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Foreword

Professor Elsbeth Heaman
Early in the experience of every student in Canadian Studies at McGill University, they are marched up to the lookout on Mount Royal so they can contemplate the expansive view of Montreal, the plains around the city, the great, roaring river that makes poets even of crusty historians, and the country and continent that stretch into the distance. It is a privileged perspective, almost a god-like one according to Hugh MacLennan, Madeleine LaRue suggests here, upon a city and a nation that call us always to better, more sophisticated understandings of our shared humanity and geography and that never fail to exceed our scholarly and artistic grasp.

MacLennan wrote in his great novel of Montreal, *Two Solitudes*, “If this sprawling half-continent has a heart, here it is.” Half a century later, the city remains one of the great social experiments of modern history, crucially shaping the ways that identities are negotiated across the country as a whole. It is a city where civilizations are ruined and renewed, in the way of Robert Brentano’s *Rome before Avignon*, where old institutions continually found new uses and hermits squatted in Roman aqueducts. Hochelaga, the village that Cartier passed on his trek up the mountain, had been abandoned when Champlain arrived nearly a century later. Traditional trails up the mountain became alleyways and the indigenous habitations re-appeared as missions and reserves first on the island of Montreal itself and later on land around the island that still looks very different, much greener, from the mountain’s vistas. The French missionary and fur-trading town that was founded by Maisonneuve and Mance became a commercial metropolis dominated by English-speakers who spoke airily of racial progress and decline. In the 20th century, that city was made predominantly French once again through a process of social, economic, and political renewal charted here by Emilie Horrocks-Denis in her discussion of Jacques Godbout. Now the English-speaking Montrealers lamented the decline of their whole civilization. The hopefulness that characterized MacLennan’s work became, in Mordecai Richler’s *Barney’s Version*, alienation and exile amidst ruins, as Cameron McKeich observes here. But even with French-Canadian political mores and institutions predominant once again, nationalist politicians, pundits, and intellectuals are too well attuned to the vagaries of civilization not to fear that this too may pass and, as a number of essays here attest, they search for a voice or a policy that will firm up the foundations of nationhood and identity. As hard as they work to construct paradigms of stable identity, others find founds and
means to undermine their bounded constructions.

Still standing at the lookout atop Mount Royal, if you drop your eyes to the foot of the mountain, you see McGill University, which offers its own (distinctly ungod-like) vistas upon the wider world. Canadian Studies is one of those vistas. Canadian Studies at McGill makes use of all the different disciplinary and theoretical approaches to the study of the modern world and invites students and scholars to engage in fertile conversations about what those approaches tell us of modern Canada and how they can mutually illuminate one another. That Canada must be studied and understood cannot be doubted. And yet the scholarly enterprise of Canadian Studies is fraught with uncertainty and imprecision, because there are no clear boundaries or methods to it and, it may seem, perilously little that characterizes the country as a whole. Though we all know that there is indeed a ‘there there,’ when we try to focus on some sort of core or essence, it seems to slip away.

The essays in this collection go a long way to exemplifying the processes at work in this process of construction and deconstruction of identity in Canada. The processes are infallibly at work when Canadians and immigrants contemplate one another. David Nagel sets the scene with his discussion of the balance between inclusion and exclusion of new and old peoples and products on the western plains and Lina Crompton probes them more intimately in John Grierson’s documentary of a Polish immigrant in Winnipeg. Grierson sought to depict such people as ‘hardworking, humble, religious, and thoughtful,’ and thereby to nudge the Canadian sense of self identity towards an enriched appreciation of a diverse society. Those same processes of negotiation can be observed in the debates over whether Canada should welcome or rebuff American draft dodgers during the 1960s, when people argued as to quintessential qualities of Canadian and American identity or the conceptualization of English and French journalistic cultures. And those negotiations about what is old and what is new in Canada, what is good and what is bad, animate contemporary debates about newcomers, for example in Brendan Tang’s artistic installations that play upon commoditized definitions of Chinese identity, or in debates over language policies in Quebec, or the perpetual will to ever better representation of regions and social groups in the different political institutions in Canada, whether provincially, federally, or juridically. Populations and rules change, and old norms decay, sometimes to disappear entirely, sometimes to shape the new forms
of identity and being that come into play.

But the message that comes from the essays, produced by students in our Canadian Studies program, when read together, is not uncertainty. Rather, they convey the joy of making a discovery, staking out an intellectual claim, explaining how and why something happened, or failed to happen, or made sense to people. The work and pleasure of intellectual connection is fully on display here. Perhaps we may take as exemplary for our project as a whole the experience, described by McKeich, of Chantal Guy`s reading of Mordecai Richler`s *Barney`s Version* or, rather, *Le monde de Barney*. Guy disliked Richler`s politics and was prepared to dislike the book. But when she actually read it, she discovered that the novel spoke to her very powerfully as a Montrealer, capturing a shared experience of life in that extraordinary city. That sense of intellectual connection, of shared experience that can suddenly transcend language, ethnicity, gender, politics, remains at the heart of the enterprise of studying Canada and being Canadian. Long may the students sustain such conversations and extend our vistas higher and further.

*Professor Elsbeth Heaman* is the Undergraduate Program Director at the McGill Institute for Canadian Studies. She is an associate professor, as well as the Canada Research Chair in Early Canada.
Developing National and Personal Identity
What MacLennan Achieves in Making *Two Solitudes* a *Künstlerroman*

Madeline LaRue
In the opening paragraphs of his 1945 novel *Two Solitudes*, Hugh MacLennan describes the geography of Canada, specifically the courses Ottawa River and the St. Lawrence, and how they meet and merge around the island of Montreal. “Two old races and religions meet here and live their separate legends, side by side,” says his narrator about the area, “If this sprawling half-continent has a heart, here it is.” The rest of his novel explores the dynamic between these two “race legends” in Canada, the French and the English, and how they struggle to coexist, their relations “slow, reluctant, and rarely simple” but hopefully working towards a “self-moved reciprocation.”

That long-standing tension between the two traditions and cultures exist and make joint progress difficult is clear from the first part of the novel, which takes place at the end of the First World War in the small Quebec town of Saint-Marc. Athanase Tallard, a native of the region and the descendant of a long line of influential French land-owners, brings in some Englishmen from Montreal to look at a property that is for sale, immediately sparking anxiety in the local French-Canadians. Athanase’s son by Kathleen, Paul, is only a boy at this point, but Athanase is insistent that Paul not only convert with him to Protestantism, but also that he attend an English school, where he will learn science and thereby, in Athanase’s view, understand the modern world better than the tradition-obsessed natives of Saint-Marc.

Paul, the product of so many conflicting tensions within the country—race, religion, language, education, tradition—is in the perfect position to write the first great novel of Canada, and in it to get to the young country’s heart. That he is peculiarly suited to this task, and how he came to be so, is the focus of my essay. The conflicts within Paul’s own development are parallel to those of his country and this allows him a greater understanding of that country and the possibilities for its future, a future in which both Paul and MacLennan optimistically envision the dissolution of those tensions, or at least their subsiding into relations of mutual respect, so that the nation can understand itself as a whole, and move resolutely into the future.

In 1951 Claude Bissell put forth a “school edition” of Hugh MacLennan’s 1945 novel *Two Solitudes* that dispensed with parts three and four, the sections following the death of Athanase Tallard, altogether. This is to miss entirely the novel’s project, integral to which is the
development of the young Canadian Paul Tallard as an artist, and to end the novel with death and failure rather than an optimistic vision of the future of its main characters and of the country itself. Athanase’s story and his failure, however, are fundamental precursors to that happier ending we get at the end of part four, as his inability to distance himself effectively from his deeply rooted French heritage provides an effective foil for Paul’s success in this area. Additionally, Athanase’s insistence upon giving Paul a mixed education is just the action necessary to allow Paul to achieve that distanced perspective. So while Athanase dominates the first half of the novel and makes it appear at first more of the Family Saga genre than the Künstlerroman, the latter, the development story of Paul-as-writer, is the core of Two Solitudes, and the former generation’s back story is simply a vital setup to set that development in motion. Paul Tallard can only succeed as an artist by distancing himself from the world around him, an effect that he only achieves because of the strong direction given him in his education and development by Athanase, and that is important for him as a modern novelist because it allows him to view the world and its struggles, Canada’s in particular, with an essential objectivity that allows him both to describe and to take creative control of it.

Two Solitudes is striking as a Künstlerroman because, for the first half of the novel, the focus of the narrative is not on Paul the artist but on his father. Athanase Tallard is a French-Canadian land-owner of aristocratic descent who attempts, unsuccessfully, to bridge the gaps between French and English cultures and between traditionalism and modernity in Canada. He dreams of setting up a factory in his small Quebec town of Saint-Marc so that he can reconcile the national purposes of the English and French as he sees them: the French maintaining their identity and the English using industry and technology for the production of wealth. Athanase envisions using industry and technology not only for wealth, but for the betterment of his town and its people; he sees these things “lifting the living standards, wiping out debts, keeping people in their homes where they had been born, giving everyone a chance” (124). He wants to bring Quebec, though “she had always hated and opposed the industrial revolution” (24), into modernity on its own terms, and not at the hands of the English. His vision is noble, but, as Elspeth Cameron notes, he is “paralyzed by traditional attachments” (175); his instinctive loyalty to his province makes him want to bring it into modernity with that “promise of a better future”2, but that very desire defeats him as he manages to alienate first his fellow French-
Canadians through his conversion to Protestantism and then the English businessman with whom he is working (Huntly McQueen) because, as an outcast, he is no longer a useful liaison to Saint-Marc. Because of that “undying passion of his for trying to change people and make them over” (113)—to change traditional French-Canadians by making them modern industrialists and to change English businessmen from amoral profiteers into humanists concerned for the welfare of their neighbouring French—he fails completely, and is left with no purpose or lasting legacy whatsoever, except what he can leave for Paul. As he dies bankrupt, this naturally does not take the form of material wealth.

What Athanase does leave to Paul is essential to the novel as a Künstlerroman, for the direction he consciously gives to Paul’s development and education enables Paul to obtain the distance from tradition and societal divides that is necessary for him to further his artistic project. Early on, Athanase decides that Paul needs to be educated at an English school, where he will get a “scientific education” and, most importantly, “learn to mix naturally with English boys,” and not have his loyalty determined by the existing “artificial separation” (177) between the two ethnicities. Athanase does even more to displace that “artificial separation” by forcing Paul to convert as a boy, isolating him forever from the Catholics in the village, even the children, who run away from him as he approaches as if he were cursed (236). Paul is cursed in a way, for as Cameron points out, his mixed parenthood and education serve not to align him to each side of the conflict, but to alienate him from both (174), which will leave him in many ways with a rather lonely existence. Yet that alienation, that distance, is necessary to Paul’s development as an artist, as it allows him an appropriate objectivity. Being raised in both traditions from his early youth establishes Paul as intrinsically a Canadian, indeed even as a metaphor for the entire country, for its internal dilemmas and conflicts are more or less those that exist both within (and without) Paul as he matures. It is an opportunity not given to many of Paul’s generation, and certainly not earlier ones; Janet Methuen’s teachers at finishing school had “done all they could to prevent her from talking or thinking like a Canadian” (140), and even Paul’s own schoolmates at Frobisher are raised to think that “their country was not Canada but the British Empire” (288). As opposed to this, Paul’s case becomes clearly exceptional in the eyes of the reader: “You’ll still be Canadian, mind you,” Athanase reminds Paul when discussing his future education, “Don’t forget that” (105).
Paul’s distance and objectivity allows him to assume a place in the Ivory Tower of the artist that Maurice Beebe describes in his assessment of the Künstlerroman as a genre. The typical artist-hero, says Beebe, has a “Divided Self” (a double-identity as both the distant, observant psyche of the artist and as the actual man participating in worldly life) and may choose, as an artist, to produce his creations away from other men and the experiences of living—that is, in an “Ivory Tower” where he may observe life from afar. There are many explicit examples in Two Solitudes where Paul stands aloof from the world around him in just such a way. In flipping through an “old Homeric picture book,” Paul pauses on a picture of Troy and we read through free indirect discourse his thought that “It must have been wonderful to live in a city like that, where you could come up to the wall and see the whole of it at a single glance and know everyone inside it” (305). Though still young, Paul fantasizes about the kind of knowledge one would have from being able to look down upon others living life from such a distance. That same day, Paul manages to achieve that very viewpoint, in ascending a “wall” (310) of rock at the top of Mount Royal and reaching the summit, where he “could see the whole city spread out beneath him” (311). He can see the whole of Montreal, described by the narrator from the beginning as the heart of Canada, from his high position above it on the mountain. Indeed, from such a distance, one could almost call his viewpoint god-like, and that is exactly the kind of position the artist-creator in the Ivory Tower tradition generally takes, the assumption being that such vast knowledge is necessary to create great art that is truly representative of humanity, and that can respond to its needs. Heather, for instance, whose visual art is described as having a “lack in it” (381), cannot achieve the same; the lack is in her missing the “vastness” of such scenes as those she paints of the Laurentians (382). But Heather is missing the dual-education and split background that is so essential to Paul as an artist. Significantly, when she has a chance to view the city from above, from the summit in Westmount, she can see “only a portion” (333) of Montreal—specifically, the English portion of Westmount and the surrounding areas.

