gains greater economic and political control over its affairs, its very notion of identity and integration is being transformed. In the realm of socio-cultural policy, for example, this has a particular effect. The Federal policy of ‘multiculturalism’ finds its roots in the British approach to identity, promoting
integration with an emphasis on ethnic or group identity. The Quebec policy of inter-culturalism promotes integration at the individual level, not the group as such, into the dominant society and culture. Inter-culturalism can be understood to be more closely affiliated to the French 'Republican' model. Both approaches have rich colonial legacies. The multicultural, or group approach, can contribute to segregation or highlight differences. Conversely, the French inter-cultural model could promote intolerance through forced assimilation. As Quebec society changes, what will be the place of the minority communities? Some in Quebec perceive the very notion of community to be antagonistic to the Quebec approach. Ottawa's multiculturalism has been seen to be an attempt to augment the Federalist cause in Quebec and to offset nationalist aspirations by promoting differences among Quebecers and supporting minorities. Will minorities be pressured to assimilate into the dominant Quebec culture, or will differences be respected? Will there be a backlash against multiculturalism and 'les autres' in the future? (Small, 1996; McAndrew, 1996).

3. Francisation refers to the political and socio-economic changes emerging out of the 'Quiet Revolution'. French Quebecois cultural symbols and power replaced those developed by the English (Refer to Levine, 1990).

4. Montreal's English businessmen were continental economic actors, promoting Montreal as a central transportation link in Canada's expanding agricultural commodity export markets. Conversely, Francophone merchants were mostly small businessmen, conducting their activities in a regional market. The English consistently blocked French attempts to penetrate continental-oriented economic sectors. Subsequently, economic development produced discernible linguistic divisions of labor in Montreal by the early nineteenth century. By 1840, for example, more than 70 percent of Montreal's merchants were English, while the French were over represented within the working class. More than a century later, even though Montreal became a major metropolis, the pattern of linguistic hierarchy remains (Levine, 1990).

5. The rural parish provided a way of life that was self-sufficient, isolated from the influence of cities and post-elementary education, characterized by tenacious family ties in which the family farm was a physical and symbolic focal point, and a strong Catholic faith that supported the local Cure of the authority over local affairs (McRoberts and Posgate, 1980).

6. For more on these problems see: Boyd et al., 1985; Krait, 1986; Pineo and Porter, 1985; and Royal Commission, 1984.

7. Large sectors of the Canadian population are of Ukrainian, Scandinavian and Eastern European descent. In the tabulations provided by the 1986 20 percent census survey, the above mentioned groups are the only ones examined. Consequently, they are the groups analyzed in terms of spatial dissimilarity in Montreal.

8. The four maps are standardized to assist comparability. Since the percentage formed by each of the groups are different, they have been scaled so that the difference between the average that a group forms of the city's population (i.e., LQ=1) and the maximum possible percentage that a group could form (i.e., 100 percent) has been divided into four equal parts: lowest, low, high, highest.
9. The Index of Dissimilarity (I.D.) was developed by Otis and Beverly Duncan and influenced by Park’s contributions. This index is articulated in Duncan (1955) and Massey and Denton (1993).

10. The index of segregation (I.S.) is a variant of the I.D. It compares the level of difference between a given population and the total population minus itself. The tables demonstrate that the I.D. and I.S. are similar for most groups, except those that constitute a large majority, in this case the French population. The I.S. is calculated by dividing I.D. for the target group by 1 minus the target population divided by the total population of the city (Peach and Rossiter, 1996).

11. Gini coefficient measures residential concentration for each ethnic group. It summarizes the extent to which the cumulative percent of the ethnic group can be compared with the cumulative percent of the total population in a given number of census tracts and may have a range of values from 0 to 1 (Krait, 1986). Duncan and Duncan (1955) demonstrate that the I.D. and Gini coefficient are quite similar. The Gini coefficient measures dissimilarity on a scale from 0 to 1, while the I.D. uses a scale from 0–100.

12. It should be noted that the Index of Segregation (I.S.) measures levels of segregation more effectively when assessing the dominant groups of a given population. Subsequently, the analysis in this section is more in-depth then that offered by Krait (1986).

13. According to Weinfeld (1986) 90 percent of the adult Montreal Jewish population agreed that all or most of their friends were Jewish, 53 percent agreed that among their neighbors all or most were Jewish, while more than one third agreed that all or most of their business associates and clients were Jewish. Jewish economic segregation is widespread with only 30 percent of Montreal Jewish households employed by essentially non-Jewish firms. The majority of Jews are self-employed or work for wholly or largely Jewish-owned firms. Interestingly, economic segregation is equally prevalent among foreign and native born, religious and less religious, Jews (Weinfeld, 1986). The socio-economic calculations provided in this paper, based on the two percent sample survey of Montreal, demonstrate Jewish economic segregation.