Paul’s artistic mission, and MacLennan’s too in Two Solitudes, is so vast in scope however that it really requires such a god-like position to achieve its aim. Paul speaks for the young nation of Canada as a whole, and in viewing his own internal dilemmas from an objective distance, he is viewing those of the entire country and thereby forming a national consciousness. This, claims Glenn Willmott, is the goal of many Canadian
novels of the first half of the twentieth century and why the Bildungsroman was such a widespread choice: as Archibald MacMechan said, “The young nation [Canada] has a soul, which is striving to be articulate”\textsuperscript{4}, and it was only natural that those articulations appeared in Canadian literature in “the expression of a young and wandering, collective protagonist”—in short, a protagonist whose development and feelings parallel the nation in whose literature he appears\textsuperscript{5}. Paul’s soul is representative of the Canadian soul, for he is torn in ethnicity between his race-centred French brother and his Irish Anglophone mother; in class between his aristocratic rural French upbringing in wealth and his comparative urban poverty during the Depression and after Athanase’s death; in education between his Saint-Marc childhood and his English education at Frobisher; and in the modern world between tribalism and globalism. In this last especially Canada itself is representative of the Western world in general; the traditions Canada is fixed in, the traditions of England and France, “were so mature they had almost become decadent,” (454) as Paul is aware, but how will these cultures within the nation, like their mother countries within Europe, harmonize in spite of their differences to face modernity and its rapid uprooting of traditional values? As Cameron claims was MacLennan’s theory at the time he wrote Two Solitudes, perhaps Canada’s “national schizophrenia” is symbolic of the “international breakdown” in the world (166)—old countries resorting to nationalisms founded on race and cultural traditions rather than coming together and embracing new technologies for creative purposes and thereby entering a better future together. In the novel, Marius is representative of the conservative racialism, the retreating into old traditions rather than moving forward; Paul imagines him “binding the strait-jacket tighter and tighter around himself” in what seems “the same process [Paul] had witnessed in Europe” (465). The old world, not just the old Canada, cannot handle modernity; “science and war [...] have uprooted us and the whole world is roaming [...] trying to find a new place to live” (390), and Paul not only sees but also feels that intensity because he has grown up internalizing those tensions and conflicts, trying to determine through the madness what “I” means and not to “think of the whole world as ‘they’” (371) in the discomfort that has settled over his entire generation.

Paul, then, in the privileged, god-like position of being able to survey the world from a distance \textit{and} draw from his own experience, in his art externalizing what is already in himself, can take on the task of
writing the momentous novel that sums it all up and offers a solution. God himself may have become disinterested in the fate of the world or simply been outmoded by science, but the artist, as a kind of “successor” to God by the early twentieth century, can write the world as he sees it and maintain control over that creation⁶, offering a harmonious solution and re-humanizing a society that has become hateful and destructive. Whether the standards and values of this fictional world can then be applied to the real world for benefit, and whether their failure to do so is the fault of the author alone, cannot really be determined. Deborah Bowen suggests that MacLennan himself in writing the novel assumed a reader who would agree morally with his conclusion and more, would be “practically active” (36) afterwards,⁷ setting out to harmonize the world as the last chapter of Two Solitudes suggests Canada is starting to harmonize. But then perhaps the novelist’s god-like power is confined to the world of the novel alone and cannot be extrapolated; Paul’s creation would still, as a manifestation of Canada’s soul and awakening self-consciousness, be valuable to a new nation formed from old cultures in a time of rapid change. Canada’s nationalism would not be a frightened retreat into old ideas of bloodlines and culture, but would, by its very nature, be a large step forward; its nationalism would be one based instead in the harmonious coexistence of two formerly conflicting cultures.

Perhaps many call Two Solitudes the first truly Canadian novel because its ambition, if not its effect, is to define, through the character of Paul, a specifically Canadian consciousness that is not merely the sum of its French and English parts but a completely different and brand new whole. As a relatively young country, it is still determining its place in the world, trying to sort out its own identity, and in its youthful idealism maybe attempting to offer the old European world, so set in its ways, a way to cope with the modernity that has defined much of the country’s youth and development. This, of course, will only be possible once the nation is secure in itself, in its unique identity, and has resolved or come to terms with the inner tensions its roots have created. MacLennan and perhaps Paul are both optimistic that such a self-awareness will come soon in the middle of the twentieth century when they write and that one thing that can help it along is art such as theirs.
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Institutions as Representation in Canada
Power, Incentive, and Recursive Validation

Denis Douville
A common understanding of political institutions (such as electoral systems) suggests that they provide the structures through which democratic representation occurs. Less common is the neo-institutional assertion that institutions influence the political process. One can take the neo-institutional approach further, however, and argue that political institutions’ effects on the process are so strong that the institutions themselves are a form of representation. A traditional model of political representation requires first that a representative act in the interests of the represented, and second that the represented, if unsatisfied, judge and replace the representative. Arguably, institutions perform the same functions. They “act” through constraints and incentives that they impose upon politicians to consider certain interests. Furthermore, because institutions’ effects are visible, citizens may judge and change them as they would a politician.

Political theorists have debated the exact nature and role of institutions in regard to representation. The purpose of this paper is to pit competing theoretical propositions against the above assertion that institutions are a form of representation. This paper will weigh the different theories by empirically verifying their validity regarding Canada’s institutions. Emphasis is placed on theory, and then transferred to empirical verification. Institutions are broadly defined as procedural rules and systems designed to achieve certain ends; representation may be one of those ends. For conciseness and due to different levels of entrenchment and potential impact, only three Canadian institutions are examined: Canada’s first-past-the-post electoral system, federalism, and the constitution as it stands post 1982.

**Theory and Hypotheses: Institutions as Representation**

At its minimum and most general conception, Pitkin’s understanding of substantive representation is a relationship between a representative person or politician and a represented constituency that is created when two key conditions are met. The first condition is that the representative acts as a benefactor towards a group within the society, however defined. Hanna Fenichel Pitkin describes substantive representation as something that occurs when one person begins to “speak for, act for, look out for the interests of respective groups [...] In this sense a man represents what (or whom) he looks after or concerns himself with.”

The nature and interest of the constituency that the representative acts for varies; he or she may
look after the interests of the fishing industry (the constituency is thus fishermen and their associates), or the representative may look after the interests of a select group of individuals in an electoral district.

As per Pitkin, the second condition for substantive representation requires that the represented group or constituency be able to judge the representative’s actions and deem whether or not the representative is doing a good or a bad job at furthering its interests. Indeed, Pitkin notes that the representative ought to be “responsive to pressures,” because “one represents whatever guides ones actions.” This formulation is then elaborated in Pitkin’s treatment of delegation: she notes that representation occurs somewhere in between the act that the representative thinks is in the constituency’s interests, and the act that the constituency wishes the representative to do. If the representative consistently disobedys the constituency and refuses to ever act as a delegate, then representation becomes indistinguishable from command.

Implicit in these two conditions is the tragic reality of representation: not every person, constituency, or interest can be represented all the time and in every action of the representative. Niccolò Machiavelli warns political leaders that nobles and commoners have conflicting appetites, and that a leader will have to choose the interests of only one. Pitkin laments this reality, too: she notes that every society has a multiplicity of cleavages, and politicians have to choose which to represent. Giovanni Sartori echoes a similar idea when he complains that democratic power is power that some people have over other people; “real power is something that is exercised,” and thus all people cannot have power over all others at the same time.

To this tragedy, one adds another: the two conditions are at constant risk, because politicians are naturally inclined to seek power. Machiavelli warns princes that nobles are a constant threat to the prince’s position, and that nobles will always scheme against a prince behind his or her back. Implicit in Machiavelli’s warning is that the nobles (or politicians) vie for power. Politicians may not represent if all they seek is power or office. What is one to do? In “Fugitive Democracy,” Sheldon Wolin is pessimistic. Wolin argues that politicians are selfish, promote inequality, and are unresponsive to the public. For Wolin, since selfish politicians do not actually represent, democracy only truly occurs during the fleeting moments of revolution.

The fact that politicians selfishly seek power, however, does
not preclude representation, because political institutional rules and procedures tie the means of gaining power to the interests of specific groups. By different design, institutions create different incentives with which politicians must comply in order to obtain power, including the incentive to further certain interests (to represent). Sartori notes that all politics are merely systems of incentives: reward and punishment.\(^9\) Actors seek reward and avoid punishment, and institutions determine which acts are rewarded and which are punished. Even Machiavelli’s unelected prince has incentive to provide certain groups with some satisfaction to avoid punishment; that is why he advises princes to avoid actions that cause citizens to hate them.\(^10\) In other words, as Pitkin notes, “representation” as an institutional process may “emerge from a political system in which many individuals, both voters and legislators, are pursuing quite other goals,” in our case, power.\(^11\)

One may devise a model of “institutional” representation that takes into account the two conditions of the traditional model. The first condition requires that institutions “act for” specific interests, and these interests must be exclusive according to the first tragedy of representation; one cannot represent everyone all the time. Institutions (rules, procedures) of course cannot actually act in and of themselves, but as Sartori notes, different institutional designs can change politicians’ incentives for power by discouraging or encouraging different actions. For instance, Sartori describes the incentive-changing attributes of different electoral systems: different electoral systems punish and reward different types of parties, who may or may not stand for different interests, such as local versus national interests.\(^12\)

Many theorists have raised doubts about the utility of institutions as causal or predictive factors, and these doubts, at least on their surface, appear to raise conceptual difficulties for the first condition of representation. Louis Massicotte, for instance, notes that many theorists argue that representation depends more on preferences themselves rather than on institutional constraints; others suggest that institutional constraints and incentives cannot accurately predict behaviour.\(^13\) To such objections, however, one finds solace in Sartori’s response, which is to claim that as any social science, institutional causes need not manifest themselves as predicted all the time; general tendencies are verification enough. Furthermore, those tendencies are indeed more or less directly observable and predictable in a socially scientific way.\(^14\)
The second condition holds that in order to be called a form of representation, institutions and their effects must be judged or evaluated by their “constituencies” in the same way that a politician, the classical representative, is judged and evaluated. Moreover, the represented must be capable of changing the institution in the same way that the politician’s constituency is able to vote him or her out. Sartori argues that dissatisfaction with corrupt politicians is a reflection of dissatisfaction with corrupt institutions. Iris Young’s general thesis posits that special, extra-institutional structures must be created in order to adequately represent marginalized groups. Seyla Benhabib provides the most convincing analysis on how institutional change may occur. She argues that societies engage in “recursive validation”: elites and society may deliberate the rules and procedures by which deliberations themselves are guided and limited by the institutions. Phrased differently, a discussion that is guided by rules and procedures can result in a decision that changes the rules and procedures that have guided the discussion.

An opposing body of theory suggests that institutions may not meet the second condition. This theory suggests that institutions, unlike politicians, cannot be “held to account.” Max Weber, for example, fears that institutions themselves might come to govern our lives entirely: he forewarned, in his famous phrase, that society may be trapped in an “iron cage of modernity.” In this iron cage, also known as the “polar night of icy darkness,” citizens and politicians alike are automatons: mere cogs in a machine of legalism, bureaucracy, and rules. As noted above, however, many authors are optimistic about institutional change. Benhabib’s theory of recursive validation in particular is just as if not more plausible than Weber’s fears of an iron cage. Indeed, she even emphasizes that debates about institutions themselves need not be “rationalist” or legalist in order to be discussed and have an effect. Benhabib offers a plausible theoretical alternative to empirically test against Weber’s fears.

The theorist is left with a model of institutional representation that is not so different from Pitkin’s minimal model of politicians as representatives and citizens as empowered judges. Based on the two conditions, this model can be distilled into two hypotheses to be used for empirical verification. The first hypothesis suggests that institutions, by changing the power incentives of elites, “act for” or favour certain groups’ interests over others. The second hypothesis suggests that citizens, though constrained by institutional rules, can nevertheless engage in recursive
validation to both discuss and change the institutional rules themselves. These two hypotheses are respectively verified in the next two sections by investigating three of Canada’s core political institutions: the electoral system, the federal system, and the constitution.

**Power, Punishment, and Reward in Canada: Institutions “Acting For”**

In Canada, an existing body of literature spurred by the writings of Alan Cairns examines the influence of institutions on Canadian political life. In its exploration of representation, this paper champions Cairns’ emphasis on the overwhelming importance of institutions. Through incentives (or constraints) that encourage (or discourage) politicians to represent (or not) different interests, Canadian institutions do “act for” those represented interests. Elites who further an interest are either rewarded with power or punished (suffering a reduced chance at power), depending on the interest and institution. Canada’s electoral system furthers regional interests along different district lines. Canadian federalism furthers regional interests along provincial lines. The constitution protects and arguably furthers considerations of minorities.

Alan Cairns’ analysis of Canada’s current first-past-the-post (FPTP) electoral system provides convincing evidence that the system constrains Canada’s parties through punishment and reward. In “The Electoral System and the Party System in Canada, 1921-1965,” Cairns demonstrates that FPTP consistently punished small parties with nation-wide support by allocating them fewer seats. For instance, in 1935, the Reconstruction Party held 8.7% of the popular vote across the nation, but was rewarded with only one seat and subsequently disbanded. Conversely, FPTP rewards small parties with regionally concentrated support. For instance, also in 1935, FPTP allocated 7 seats for Social Credit, even though that party only had 4.1% of the popular vote. FPTP generally also tended to reward the large, electorally victorious government party with more seats and punish the opposition by allocating it fewer seats.

The constraints illustrated above translate into changed incentives for politicians, who indeed wish to maximize their chances at obtaining power by maximizing effective votes (votes that translate into seats, rather than votes that do not). Power here is defined as the holding of official political office: in other words, a seat in parliament. Generally speaking, the changed incentive for politicians is to mobilize their constituencies
and make appeals on the basis of region instead of on other, nation-wide issues, such as left-right class politics. As Cairns notes, “sectionalism [regionalism] has been rendered highly visible because the electoral system makes it a fruitful basis on which to organize electoral support” in terms of “the payoffs of representation,” that is, a politician’s chances to get elected.²⁰ Hence why, at the time, the Liberals favoured campaigning in Quebec while the Conservatives favoured Ontario.

The changed incentives, furthermore, translated into representation via policy. Cairns notes that “the significance of the electoral system for party policy is due to its consistent failure to reflect with even rough accuracy the distribution of partisan support in the various sections/provinces of the country” as parties “become less sensitive to the interests of the unrepresented sections than they otherwise would be.”²¹ Thus, during this period, Conservatives in Quebec received little institutional representation, given that Quebec was a Liberal stronghold. Indeed, Jean-Pierre Dierrienic criticizes FPTP for this reason, arguing that such regional biases are reflected in the victorious party’s government policy.²² Through its incentive structure, FPTP “represents” Liberals in Quebec by granting them increased party support, while not representing Quebec’s Conservatives, who become invisible.

Importantly, the electoral system as an institution influences policy and regional representation without a necessary demand by constituents for this form of representation. As Cairns argues, the electoral system may lead to misperceptions about the constituencies; it may make the constituencies wish for more regional representation than is actually necessary or desired.²³ Certainly, there will be constituents who prefer that representation occur in the form of regional representation; they may wish, for instance, that Quebec, and not a certain group within Quebec, or a group that crosses Quebec’s boundaries, or a non-regional group be represented. Those constituency’s voices will be amplified by the electoral system, which represents regions regardless, given the incentives that it places on elites. Constituencies that do not seek regional representation, however, have their voices dampened or muted by the electoral system.

Some objections to the electoral system’s regionalizing effects in representation may be made and considered. Richard Johnston and Janet Ballantyne argue that “the smaller the party, the more concentrated in one or a few provinces its vote should be, if it is to maximize its strength in Parliament. Conversely, the larger the party, the more dispersed across
Canadian federalism imposes its own set of constraints and incentives upon political elites, and these incentives likewise amplify and favour regional representation. Cairns explores those incentive structures. For one, provincial governments are vested with increasingly important jurisdictions, such as health care (which requires massive funding), and natural resources (which provides funding). “By their self-interested obstinacy [provincial governments] preserved their basic bargaining power for the future and formally protected the jurisdictional integrity essential for subsequent increases in their governmental potency and importance.”

Furthermore, institutionally speaking, the provinces have an incentive to foster provincial identities in order to maximize votes by minimizing the cleavages within their region.

Undoubtedly, power is the prime motivator behind the Canadian federal institution’s regionalization of provincial representation. To put the matter briefly, as Allison Graham notes, placing someone in an office changes that person’s incentives to match those of the office. A bureaucrat’s and politician’s ability to influence other actors, as well as their jobs and salaries, depend on the office’s prestige and importance. Hence, Allison’s main contention that “where you stand depends on where you sit.”

Provinces sit in a specific, regional jurisdiction; thus, the region is where they stand, or what they represent. Cairns documents such behaviour. “Each political office [...] has a history that influences and constrains the succession of incumbents who briefly possess it.” For instance, “no Quebec leader,” regardless of party, “would question the sacrosanct objective of ‘la survivance francaise en Amerique’.”

The end result of the institutional structure is thus that regional representation occurs even if different political leaders or societal members do not actively strive for it. Cairns laments that “although their functions relate them to particular sectors of society, they are not puppets or simple reflections of interests of the groups they control, regulate, or service.” “Passivity, indifference, or the absence of strong...
opposition from their environment may be all that provincial governments need in order to thrive and grow.” Each region thus endures (or enjoys, depending on perspective) a proliferation of regionally tailored provincial statutes, regulations, and laws. Cairns notes that this government activity occurs despite the lack of lobbying or demand for it. Even more so than Canada’s FPTP electoral system, Canadian federalism acts in the name of regional interests through the constraints and incentives that it imposes on or creates for political elites to act for and represent a type of regional as opposed to other interest.

The consequence of increased regional representation is the negation and difficulty of interests that do not serve provincial governments’ search for power. The party structure has become split to mirror the federal structure; Quebec Liberals are different than federal or Ontario Liberals. The parties split because to maintain links would only be detrimental to their appeal to voters. Federal Liberals do not wish to suffer the hassle that comes with having to deal with provincial Conservatives while also supporting that province’s Liberal opposition. Hence, “the circumstances in which provincial parties in power will support their federal counterparts almost entirely reflect [institutionally motivated] strategic considerations.”

Furthermore, certain national politics, such as class, are subsumed in a regional perspective of provinces that takes precedence. Citizens are not “wealthy” or “poor”; rather, provinces are “have” or “have not.” Although-on the surface, Canadian federalism seems to grant the federal government considerable amounts of room to represent, closer inspection reveals that this room is limited and regionalized. Certainly, the federal government responds to certain nation-wide considerations, and can have considerable power spend in any issue area. However, provincial sources of funds, such as natural resources, are increasingly important. The federal government also faces constraints. Federal parties also have an incentive to cater to their own regional support base. Further, the government cannot criticize a province without losing legitimacy; it must also manage more diverse interests. Provinces can also “gang up” on the federal government if it grows too bold.

Through its empowerment of the courts, Canada’s constitution (and its Charter) has created new constraints and incentives for governments. Heather MacIvor notes that “sections 25, 27, and 28 instruct courts to take particular interests into account - Aboriginal, multicultural, and gender respectively - when they interpret the rights and freedoms.”
behind these rights and freedoms are now valid sources of legal reasoning. These rules, now institutionally enshrined in the constitution, require that the court engages in judicial review. In section 24, the constitution also provides the courts with remedies to amend, invalidate, or suspend government legislation. Indeed, critics have even argued that the Supreme Court has become judicially “activist” and uses the Charter to advance the claims of interest groups.

For the sake of continued power, governments have altered their policy behaviour in response to the Charter’s institutional entrenchment. James Kelly argues that the “new policy environment introduced by [the Charter] has seen [judicial power and review] as serious constraints on the political executive’s ability to govern from the centre.” To counter the new threat that the courts pose to the power of the Prime Minister, the Department of Justice has assumed a new role. Its staff sensitizes other departments’ policy proposals to the Charter; it vindicates those that are Charter sensitive, and modifies or nullifies those that are not. In this sense, for the sake of legitimacy before the law, but also for the power to counter the courts, governments are indeed responding to the changed constitutional structure.

Beyond the centre of the federal government, the introduction of the Charter to the constitution has made bureaucrats and departments writ large more aware and considerate of minorities. Cairns’ assessment in “The Canadian Constitutional Experiment” seems apt. Constitutions, Cairns claims, “change the cues transmitted to political actors.” It is for such reasons that in the culture of the public service, all treat the Charter sensitively, as Janet Hiebert emphasizes. Arguably, Charter rights are more than mere symbols. They give elites incentive to consider different group interests. Policies were rewritten; statutes were struck down, amended, or reformulated, all with the interests of groups protected by the Charter in mind.

Recursive Validation and Opportunity: Canadians Shaping Institutions

Citizens are capable of both judging and changing their institutions in the same way that they would judge a politician and hold him or her to account for (un)satisfactory representation. Canadians have judged the representativeness of their electoral system through assemblies and referenda, Canadian federalism by bolstering the government level that
best represents their interests, and the constitution and Charter during the constitutional negotiations from patriation to Meech Lake. Their ability to change these institutions is ultimately constrained by self-serving elites. Such a constraint on citizens’ ability to change institutions is to be expected, however, and citizens can nevertheless engage in recursive validation as defined by Benhabib by working through (and with) politicians’ self-interest to change the institutional structure.

Canadian citizens have demonstrated numerous times that they are capable of judging and attempting to change their electoral institutions. Patrick Fournier notes that during the British Columbia citizens’ assembly, citizens, although guided by elites, were not manipulated by them, and critically weighed the costs and benefits of different electoral systems. “Satisfaction with the existing electoral system influenced judgements [...] criticisms of the specific proposed reform mattered.” Importantly, citizens formed their views on electoral systems despite elite guidance; indeed, after the courses on electoral systems, many individuals retained their original preference. This calculation occurred even beyond the assembly, and during the referenda.

Likewise, Canada’s citizens are aware of federalism’s structure, and this awareness allows them to judge and attempt to change it. Cairns documents how interest groups attempt to bolster the powers of the government, provincial or federal, that can best represent their interests. During the Charter negotiations, citizens were aware of Premiers’ self-interest and regionalizing tendencies. The choice between Trudeau’s package and the Premiers’ package was truly a choice between a liberal conception of “the national interest” and regional interests. Similarly, during the debate surrounding Quebec’s secession referendum, topics touched on the rules of federalism, from provincial secession to language issues to the allocation of federal powers itself.

Perhaps no institution is as judged and watched by Canadians as the constitution. Speaking of the Canadian public, Cairns notes that “we now know that systems are deliberate acts of choice.” As he notes, many groups “demand affirmative action” and are critical of politicians who wish to change the constitution. Citizens, especially minorities, seek refuge and support in a constitution that they fear may be “subverted” by governments more responsive to power and numbers than to rights. The constitution is more than a symbol; real interests are at stake, and citizens know it. During Meech Lake, citizens feared that elites might overlook
their interests while they negotiated the Charter, and Cairns warned that “they may be right.”

While citizens judge their institutions, their ability to change them is limited due to the institutions themselves. The only ones who have the power and authority to change the institutions are the ones who gain power from the institutions, and this conflict of interest may prevent any real change from occurring. Institutions and the incentives that they present politicians can limit citizens’ ability to change institutions. This limitation manifests itself most clearly in the powerful elites who wish to maintain the institutions that allow them to keep their power in the first place. Has this conflict of interest barred change?