14. It should be noted, however, that the Jewish community has a high level of language proficiency. Nearly 75 percent of Jewish English speakers are fluent in French, while 70 percent of Jewish French speakers are fluent in English. In addition, 55 percent of the Jewish population is proficient in Hebrew, to some extent, while 62 percent are proficient in Yiddish to some degree (Shahar, 1991).

15. Forty-five percent of the Jewish population are members of a Jewish community organization; 31 percent did volunteer work for Jewish, and 8 percent for non-Jewish, organizations, during a twelve month period in 1991. Fifty-nine percent of Jewish households donate money to the United Jewish Appeal, geared to funding Jewish community organizations (Shahar, 1991).

16. Of the Montreal Jewish community, 42 percent attend Jewish elementary schools; 37 percent attend afternoon/part time school; 25 percent attend Jewish
high schools; 23 percent receive private tutoring; 15 percent attend regular Sunday schools; and 10 percent attend Yeshivas. In addition, 53 percent of the Jewish community attend synagogue on the high holidays; 20 percent attend on special occasions; 15 percent frequent once or more a week; 9 percent attend once or more a month; while three percent never go (Shahar, 1991).

17. The fact that Jewish education increases with the level of household income is consistent with the general trend in Montreal’s differentiation. It seems that with economic mobility groups turn to their community. In a society that promotes ethnic identities, it seems that with success comes the ability to practice this Canadian ethos.

18. Since 1982, the League for Human Rights produces an annual review of anti-Semitic and racist incidents, providing a measurement of violence directed against Jews and other minorities in Canada. It is not a scientific study. Some difficulties in the survey include: not recognizing an incident as being racist by the victim; fear of relating an incident; not being aware of whom to report to; and approaching a group that does not share information with the League. Nevertheless, it gives a good indication of trends (Shefman, 1987).

19. The 1992 Report asserts that there is a new openness in expressing anti-Semitic views, manifested throughout societal institutions, including academia. As anti-Semitism becomes more acceptable, so do other forms of racism and xenophobia. Recently the right has condemned the cost of multiculturalism, bilingualism and employment equity. Political parties denouncing these Canadian institutions as unacceptable drains on national funds erode taboos against expressing intolerance (Mates, 1987; Mock, 1992). The League Report points to racism in the media and irresponsible journalism. It also warns of the serious physical threat groups such as the Aryan Nations and the Church of the Creator pose to the Jewish community and other minority groups (League Report, 1992).

20. English-speaking subgroups and their institutions, for the most part, were centered in the west and south of Montreal, while Francophone subgroups were essentially based in the north and east of the city. Consequently, the two communities are separated from one another. Within the Francophone and Anglophone associations, subgroups existed, especially within the Caribbean communities, with networks and affiliations significantly based on island of origin. This differentiation is demonstrated within the maps indicating location quotients.

21. Hall (1980) argues that in order to undermine welfare rights, notions of citizenship, and the freedom of organized labor, police powers are used to criminalize parts of the Black community. Gilroy (1987) sees criminalization in terms of constructing a narrowing nationalism (Keith, 1993).

22. Radio communication by the police on the day of Francois’ murder was filled with racist slurs (Yarosky, 1992). Police racism is a serious issue, threatening the security of the Montreal African-Canadian community, particularly young men. Little research has been carried out on this topic in the Montreal context. It is vital that critical analysis be carried out, since the criminalization of a sector of the population could result in profound ramifications.

24. Bonacich examines middlemen minorities in various social formations and the economic role they play. Jews, perhaps, are the epitome of this role, often occupying it throughout much Europe, at least since the Enlightenment (Bonacich, 1973). In Quebec, with the history of anti-Semitism and nationalism, Jews are popularly understood as playing the middleman role. First, Jews, like other minorities, are resented for being seen as ponds in Ottawa's multiculturalism policy, perceived as being designed to undermine Quebec nationalism. Secondly, Jews occupy highly visible economic position, typical of Bonacich's notion of the middleman. This generates resentment from the French majority population, especially from nationalists, who perceive Jews as not quite Quebecois. In fact, many studies of Quebec's economy depict the supposed control and influence of the Jewish community (for example, see Fitzmaurice, 1985). This feeds easily into stereotypes of Jews. Combined with nationalism, it creates a potentially volatile combination. This situation clearly applies to Bonacich's (1973) analysis.

25. The approach of comparing 'observed' with 'expected' levels dissimilarity was developed by Taeuber and Taeuber (1964). They attempt to illustrate the component of social segregation that is due to economic factors. Their model utilizes indirect standardization of available census data. They delineate the status of a residential area in terms of, for example, income distribution. For each community area they apply city-wide percentages to the observed income distribution, obtaining the number of the different ethnic group families expected, if income alone determines residential locations of ethnic groups. They compute the expected number of ethnic group members in each area. Then they determine the index of residential differentiation between expected numbers of each ethnic group members. This index can be regarded as the amount of ethnic residential segregation attributed to patterns of residential differentiation of income groups. It is admittedly a rough measure of ethnic residential segregation to income (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1975).
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