For all attempts at institutional reform, elites dominated the institutional reform process. There is no question, for example, that Meech Lake was an elitist affair, during which the federal division of powers as well as the constitutional status of different Canadians were discussed by politicians and bureaucrats behind closed doors. Cairns sighs at the fact that minority citizens who depend on the Charter for the pursuit of their interest “recognize, in a nutshell, that the respect accorded to their constitutional status [...] fluctuates for reasons largely beyond their control.”

The same logic explains why the electoral citizens’ assembly was mobilized by elites, but rejected by British Columbia’s government, which set the referendum threshold too high.

Do the incentives of elites to maintain institutions due to their desire for power mean that citizens are permanent prisoners of their political institutions? Arguably it does not, for citizens can still change on their political institutions, though they must do so in a neo-institutional fashion. Democratic action for change takes place within an institutional framework: citizens must work through the established interests and rules in order to change the established interests and rules. Phrased differently, citizens must use Benhabib’s mechanism of recursive validation. Evidence suggests that Canadians can and have worked through the power incentives of Canadian institutions in order to stop elites from- or push them towards-institutional change.

The public’s power of recursive validation is evident in the Canadian government’s quest for legitimacy and popular support within the Canadian federation. For example, during constitutional amendments, each government had to couch its claims in terms of the interests of the people. Only by claiming to have support, and attempting to garner it,
could governments be successful.\textsuperscript{56} The fact that certain Canadian groups, such as women, pressured Trudeau for more recognition in the Charter is also evidence of citizens’ ability to change institutions. Certainly, Trudeau used this participation as a lever to bolster his legitimacy (and thus power over constitutional reform), but citizens nevertheless exercised agency to secure change.

For the constitution, examples abound of citizens exercising control over their institutions through recursive validation. The public outcry, minority lobbying, and fervent publications in defence of various interests that followed Meech Lake demonstrates that citizens can and do change their institutions.\textsuperscript{57} Likewise, popular power is evidenced in the fact that the Parti Quebecois dared not change the federal structure through secession without clear support from Quebec’s population.\textsuperscript{58} In this case, citizens were the ultimate deciders, and constrained the elite. During calmer periods, citizens still exercised a form of control by attempting to bolster the legitimacy and power of the level of government that they felt better represented their interests.\textsuperscript{59}

From the perspective of recursive validation, the failure to secure change in British Columbia for electoral reform is not truly a failure, but rather a small step in the broader, grander process towards change. The fact that reform received nigh on sixty percent of voter support means that in order to remain legitimate, the government will eventually have to cater to the public’s desires in regard to electoral reform. The hurdles for reform in British Columbia were, bluntly put, far too high: voters had to reach a minimum threshold of sixty percent support to enact electoral change. British Columbians were off the mark by less than five. When the opportunity comes next, chances are that five percent may indeed change their minds.

\textbf{Looking Back}

Canadian institutions themselves are a form of substantive political representation. They meet the first condition of representation with flying colours. Because they guide politicians’ quests for power, they modify politicians’ behaviour in such a way that amplifies different types of- and different groups’- interests. Canada’s electoral system and federalism both cater to regional interests at the cost of national interests. The constitution has sensitized politicians and bureaucrats to the interests of minorities. These institutions also meet the second condition of representation. Canadians
judge and attempt to change institutions. Citizens have lobbied, published on, and critiqued institutions to either cause or prevent institutional change in Canada’s federal and constitutional systems, and may yet influence the electoral system. While the power to change institutions ultimately resides with elites who benefit from institutional structures, unsatisfied Canadians have nevertheless changed their institutions through recursive validation.

Endnotes

2 Pitkin, 117.
3 Pitkin, 145.
5 Pitkin, 213.
7 Machiavelli, 60.
9 Sartori, xi.
10 Machiavelli, 114.
11 Pitkin, 224.
12 Sartori, 54.
14 Sartori, 32.
15 Ibid., 147.
18 Benhabib, 37.
20 Ibid., 121.
21 Ibid., 126.
22 Ibid., 109.
23 Ibid., 72.
27 Ibid., 162, 165.
29 Cairns, “Governments and Societies,” 150.
30 Ibid., 149.
31 Ibid., 145.
33 Cairns, “Governments and Societies,” 159.
34 Ibid., 160.
35 Ibid., 164.
36 Ibid., 152.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid., 162.
40 Ibid., 15.
41 Ibid., 34.
43 Kelly, 481.
46 Hiebert, 28.

48 Cairns, “Constitutional Experiment,” 246.

49 Ibid., 237-243.


51 Cairns, “Constitutional Experiment,” 233.


53 Ibid., 124.

54 Ibid., 123.

55 Fournier, 92-105 and 133.

56 Cairns, “Constitutional Experiment,” 252.

57 Ibid., 253.

58 Ornstein, 759


**Works Cited**


La Représentation de l’identité québécoise dans *D’Amour, P.Q.* de Jacques Godbout

Émilie Horrocks-Denis

collectiviste des Québécois, je pose que l’identité collective de Mireille et de Thomas prévaudra sur leur identité individuelle.  

L’analyse de l’évolution identitaire de Mireille confirme la majorité de ces hypothèses. Tout d’abord, Mireille manifeste son mépris pour la religion catholique en la parodiant fréquemment dans le roman. Ensuite, elle favorise un langage familier plutôt qu’un langage courant ou soutenu, malgré le fait qu’elle soit éduquée et cultivée. Son emploi du joual peut donc être perçu comme « révolutionnaire ». En outre, quoique l’idéologie de Mireille soit nationaliste, elle est explicitement antiétatique. Ce résultat est surprenant en raison de la prépondérance d’opinions favorables au gouvernement québécois pendant la Révolution tranquille. Enfin, Mireille attribue davantage d’importance à son identité collective qu’à son identité individuelle. En somme, l’étude du personnage de Mireille révèle que son identité demeure relativement uniforme et constante tout au long du roman et que cette identité reflète le récit de l’enchantement de l’être des Québécois.

Le parcours identitaire de Thomas D’Amour est plus complexe que celui de Mireille, mais appuie tout de même les hypothèses ci-dessus. Contrairement à celle de Mireille, l’identité de Thomas est instable et polymorphe, c’est-à-dire qu’elle se transforme considérablement à mesure que le récit avance. Au départ, Godbout présente Thomas comme un être profondément religieux, mais ce dernier renie progressivement son attachement à la religion catholique, ainsi que son respect pour celle-ci, sous l’influence de Mireille. De plus, Thomas préfère initialement le langage soutenu ou courant au langage familier; toutefois, il adopte un langage de plus en plus populaire au fil du récit. Par ailleurs, l’identité politique de Thomas devient explicitement nationaliste à la fin du livre. Enfin, bien que les idiosyncrasies de Thomas soient mises en relief au début du roman, elles finissent par se perdre dans l’identité plurielle et collective québécoise qu’il épouse en définitive. Somme toute, l’analyse du trajet identitaire de Thomas révèle son passage du récit de l’empêchement d’être au récit de l’enchantement d’être des Québécois.

L’évolution identitaire de Mireille

Identité religieuse

Tel que prédit par ma première hypothèse, la vision de l’identité québécoise des années 1960 et 1970 qui est exprimée par Mireille se définit notamment par une rupture avec le clergé catholique. Cette
rupture est révélée lorsque ce personnage parodie l’enseignement moral et religieux :

« Justement, dites-moi, ma petite Mireille, pourquoi les âmes des justes attendaient, dans les enfers, la venue du Sauveur ? Parce que le ciel était fermé depuis le péché d’Adam. Tous ensemble maintenant : Nous vous adorons, Ô Christ, et nous vous bénissons [...] Hé bien bravo ma petite Mireille. Tu connais bien ton catéchisme ! C’est ce à quoi ça me fait penser, ton ostidtexte l’Auteur ! T’as rien compris. Le Paradis perdu, c’est MOI ! »

Ce passage, comprenant un monologue dialogique de Mireille, démontre qu’elle se moque de l’éducation catholique qu’elle a reçue. Cette femme dénonce particulièrement l’aspect inflexible et inaltérable du discours religieux qui, selon Seyfrid, est accentué par la typographie de la phrase « Parquelecielétaitfermédepuiislepéchéd’Adam ». De plus, Mireille semble rejeter les limites imposées par la religion catholique à la libération et à l’ouverture sexuelle des Québécois en invitant son interlocuteur à découvrir « le Paradis perdu » ou à atteindre l’extase par l’entremise de l’acte sexuel, plutôt que par l’étude de la religion. En outre, Mireille articule son rejet de la religion catholique par son emploi abondant du sacre québécois, qui se situe « entre le juron et le blasphème ». Par exemple, outrée par l’œuvre quasi liturgique de Thomas qu’elle corrige, Mireille s’écrie : « Wouo ! Ya des limites ! Saint Siméon ! Saint Jacques le mineur ! Saint Michel des Saints ! Saint Philippe d’Abotsford ! Saint Crème […] ! » Cette exclamation laisse sous-entendre que le personnage conteste le caractère sacré de la religion. Tel que mentionné plus haut, l’opposition de Mireille à la morale et à la religion catholique reflète le refus des Québécois de la Révolution tranquille de demeurer sous l’emprise de l’Église. D’une part, Belliveau et Boily expliquent ce refus par la redéfinition du rôle de l’État québécois en faveur de sa déconfessionnalisation et de son intervention grandissante dans le domaine social. D’autre part, ces auteurs attribuent la diminution graduelle de l’influence du clergé catholique sur les Québécois francophones à la révision de leur rapport à la foi. De surcroît, Mendelsohn associe la transformation de l’identité religieuse des Québécois avec leur transition d’un nationalismime ethno-religieux à un nationalismime civique, ce dernier
étant plus propice à leur émancipation collective. Enfin, l’évolution de l’identité religieuse de Mireille évoque le récit de l’enchantement d’être des Québécois, car elle présente positivement la libération de ce personnage, qui symbolise la société québécoise, de l’ordre établi par l’Église catholique. Puisque Mireille appréhende la religion catholique comme une institution freinant l’affranchissement individuel et collectif des Québécois, l’on peut déduire qu’elle impute la dominance de la nation québécoise en partie au clergé catholique, majoritairement francophone, de la province. Ceci explique pourquoi ce personnage n’identifie pas explicitement l’élite anglophone du Québec comme source d’oppression des Québécois.

**Identité linguistique**

Mireille adopte le joual comme langage de prédilection et célèbre le fait français au pays ; ainsi, elle représente la réalité linguistique de la société québécoise des années 1960. Ceci confirme ma deuxième hypothèse. Certains membres de l’élite intellectuelle du Québec prétendent que l’usage du joual découle d’un manque d’éducation et de culture. D’autres rejettent cette vision du parler populaire des Québécois francophones, car le joual ne comprend pas de constructions syntaxiques incorrectes, même s’il comporte plusieurs anglicismes. Le joual constituerait donc « un acte conscient de révolte contre une domination culturelle et existentielle par les Canadiens et les Américains anglophones ». Les adeptes de la théorie de la décolonisation partagent cet avis, affirmant que le joual représente un outil de provocation et de résistance des « colonisés » français contre les « colonisateurs » anglais. Hobbs explique que, paradoxalement, en intégrant des mots, des locutions et des phrases relevant du lexique anglais à leur vocabulaire, les Québécois francophones absorbent en quelque sorte « le poison de l’anglais », afin de se protéger contre l’anglicisation. Les résultats de mon analyse du langage de Mireille appuient cette conception positive du joual québécois. En effet, Coates croit que le langage de ce personnage « est enrichi par les québécismes et nuancé d’une espèce de révolte par son usage des anglicismes ». Néanmoins, Mireille n’attribue pas explicitement son assimilation de mots anglais à son intention de se révolter contre l’autorité des « colonisateurs » anglophones du pays... En fait, au cours du récit, elle ne représente jamais les Canadiens anglais comme les antagonistes principaux des Québécois français. Tout de même, je pose que le parler populaire de ce personnage est « révolutionnaire ».
pour les raisons présentées ci-dessous.

Tout d’abord, l’emploi du joual par Mireille ne résulte pas d’une mauvaise instruction, puisqu’elle a obtenu un diplôme en lettres et en sciences.\(^43\) La capacité de Mireille de repérer les références textuelles apparaissant dans l’ouvrage de Thomas D’Amour témoigne de sa culture littéraire. Elle perçoit, par exemple, « le prince des ténèbres » comme une allusion à un poème de Nerval.\(^44\) De plus, Mireille connaît les règles orthographiques et grammaticales du français, car elle réussit à identifier et à corriger des fautes d’orthographe dans les textes de Thomas.\(^45\) La maîtrise du français par Mireille transparaît au travers de sa créativité linguistique. C’est-à-dire, le parler de la secrétaire manifeste son aptitude à manipuler des mots avec brio.\(^46\) Par exemple, elle transforme la machine à écrire en un « piano à lettres » et elle définit le produit de sa dactylographie du manuscrit de Thomas comme un « tapuscrit ».\(^47\) D’autre part, les compétences linguistiques et l’imagination littéraire de ce personnage l’amène à participer à la rédaction du roman de Thomas.\(^48\) Enfin, l’extrait suivant démontre que Mireille passe aisément du registre de langue familier au registre de langue soutenu : « Nous sommes la salive de Dieu, une goutte d’éternité, nous aurions pu choisir les oiseaux et nous aurions volé ! Mais non ! On s’est fourré ! Epis c’est pour ça que t’es rienk’une guenon qui parle! »\(^49\) Bref, ce personnage parle le joual par préférence, plutôt que par ignorance.

Par ailleurs, Mireille favorise l’usage du langage familier en raison de son anti-intellectualisme.\(^50\) La sténodactylo reproche à Thomas son inclusion de références littéraires et culturelles obscures dans ses écrits « pour faire cultivé »\(^51\). Elle dénonce aussi le puritanisme et le snobisme de Thomas et des académiciens en général.\(^52\) Leur langage soutenu lui donne envie de « crucifier l’imparfait du subjonctif » et de leur « fourrer au fond de la gorge un mot juteux, […] un mot de rue, un mot bon, pas un bon mot […] ».\(^53\) Le caractère terne, rigide, ennuyeux et artificiel du registre soutenu exaspère Mireille; alors, elle préconise l’adoption du lexique coloré, naturel, vivant et savoureux du registre familier. De plus, ce personnage conteste les préjugés de l’élite intellectuelle francophone envers le parler populaire québécois. Elle répudie notamment leur conception du joual comme un « problème de langage ».\(^54\) Lors d’un entretien à la radio à propos du livre que Mireille a coécrit avec Thomas, elle refuse de « soigner son langage » « vu qu’il n’est pas malade ».\(^55\) Au contraire, elle revendique le droit du peuple québécois d’employer un langage populaire, étant donné que la langue
française représente « une richesse naturelle nationale » que les Québécois peuvent exploiter à leur guise. En d’autres mots, Mireille subordonne le droit individuel des décideurs québécois de choisir un langage soutenu au droit collectif des citoyens d’opter plutôt pour un langage populaire. Ceci confirme ma supposition que ce personnage, agissant comme le miroir de la société québécoise, serait davantage collectiviste qu’individualiste. Enfin, en décrivant le joual de Mireille comme un puissant acte expressif visant la liberté linguistique des Québécois, Godbout évoque le récit de leur enchantement d’être.

L’analyse de l’évolution identitaire de Mireille au niveau linguistique nous permet d’appréhender l’importance qu’a acquis la langue par rapport à la définition de l’identité québécoise et à la consolidation des mouvements nationalistes et séparatistes lors de la Révolution tranquille. La langue française est devenue le pôle principal de l’identité individuelle et collective des Québécois suite à l’affaiblissement de leur croyance en et/ou de leur pratique de la religion catholique pendant les années 1960 et 1970. Selon Dion, la langue est devenue le seul élément distinguant les Québécois français des Canadiens anglais depuis la convergence culturelle qui s’est produite à cette époque. Le besoin des Québécois de se différencier des membres du Reste du Canada en affirmant leur caractère francophone a donc alimenté leurs sentiments nationalistes. Cette situation se conforme aux prédictions du « Paradoxe de Tocqueville », soutenant que le rapprochement des cultures, causé par l’avènement de la modernité, résulterait en la hausse du nationalisme. En outre, Taylor pose que le désir des Québécois de protéger et de promouvoir la langue française, qui est fondamentale à leur capacité individuelle et collective d’expression, de réalisation et de reconnaissance, justifierait leur idéologie nationaliste. Ainsi, la langue française et le nationalisme québécois sont intimement liés. Mireille représente cette corrélation, étant donné qu’elle revendique le droit des Québécois de préserver la langue française et défend leurs idées nationalistes.

**Identité politique**

Les résultats de mon analyse de l’identité politique de Mireille indiquent qu’elle embrasse une idéologie égalitariste et nationaliste à la fin du roman. Par exemple, l’indignation de la secrétaire, en raison de l’exploitation du peuple québécois par l’élite intellectuelle et économique de la province, révèle son égalitarisme : « Bon j’ai mon voyage ! La
complicité des élites sur le dos du prolétariat ! Ostid bourgeoise de lettres ! Ecrivains ! Capitalistes ! Tous des exploiteurs ! »65 Cette citation prouve que ce personnage n’attribue pas l’oppression de la population québécoise aux Canadiens anglais, mais plutôt aux décideurs de la province, quelque soit leur langue. Ceci semble contredire mon hypothèse que les personnages de D’Amour, P.Q. auraient une conception positive du gouvernement québécois, puisque le récit se déroule à une époque où ce dernier était généralement perçu comme le véhicule principal de l’émancipation du peuple.66 Au contraire, pendant une émission littéraire à la radio, Mireille confie la responsabilité de reconstruire l’identité collective du Québec aux citoyens : « Servilité terminée ! On s’en va à choppe ! Pour se faire overaller tous ensemble […] Un écrivain, c’est pas plus important qu’une secrétaire, oké ? »67 D’une part, elle critique la hiérarchisation des secteurs professionnels, car l’emploi d’une personne ne détermine pas sa valeur. D’autre part, elle laisse sous-entendre que l’assujettissement des Québécois à l’autorité religieuse, économique et politique de la province appauvrit leur culture et inhibe leur émancipation. Elle invite donc les Québécois « à se faire overaller » (traduction incorrecte de l’expression anglaise « to get an overhaul »), c’est-à-dire d’examiner et de résoudre leurs problèmes identitaires qui les maintiennent dans la servitude.68 Quoique l’idéologie politique de Mireille puisse paraître marxiste, elle rejette toute étiquette politique qui limiterait sa liberté et son unicité.69 Bref, le discours égalitaire de Mireille rappelle du récit de l’enchantement, puisqu’il tend à renouveler positivement la conception identitaire de la nation québécoise.70 En outre, ce discours est aussi collectiviste, démontrant encore la validité de mon hypothèse concernant l’orientation culturelle des Québécois. Enfin, l’aspect progressif et égalitaire de l’identité politique de ce personnage appuie le lien de causalité entre l’identité, le nationalisme et la social-démocratie au Québec, proposé par Béland et Lecours.71 C’est-à-dire, les nationalistes québécois ont tendance à soutenir des politiques plus égalitaires et progressives que les membres du Reste du Canada, en raison de leur ensemble de valeurs et de leur désir de démontrer que les Québécois forment une société distincte au sein du Canada.72

En somme, le parcours identitaire de Mireille reflète le récit de le l’enchantement de l’être des Québécois, en raison de l’importance qu’elle accorde à l’affranchissement individuel et collectif des Québécois de l’autorité religieuse, linguistique et politique de la province.73 Par ailleurs, elle fait preuve d’une orientation culturelle davantage collectiviste
qu’individualiste, embrassant et représentant les valeurs de la communauté québécoise.74

L’évolution identitaire de Thomas D’Amour

Identité religieuse

Le parcours de l’identité religieuse de Thomas D’Amour appuie ma supposition première que l’attachement de ce personnage à la religion catholique diminuerait au cours du récit, traduisant ainsi une réalité sociale des Québécois pendant la Révolution tranquille.75 À l’opposé de Mireille, la religion occupe une place importante dans la vie de Thomas au début du roman. La foi catholique de Thomas transparaît au travers de ses écrits, particulièrement au travers de son roman intitulé « Zappe » qui comporte six chants à caractère religieux, explorant, entre autres, la relation entre l’être humain et Dieu et la condition de l’âme.76 En voici un extrait : « [c]eux qui se repentiraient auraient le pardon de Dieu, et le jardin délicieux serait distribué comme dragées au baptême ».77 Comme je l’ai signalé plus tôt, l’aspect quasi liturgique du roman de l’auteur, que l’on décèle à la lecture de ce passage, exaspère Mireille, en raison de son opposition à l’influence du clergé catholique dans la province. L’écart entre le degré de religiosité de Mireille et de Thomas contrarie ce dernier. Par exemple, il est gêné d’avouer à son amoureuse que, s’il était condamné à s’isoler sur une île tropicale et qu’il pouvait n’y apporter que deux livres, son premier choix serait « L’Histoire sainte ».78 L’embarras qu’èprouve Thomas lorsque Mireille se moque de sa croyance suite à cette révélation le mène à modifier progressivement son identité religieuse.79 En fin de compte, Thomas semble renoncer à sa foi en la religion catholique, suivant ainsi le trajet identitaire de plusieurs Québécois des années 1960 et 1970.80 L’apparition du sacre dans le vocabulaire de Thomas rend évident son rejet de la religion : « au petit catéchisme, j’ai entrepris une collection d’hosties variées que je gardais dans un vieil album de philatélie, osties toastées osties foquées osties dchin […] »81 Thomas emploie donc un terme du lexique religieux, soit « hostie », et le manie de manière à démontrer qu’il se moque maintenant du sacré.82 Puisque que l’adhérence de Thomas aux préceptes de l’Église compromettait son émancipation sexuelle, j’interprète son parcours identitaire religieux comme un passage du récit de l’empêchement d’être au récit de l’enchantement d’être des Québécois.83

Identité linguistique

L’évolution de l’identité linguistique de Thomas confirme ma
deuxième hypothèse, soit qu’il adopterait progressivement le joual, reflétant ainsi l’importance grandissante de ce parler populaire au Québec pendant la Révolution tranquille. Au début du récit, Thomas emploie le registre soutenu, particulièrement à l’écrit. Voici une phrase comprise dans la première version de son roman : « [il] nous faudra créer [des enfants] de toutes pièces pour prouver que nous avions raison de ne pas céder aux arguments mille des archanges qui rêvaient de nous voir à jamais soumis ». Le style lyrique et recherché du langage de d’auteur le rend artificiel, voire ridicule. De plus, ce langage manque d’éclat et d’originalité comparativement à celui de Mireille.

Par ailleurs, Thomas est déchiré entre son désir de se conformer aux normes linguistiques et culturelles de la France, qu’il conçoit comme étant « supérieures » à celles du Québec, et celui de s’intégrer à la société québécoise. Ce déchirement est apparent dans l’extrait suivant : « il n’y a, au loin, […] que la littérature française, toute nue, qui l’attend. Il la regarde longuement, il la désire, mais aussi il regarde son jardin québécois, sourit ». Au début du récit, l’écrivain semble davantage attiré par la littérature et la culture européennes, auxquelles il fait référence dans ses œuvres. Son discours inspiré d’une culture et d’une pureté étrangères à sa province d’origine suscite la colère de sa secrétaire : « Sacrament de calvaire, que t’es fendant avec ta culture le grand ! […] T’as attrapé un coup d’Europe à l’université ? C’est un maudit torticolis ça. Mais vas-tu te promener toute ta crisse de vie le corps dans un sens, la tête dans l’autre ? » Mireille interprète l’ambivalence identitaire de Thomas comme une source d’anxiété et de détresse qui l’empêche de s’épanouir en tant qu’individu et membre de la collectivité québécoise. Par conséquent, elle l’amènera peu à peu à délaisser son langage littéraire et sublime, afin d’adopter le parler et les valeurs du peuple québécois. La citation suivante laisse deviner l’influence qu’exerce Mireille sur son amoureux : « la cogestion, la participation, la démocratie, le comité des secrétaires citoyennes, c’était pas la peine de faire son cours classique, pense Thomas D’Amour, Ostie que jme suis fait chier pour rien ! » Thomas est abasourdi par la force de caractère et l’idéologie égalitariste de Mireille, qu’il considérait comme une simple secrétaire. Il devient aussi conscient de la futilité de son éducation formelle ; alors, il utilise le joual pour exprimer son indignation. Le nouveau mode d’expression de ce personnage incorpore non seulement des anglicismes et des sacres, mais aussi des jeux de mots, comme le démontre ce dialogue entre Thomas et Mireille:
« Comment tu veux que je pense, si t’arrêtes pas de parler ?
Mireille la Merveille !
- Heille, l’Auteur, chutu da Muse ?
- M’amuse, oui, m’amuse bien gros. »

Grâce à « muse », l’auteur parvient à manipuler les mots et les sonorités pour leur donner un sens nouveau et humoristique. Il réalise ainsi « qu’écrire, c’est aimer. C’est aimer un langage [...] ». La découverte de Thomas du bonheur d’écrire et de jouer avec les mots contribue à son épanouissement personnel. Ce personnage comprend finalement que ses problèmes identitaires liés à la langue française provenaient de son assimilation du puritanisme propre au milieu universitaire. Il dénonce entre autres « l’impérialisme de la langue française dont la force centrifuge casse les particularismes », rappelant le refus de l’Académie française de reconnaître la juste valeur du joual québécois. Par conséquent, Thomas rejette la rigidité linguistique, célébrant à l’inverse la « liberté de langage ». Spécifiquement, il revendique comme Mireille, le droit collectif des Québécois de parler le joual. Ce personnage adopte donc une orientation culturelle collectiviste, plutôt qu’individualiste, confirmant ainsi l’une de mes hypothèses de recherche. En outre, son identité linguistique devient plus saine et stable à la fin du roman, reflétant ainsi le récit de l’enchantement d’être des Québécois.

Par contre, bien que Thomas loue la liberté linguistique, il s’oppose au bilinguisme, particulièrement à la littérature bilingue. Ce personnage prétend que la langue perd sa valeur intrinsèque dans un univers bilingue, assumant plutôt une valeur purement utilitaire. Cette vision utilitaire du langage évoque celle de Trudeau, qui a implanté une politique de bilinguisme officiel au Canada afin d’assurer le droit de chaque individu de communiquer avec les institutions fédérales dans la langue de son choix. Selon Taylor, cette politique n’affirme pas le fait que la langue française forme la base de l’identité et du nationalisme des Québécois. Puisque Thomas semble nier le droit des Québécois de parler l’anglais et stigmatiser l’usage du registre soutenu, l’étendue de la liberté linguistique qu’il prône est suspecte.

**Identité politique**

Les résultats de mon analyse de l’identité politique de Thomas D’Amour appuient mes trois hypothèses quant à l’orientation culturelle,
l’idéologie politique et l’image globale de la société québécoise qui sont véhiculés par *D’Amour, P.Q.*. En premier lieu, quoique ce personnage se préoccupe peu de l’état de la collectivité québécoise, il devient de plus en plus collectiviste à mesure que le récit progresse. Spécifiquement, Thomas assume son ambivalence identitaire, qui était initialement présentée comme une forme d’anxiété et dépression, de manière positive à la fin du roman, rappelant de la sorte le récit de l’enchantement de l’être des Québécois. L’épigraphie de l’épilogue révèle de manière évidente le collectivisme de Thomas : « en réalité, je me parle à Toulmonde ». Cette citation établit l’équivalence entre les mots « me » et « Toulmonde », indiquant que ce personnage emprunte l’identité de la société québécoise. La nouvelle orientation culturelle du personnage apparaît aussi lorsqu’il répond à la question « qui suis-je ? » de la manière suivante : « je suis un bouquet de carottes […], je suis un cri, je suis un prix, je suis un échange […] ». Selon Seyfrid, la démultiplication de l’identité de Thomas nie son unité et son caractère individuel. Cela démontre que la perte de l’individualité est l’un des dangers de la conception positive de la liberté qui est liée au collectivisme.

En deuxième lieu, le discours de Thomas D’Amour dans la dernière partie de *D’Amour, P.Q.* évoque le récit de l’enchantement de l’être des Québécois. Pendant cet « Act », Mireille compose la version finale du roman de Thomas, dans lequel ce dernier devient Tarzan, « fils de Lord Durham et de Jeanne Mance ». L’identité de Thomas devient donc enracinée dans sa province d’origine: « c’est ici que je m’arrête, j’ai fini de bomber, de camper, de jumper, de faire le zouave. Le Kebek, moi je trouve ça le fonne ». Ce personnage célèbre sa québécitude et son ambivalence identitaire issue de son héritage bilingue. Alors, il reflète le récit de l’enchantement d’être des Québécois, selon lequel ces derniers perçoivent leurs identités multiples et parfois contradictoires de manière positive. La pertinence de ce récit pour comprendre l’identité politique de Thomas transparaît au travers du dialogue suivant entre Tarzan/Thomas et Mireille :

« Tout un petit peuple qui tape sur un ballon, parce qu’il a décidé de jouer, d’exister, de gagner […] ; nous, on fait partie de ce petit peuple qui a décidé d’habiter ce pays, d’aimer la neige […] le petit peuple que l’Histoire, […], celle qu’on nous enseignait à l’école, avait complètement oublié […] »
- Tarzan, […] , [l]es enfants se sont mis à chanter : RÉ-VO-LU-TION-RÉVOLUTION.
- Le nôtre chantera pareil, et puis il ira à l’université, et quand il nous demandera : pourquoi est-ce que vous m’avez enfanté ? On lui répondra, d’abord par amour et ensuite pour nous aider à faire cet ostie de Pays. »\(^{112}\) (Godbout, \textit{D’Amour, P.Q.}, 126-127)

En dépeignant les Québécois comme « un petit peuple » qui « a décidé de jouer, d’exister, de gagner », Thomas traduit le dynamisme du discours des nationalistes Québécois, ainsi que leur enthousiasme par rapport au progrès et à la modernisation de leur province pendant la Révolution tranquille.\(^{113}\) Bien que le message politique de ce personnage soit un appel à la modernité, il comporte aussi des références au passé. Les allusions au « petit peuple » que forment les Québécois et à leur amour pour la neige, notamment, rappellent l’idéologie de la survivance sur laquelle est fondée la théorie de la résistance.\(^{114}\) À première vue, l’intégration de ce lexique stéréotypé et obsolète au discours révolutionnaire du duo Thomas/Mireille semble étrange. Par contre, Dion explique que le nationalisme québécois est « à la fois nostalgique et moderniste ». C’est-à-dire, les nationalistes québécois ont tendance à recourir aux mythes fondateurs de la province, afin de prouver le caractère distinct de leur province, malgré la convergence culturelle qui s’est produite au Canada entre les années 1960 et 1970.\(^{115}\) Par contre, ce nationalisme est aussi moderne, puisqu’il tend à obtenir plus de pouvoirs pour le Québec, dans le but d’adopter des politiques plus progressives et égalitaires.\(^{116}\)

Somme toute, le trajet identitaire de Thomas D’Amour est plus complexe que celui de Mireille, à cause de son adoption d’identités multiples et polymorphes au fil du roman.\(^{117}\) Au début du récit, l’émancipation de Thomas est entravée par son dévouement à la religion catholique, son emploi d’une langue soutenue et son éloignement de la collectivité québécoise.\(^{118}\) Par contre, il se libère progressivement de ses contraintes et adopte finalement une identité religieuse, linguistique et politique qui reflète celle de la majorité des Québécois lors de la Révolution tranquille.\(^{119}\) L’évolution identitaire de Thomas se distingue donc par son passage de l’histoire de l’empêchement à celle de l’enchantement d’être des Québécois, ainsi que l’individualisme au collectivisme.
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Pure Haine?
Reading *Barney’s Version* in Montréal, Québec

Cameron McKeich
As Martine-Emmanuelle Lapointe has stated, “depuis la parution en 1992 du pamphlet Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country, un parfum de scandale entoure l’oeuvre de Mordecai Richler”. Adds Yan Hamel: “Mordecai Richler est devenu, aux yeux de plusieurs francophones du Québec, l’incarnation de l’anglophone unilingue borné, irrespectueux et anti-québécois.” Richler’s polemical non-fiction has made him a controversial, oft-maligned figure during his five-decade career throughout Canada, but especially in Quebec. Indeed, the result of this hypervisibility is that his name is rarely absent from any discussion of English writing in Quebec in both academic and popular circles. How then do Richler’s fictional (usually satirical) works relate to the contested category of Anglo-Quebec literature? Reception of Richler’s 1997 novel, Barney’s Version (translated into French in 1999 as Le monde de Barney) by francophone critics and journalists offers important insights into the processes by which an author described by Francine Bordeleau as “l’un des plus farouches adversaires du Québec” can nevertheless enrich an understanding of Anglo-Quebec literature’s engagements with both Quebec society at large as well as the corpus of “la littérature québécoise”.

Barney’s Version accords with Lianne Moyes’ model of Anglo-Quebec literature as premised upon a Deleuzoguattarian conception of “minority writing” and its productive particularities. The marginal status of minority writing tends to bestow upon it a status of being always-already a political act. This is congruent with the impossibility of separating Richler-the-essayist from Richler-the-novelist: what Simon Harel has called Quebec literature’s “obsession with identity” means the author’s ethnic, linguistic and class identity tends to colour interpretation of the works themselves. Evaluated on the basis of Nicole Brossard’s criteria that Anglo-Quebec literature must make itself of interest to a francophone Quebec readership in order to profit from its marginal cultural location, Barney’s Version has been wildly successful, largely due to interest generated by Richler’s polarizing “extratextual” media personality.

Finally and most importantly, Harel’s theory of conflicted loyalties enables us to move beyond the impasse of “rehabilitating” Richler, conceptually separating his non-fiction from his novels, or critiquing his figurations of Quebec and the québécois as positive or negative, truthful or stereotypical. Instead, the foregrounding of conflicted loyalties in literature allows for an understanding of how Anglo-Quebec texts like Barney’s Version can perturb the stories a society tells about itself.
Richler’s oppositional stance toward Quebec nationalism from within its borders forces a recognition of the social and political heterogeneity which is often absent from prevailing narratives. Harel’s claim that conflict is healthy allows us to read *Barney’s Version* and Richler not as stumbling blocks, nor as regrettable breaks from the norms of polite dialogue, but instead as useful and necessary interventions into Quebec literary history.

Rather than distancing itself from Richler for the sake of incorporation into the Quebec canon and greater acceptability amongst francophones, Anglo-Quebec literature ought to embrace Richler and his works’ own subversive potential as fiction-from-the-margins, in order to challenge dominant constructions of literary and socio-political identity in Quebec. As a Montreal novel, *Barney’s Version* shares with many works of Anglo-Quebec fiction the portrayal of “d’autres espaces culturels métropolitains, autrefois ignorés, dont la proximité est fort troublante […] La ville est à la fois une aire de jeu et la scénographie de conflits de langues et de cultures.” This foregrounding of proximity and difference provides necessary contextualization of the lived experiences of francophones and anglophones in Montreal.

**Anglo-Quebec in Transition**

Born in Montreal in 1931 and old enough to remember the ‘golden years’ of the 1940s, 50s and 60s, in which Montreal writers dominated the English Canadian canon (his first novel having been published in 1955), Richler occupies a complicated position within an Anglo-Quebec milieu described as being in a transitional and uncomfortable state. His anti-sovereignist position places him at odds with an emerging consensus about contemporary Anglo-Quebec writers, many of whom migrated from elsewhere, which suggests that many of them accept their minority status, are not threatened by it, and do not mourn their new cultural and political position, described as “muted, made invisible, [and] marginalized.” In fact, this group of writers tends to share an openness to francophone aspirations and a greater affinity with Quebec, or with Montreal, than with the rest of Canada. While Leith suggests Richler is distinct from the newer generation in that he was one of the last English writers from the not-yet-marginal Anglo-Quebec to achieve prominence throughout Canada and internationally, his final work, *Barney’s Version*, does fit within Leith’s paradigm of Anglo-Quebec literature in that it “shows an interest in relations between francophones and non-francophones” distinct from
works written elsewhere in Canada.\(^7\)

“À la revendication récente d’un Montréal francophone… une cité des conflits et de démesures à échelle humaine, un univers minoritaire où le fait de vivre en français n’exclut pas, bien au contraire, l’expression d’autres langues. Dans ce contexte, ‘l’anglo nouveau’ a droit de cité. Il incarne une acceptation tranquille (comme la Révolution du même nom) de la complexité de nos alliances et héritages, À la lutte à finir entre l’Anglais et le Français, … il faudrait substituer les romans de Gail Scott, de Robert Majzels, la reconnaissance de l’oeuvre de Mordecai Richler par ceux qui furent autrefois ses plus violents adversaires.”\(^8\)

The arena of literature may therefore be one in which the changing position of anglophones in Quebec is debated, re-worked and re-presented to a plurilingual public. Anglo-Quebec literary works occupy a privileged position in this interventionist discourse.

**Minority Becoming, Minority Writing**

One of the most influential accounts of Anglo-Quebec writing and its specificity was adapted from the concepts of “devenir minoritaire” and “déterritorialisation” posited by the post-structuralist theorists Deleuze and Guattari. Devenir minoritaire “ne désigne pas simplement un processus de devenir une minorité, de se reconnaître en tant que minorité (souvent comprise un groupe marginalisé), mais aussi un processus de rencontre et d’interférence productive entre groupes, un processus qui transforme la notion d’une minorité en lui reconnaissant une force culturelle potentiellement innovatrice.”\(^9\) As a result of being accepted as “ni canadienne, ni québécoise, l’écriture de langue anglaise au Québec est déterritorialisée: elle est produite au Québec dans la langue du Canada anglais.”\(^10\) Furthermore, “une des contradictions de la communauté (littéraire) de langue anglaise au Québec est que malgré le fait qu’elle se concevait comme une minorité pendant la fin des années 70 et les années 80, elle persiste à pratiquer l’anglais en tant que langue de la majorité, et dans certains cas, à utiliser la fiction pour se reconstituer en tant que majorité.”\(^11\) Herein lies the key to understanding how the generational divide alluded to by Leith plays out on the textual level and as to whether
Anglo-Quebec texts may be interpreted as threatening to or deferent to the French language and québécois self-determination, or if they exist in a more complicated web of relationality.

Moyes gives credence to the heterogeneity of Anglo-Quebec writing, noting that acceptance of marginality is not universal amongst Anglophone writers living and working in Quebec. She suggests that using language as a strategy to resist marginality and attack the power of an ascendant majority may be the source of some québécois critics’ reluctance to acknowledge Anglo-Quebec literature, especially that of Richler and the earlier generation:

“Bien qu’elle soit produite dans les années suivant la Révolution tranquille, à un moment où les Anglophones commencent à parler d’eux-mêmes en tant que minorité, la représentation de Montréal de Richler est […] interchangeable avec celle de MacLennan produite des les années 40-50 […] Dans le Montréal de Richler, il n’y a pas assez de changements.”

Lapointe’s reading of Barney’s Version agrees to the terms of Moyes’ analysis and places it within the category of an expression of refusal of minoritarian becoming:

“Tout se passe comme si Barney Panofsky se trouvait exilé dans son propre lieu, étranger au sort d’une collectivité à laquelle il ne peut plus appartenir. La ville, qui étalait autrefois des repères et des signes facilement reconnaissables, a endossé une nouvelle identité; pire, le Montréal contemporain de Barney’s Version se présente sous la forme d’un lieu ruiné où les anciens monuments ne sont plus que les spectres d’eux-mêmes.”

Barney’s melancholic attitude and reluctance to accept the transformed status of anglo-Montreal or the subject position of “un anglo nouveau” is epitomized by assertions like the following: “Soon the only English-speaking people left in Montreal will be the old, the infirm, and the poor,” implying that all those capable of leaving will undoubtedly do so. Barney describes his apartment building as a “fortress for besieged Anglophone septuagenarians who tiptoe about in fear of our separatist provincial premier” in the midst of a community gripped by “panic” and a city that
“like me, is diminishing day by day.”

Characters who do correspond to the ‘new anglo’ archetype are dismissed as sentimental liberals whose political correctness blinds them to the reality of the conflict unfolding. Nevertheless, a certain degree of heterogeneity is attributed to the anglophone community, especially its younger, more bilingual members.

**Addressing a Francophone Public**

Acceptance of Anglo-Quebec writing as a coherent category is far from unanimous. In his refutation of the existence of la littérature anglo-québécoise, renowned critic Gilles Marcotte makes frequent reference to the supposed incommensurability of Richler’s works with the Quebec canon: “Le roman à la Richler… n’a aucun droit de cite dans la littérature québécoise, la vraie littérature québécoise… celle qui s’écrit en français.”

Compared to francophone novels set in Montreal, “le Montréal de Hugh MacLennan ou de Mordecai Richler m’inspire évidemment des sentiments plus troublés: j’y rencontre rarement des signes de ma culture – ou de la culture qu’on ma présentée comme mienne, exclusivement -, et quand j’en trouve, ils désignent cette culture comme secondaire, périphérique.” The incongruities, conflicting portrayals and sense of strangeness which can be found in Anglo-Quebec novels therefore reflect and refract the unsettled political questions of Quebec society.

Nicole Brossard’s reflections upon the question of “Comment un littérature minoritaire arrive-t-elle à occuper un espace culturel autre que celui qui serait normalement le sien?” are instructive in explaining what makes Richler’s works particularly compelling examples with which to analyze the position of Anglo-Quebec writing. Her answer to this question is that a minor corpus can be distinguished by the quality of its works and “par la pertinence ou la provocation de ses courants littéraires.” She goes on to argue that “La littérature minoritaire déborde de l’espace minoritaire uniquement dans la mesure où la majorité veut bien s’y intéresser, sent le besoin de s’y intéresser. Or le majoritaire ne s’intéresse à l’autre que dans le mesure ou il se sent concerné et interpellé.” Robert Schwartzwald notes that while the *Histoire de la literatuer quebéciose*, a new encyclopedia, devotes “serious critical attention” to anglophone writers including Richler, “the role of English writers is assessed precisely in the terms Brossard foresaw: their interest, and relevance to the francophone majority.” The authors frame their goal thusly: “Nous avons tenté de rendre compte des œuvres de langue anglaise qui, par leur circulation
grâce aux traductions et par leur retentissement critique, se sont avérées les plus significatives du point de vue des lecteurs francophones. Although Brossard might have hoped the interpellation of French-Canadian readers was less confrontational than the form it takes in *Barney’s Version*, we can nevertheless trace a lineage of (media-facilitated) francophone interest in the novel, both in its original English, and in translation two years later. The novel serves as an accessible and visible manifestation of Anglo-Quebec writing for a mainstream francophone audience.

**Is Anglo-Quebec Literature “Post-Richler”?**

David McGimpsey criticizes the recurring trope in designations of contemporary Anglo-Quebec writers as the antithesis of Richler: “The new generation is allegedly ‘beyond’ Richler, but somehow, some way, Richler is the first item on the menu. The English writer in contemporary Montreal can either follow in his footsteps or be noted for how he or she is ‘miles away’ from his ‘extreme’ views.” He mocks Sherry Simon’s invocation to readers of *Le Devoir* to ‘re-educate’ themselves about the diversity of contemporary Anglo-Quebec writing in addition to Richler. Simon’s comments suggest a ‘reading’ of Richler as a spectre haunting Anglo-Quebec literature whose offensive remarks and tainted persona must be expunged (or rehabilitated) if francophones are to be convinced of the validity of Anglo-Quebec writing. Does Moyes’ conception of devenir minoritaire suggest that anglophone writers might only achieve acceptance on the condition that they write from an acceptable minoritarian position? Are the ‘new anglos’ the only anglos who can be incorporated into le plan culturel?

For McGimpsey, Richler is not an embarassment, but instead one of the few Anglo-Quebec writers who has written anything of interest to francophones. Setting aside Brossard’s preference for experimental works, Richler may be one of the few anglophone writers who comes remotely close to satisfying her criteria in terms of cultural relevance and impact. By taking up Harel’s injunction to adopt conceptions of cultural space as characterized by conflict and abandoning the valorization of harmonious dialogue, Richler is no longer the skeleton in Anglo-Quebec literature’s proverbial closet, but one of its greatest assets. Under this rubric, Richler’s controversial non-fictional writings and his personification of negative affect and anglo resentment in the character of Barney are re-valorized in terms of their shattering of the idealized and artificial assertion of
(linguistic) peace in 1990’s Montreal.

**Nuancing Richler, Thematizing Montreal**

Yan Hamel was one of the first francophone literary critics to contend with what Richler’s works mean to Quebec. Hamel sees *Barney’s Version* as a legitimate object of inquiry for someone interested in la littérature québécoise: “Si nous acceptons de reconnaître que le mode d’être de la conscience québécoise se réalise vraiment sur le plan de l’ouverture et de l’éclatement, il sera alors pour nous difficile – voire impossible – de restreindre légitimement la littérature issue de cette conscience aux seules œuvres de langue française.”

Hamel’s close-reading enables him to come to different conclusions about the contact between Richler and francophone Québec than those at which other commentators have arrived. He suggests generously that “à la différence de ce que l’on retrouve dans ses essais, Richler s’en prend ici aux réticences et au manque d’ouverture de ceux qui appartiennent à sa propre communauté vis-à-vis des francophones.”

The elephants in the room which continue to animate many discussions of Richler in the francophone media are his 1991 *New Yorker* article “Inside/Outside” and 1992 book *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*, which were vociferously critical of what he perceived to be the excesses of Quebec nationalism. Writing for *La Presse*, Chantal Guy struggles to reconcile her distaste for Richler’s politics and, in a repudiation of Marcotte’s assertion of a radical strangeness in Richler’s works, the intense connection she feels with his work as une montréalaise:

> “De l’homme, je ne connaissais que le mal dont on en pensait… Par professionnalisme, je me suis procuré son dernier roman, *Le monde de Barney*… Comment avais-je pu ignorer une telle oeuvre née dans l’esprit d’un Montréalais qui avait habité à quelques rues de chez moi?”

Guy adds in another column that “même si, dans son oeuvre, les Canadiens français font figure de personnages secondaires, ce n’est pas une raison pour bouder le plaisir [parfois coupable] de lire Richler.” Francine Bordeleau likewise finds it difficult to stomach Richler’s “absence totale de nuances, son incompréhension de la situation québécoise,” but nevertheless claims him as “l’un de nos plus grands écrivains.” By adding a nuanced interpretation of Richler to the body of reportage characterized by the
polarities of outrage and admiration, Hamel hopes to re-evaluate his place in the Quebec literary milieu. He notes that traditionally:

“Les critiques opposent artificiellement ces deux facettes de l’homme, ce qui leur permet de rendre hommage au romancier sans pour autant cesser de vilipender l’essayiste. Ils font de la sorte l’économie d’une analyse approfondie des textes de fiction qui les amènerait à mieux saisir la complexité du rapport que l’écrivain entretient par l’écriture et l’imaginaire à l’endroit de l’identité québécoise francophone, mais qui risquerait de miner la position qu’ils adoptent d’emblée envers Richler.”

Harel also takes exception to the aforementioned separation of Richler’s political views and his fiction, arguing that it is no accident Richler’s works are among the most popular and discussed examples of Anglo-Quebec writing – they challenge orthodoxies and force Quebec to confront its well-worn and comforting stories about the colonial past:

“Ainsi, le laboratoire de ‘la’ culture québécoise serait une zone de tensions, le milieu propice à l’émergence d’aspérités qui peuvent faire l’objet de ‘médiations’ fictionnelles. Nous avons sans doute octroyé un rôle excessif à la question des identités dans le domaine des lettres québécoises. La quête d’un dénominateur commun qui assure la pérennité de la littérature québécoise semble chose du passé. Ce n’est pas un hasard si l’œuvre de Mordecai Richler est relue avec surprise et incrédulité. Tout se passe en effet comme si le discours critique acceptait de dissocier le point de vue editorial de l’écrivain (bien évidemment discutable) d’une somme littéraire éblouissante.”

Harel is not simply suggesting that Richler is brave to voice opposing views, but that this is at its core, a normal and healthy process in any culture.

Hamel argues that the overwhelmingly positive portrayal of Solange and Chantal in *Barney’s Version* situates them as the only characters capable of passing moral judgment on Barney: “accusé d’être anti-québécois, Richler diffuse pourtant, par l’entremise de ses
Romans, une image de la Québécoise qui met en relief les culpabilités, les manquements et les ambivalences de ses héros.”

Importantly, Solange’s voting intentions before the 1995 referendum facilitate the presence of a conflicting viewpoint to Barney’s, one that is, significantly, québécoise and nationalist: “I’m seriously thinking of voting Yes this time. There are some in the PQ who are really racist, which is abhorrent to me, but for more than a hundred years this country [Canada] has exhausted itself, and been held back trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. Of course it’s risky, but why shouldn’t we have our own country?”

Barney’s immature response demonstrates an unwillingness or incapacity to engage substantively with opposing political opinions, a stance which reveals his ideological blindspot when it comes to francophone Quebec. However, even this brief opening of the narrative onto explicitly political questions remains framed by Richler’s narrative authority and opinions, i.e. the nod to the alleged racism of the PQ, which led reviewer John Updike to frame the novel as a “lament for a multicultural Montreal now torn and depressed by Québécois separatism,” a response common in other American reviews.

It would be wrong to force literature into the didactic stance of educating francophone and anglophone readers about each other’s clichéd political stances. Barney’s framing of sovereignty in emotional terms, which at first appears to be a weakness, is actually the method by which anglophone and francophone readers alike might apprehend how Barney’s affective investments in Montreal have formed his ways of knowing the world. Whether we identify with Barney or utterly reject his opinions, Richler nevertheless poses the question of a seemingly intractable conflict to be worked through, which Harel argues ought to be addressed in Quebec literature.

Martine-Emmanuelle Lapointe attempts to demonstrate the shared themes in both, namely an attention to place and a nostalgic view of the Montreal cityscape. Lapointe’s reassessment permits a reading of works like Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! and Barney’s Version as mutually informed by many of the same motifs and experiences of place, thus discardling notions of two radically opposed tendencies in Richler’s work. More important is the “relation singulière qui s’établit entre l’auteur et son lieu d’écriture.” Lapointe elaborates that

“Paradoxal et ambigu, le rapport au lieu natal constitue, me semble-t-il, le noeud et le point aveugle de l’argumentation de
l’auteur. Comment concilier l’amertume qu’il nourrit contre la communauté francophone et cet amour pour Montréal dont il se réclame toujours…? Comment, en outre, ne pas voir se dessiner dans les fréquentes évocations du Montréal dynamique des années 1950 une forme de nostalgie du pays perdu ?”

This avoids depoliticizing Richler’s novels by positing them against and apart from his deliberately provocative essays. The novels, in Lapointe’s formulation of a continuum, retain ideological elements equally capable of provoking strong reactions. As Harel argues, Quebec writers “ne sont pas des négociateurs de bonne entente et de tolérance réciproque. Ce sont des écrivains. La loyauté conflictuelle traduit à mon sens ce qu’est la littérature […] L’écrivain fait ici office de profanateur. Il déterre les secrets de famille, les refoulés de l’histoire individuelle et collective.”

*Barney’s Version*, by insinuating that Barney and Richler share some of the same opinions, and by self-consciously foregrounding the act of narration, engages in this process of disturbing individual and collective histories and insists that doing so is an indispensable task in making sense of cultural history.

Lapointe’s designation of Richler’s non-fiction as haunted by a Montreal which no longer exists could apply equally well to *Barney’s Version*:

“Habitée par le fantasme de la cohabitation pacifique et des échanges culturels fructueux, cette représentation quasi euphorique du lieu d’origine emprunte une forme spectrale, devient l’arrière-plan nécessaire à l’élaboration de l’argumentaire de l’auteur. À ce Montréal disparu se superpose en effet l’image de la métropole déchue où les perspectives économiques seraient moins advantageuses et où les lois linguistiques et les politiques de sauvegarde du français feraient fuir les non-francophones et les nouveaux arrivants.”

Francophone readers remain free to disagree with Barney’s diagnosis of Montreal’s social, political and economic ills in the 1990s, but they are nevertheless confronted with a humanized portrayal of (if not an adequate excuse for) the sense of mourning and denial felt by many anglo-Montrealers of Richler’s generation. In fact, Lapointe’s comments make a
strong argument for reading *Barney’s Version* as a fictionalized final draft of observations begun in Richler’s essays of the early 1990s, and therefore as a text which retains both its resolutely oppositional stance and the same political and affective blind spots. Lapointe concludes by noting:

> “Ce détour par la fiction permet de relativiser le point de vue de Richler face à la communauté québécoise francophone. La nostalgie du pays, de la ville et du quartier perdus, l’angoisse de la disparition et l’amertume de celui qui ne retrouve plus ses repères jadis familiers ne sont pas uniquement nourries par le mépris, mais renvoient aussi à un sentiment d’étrangeté, à une forme d’exil non consenti en son lieu propre… *Aussi radical soit-il, le point de vue de Richler ne fait pas figure d’exception.*”

### Conflicted Loyalties

Simon Harel argues that anglophone writing in Quebec, in its disruption of “la ‘consensualité’ des relations interculturelles,” allows for a revitalized understanding of Quebec literature “sous l’angle de relations conflictuelles entre communautés.” Marking a shift away from Marcotte’s discourse, Harel muses: “Mesurons en effet le paradoxe. C’est ‘au nom’ de la littérature québécoise qu’on lit aujourd’hui les œuvres d’une Scott et d’un Richler […] S’il importe de comprendre ce que ‘nous’ sommes, de faire appel au passé pour mieux expliciter les relations tendues avec un ‘voisinage’ anglophone, la reconnaissance récente des lettres anglo-québécoises est un profond signe de changement.” Despite the radically divergent aesthetic and political projects of Gail Scott and Richler, for better or for worse, they share a degree of visibility in the francophone community as representatives of Anglo-Quebec writing.

‘Confrontational’ writing cannot be seen as an insurmountable obstacle separating anglophone writers from the Quebec literary establishment and society at-large. As Harel insists, “le motif vieillot des deux solitudes (forme d’ignorance mutuellement consentie) laisserait place à une conflictualité créatrice de nouveaux imaginaires.” However constrained the possibilities for dialogue may be between Barney and representatives of francophone society, the work itself has provoked contradictory yet fertile reactions from a francophone readership as it circulates in translation and as a result of interest sparked by the negative
effects of Richler’s abrasive journalistic interventions.

Harel’s critique opens a new avenue of criticism on Anglo-Quebec writing. In addition to investigating how language is used, and how the vibrancy or lack of intercultural dialogue and conflict is portrayed, “[la littérature anglo-québécoise] représente une conflictualité en acte qui perturbe l’assise normative de la littérature québécoise. L’adversité est à l’oeuvre tant elle traduit une énonciation littéraire qui recourt à la langue de l’ancien colonisateur!” Harel speaks of the critical “rehabilitation” (using the term ironically) of formerly “distant” Anglo-Quebec literature as a difficult and problematic process for Quebec literature because of the scrutiny to which it must subject itself and its favourite identitarian constructions:

“La lecture des lettres anglo-québécoises ne peut correspondre à un jugement d’opinion, à une appréciation morale, à une décision politique. Il nous faut procéder autrement: la conflictualité peut ainsi s’avérer un concept d’une grande utilité tant elle permet de renoncer aux idéaux de cohérence, d’uniformité.”

Harel’s theory of conflicted loyalties can thus enrich extant interpretations of *Barney’s Version* as a novel which forcefully punctures consensus by articulating claims to an Anglophone and Jewish history based on shared ownership of the urban territory of Montreal.

**Conclusion**

A synthesis of approaches to Anglo-Quebec literature allows us to read Mordecai Richler’s novel *Barney’s Version* from the perspective that conflict can be healthy, rather than engendering an uncomplicated dismissal, recuperation, or rehabilitation. As an ensemble, Leith’s concept of marginality and Moyes’ reworking of devenir minoritaire productively illustrate the differences between the position of Richler’s oeuvre towards minoritization and the attitudes of a newer generation of Anglo-Quebec writers who possess a wholly different relationship to minority status and language use. These theories nevertheless provide a compelling case for situating *Barney’s Version* as a work deeply informed by the political and linguistic specificities of being an anglophone writing in Quebec and attempting to occupy cultural space in Montreal, rather than repatriating it
towards the English Canadian canon and erasing its québecité.

Harel’s formulation of conflicting loyalties turns what were seen as liabilities – the work’s aggressively confrontational political stances – into assets which perturb monolithic definitions of which works (and whose works) can constitute la littérature québécoise, and force a definitional rethinking of the Quebec literary establishment’s inadequate account of pluralistic contemporary identity formations. Finally, instead of attempting to separate Richler’s controversial political speech from his fictional output, understanding both of these as expressions of negative affect which could compel a francophone Québec public to recognize and engage with a work from the emerging Anglo-Quebec canon suggests greater possibilities for what this newly visible literature can perform and signify in Quebec society. *Barney’s Version* is therefore not radically opposed to Anglo-Quebec writing, nor should it pose a barrier to its increasing institutional legitimacy. It is instead constitutive of the very possibilities of an incipient Anglo-Quebec literature to bring conflict to the fore, espouse difference, and propose alternate histories of Quebec’s lived social realities.
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Globalization, Ethnicity, and Politics of Identity
Quebec’s Resistance to Cultural Homogenization

Vincent Di Sciullo
Can local politics effectively oppose the cultural influences of globalization? Due to the vast power discrepancies between local governments and supranational institutions, it is often held that the actions of local politics cannot determine how the dynamics of globalization will influence society. Consequently, it is perceived that the “forces of globalization” hold direct consequences on a nation’s cultural identity. It will be argued that emphasis on the effects of globalization on culture may not be warranted; on the contrary, the case of Quebec provides evidence that local politics can effectively resist the cultural influences of globalization.

There is a tension concerning language use between the processes of globalization and local politics. This is attributed to the dominance of the English language within the international economic system, and the importance of English in conducting international affairs. In this sense, it is proposed that language laws in Quebec effectively oppose the increasing level of anglicization in the targeted segments of society. Furthermore, it is suggested that more emphasis should be placed on the analysis of politicians adopting anti-globalizationist discourses to accede to power, rather than on the direct influence of globalization on culture. If constituents demonstrate an opposition to globalization, then politicians have an incentive to engage in politics of identity. Finally, the emergence of the new economy has constrained politicians in Quebec to adapt their language policy orientation. A focus on neoliberalism in the world market since the late 1980s has made the political discourse of Quebec’s language policies diverge from protection rights towards economic development.

Scholarly literature on globalization is inundated with diverse applications and analyses. At its most basic level, one may refer to globalization simply as “a set of processes having many facets.” However, this definition does not emphasize the particular processes of interest within the concept of globalization; it leaves the framework of globalization too open ended to draw conclusions. Therefore, for the purpose of this paper, the notion of globalization is grounded in the processes of rapid technological and economic change, which results in increasing communication and integration amongst societies. In turn, these processes have a protracted effect on cultural identity, which may result in political backlash or restructuring.
English and the Post-WWII Economic Order

Politics of identity deriving from the processes of globalization are often couched in linguistic divisions. In a great number of cases this is attributable to the dominance of the English language in international relations after the Second World War. Robert W. Cox in “Global Restructuring: Making Sense of the Changing International Political Economy” provides an understanding of the historical process that established English as the international mode of communication.

As highlighted by Cox, the beginning of America’s contemporary global economic dominance is linked to the establishment of the Bretton Woods system. The Bretton Woods agreement was the initial model for creating economic linkages between cosigning states, whilst contributing to the spread of American hegemony. As noted by Cox, “the Bretton Woods system attempted to strike a balance between a liberal world market and domestic responsibilities of states.” States seeking to participate in the American-led economic system would be required to alter their domestic institutions in order to be compatible to those of the United States. It is important to note that the Bretton Woods system is a marker for the contemporary prominence of the English language in international affairs.

The creation of an international economic system resulted in the legitimization of international institutions to preside over the various functions of the agreement. In this sense, states that had signed the Bretton Woods accord lost a significant amount of their power as autonomous sovereign entities; their economic welfare became tied to the proper functioning of the international economic system. As the international system evolved, additional institutions were created, and the power of the system over its participants increased accordingly. Cox explains that “States became accountable to agencies of an international economic order—the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—in regard to trade liberalization and exchange-rate stability and convertibility.”

The post-war order established by the United States was effective in managing and promoting the economic growth of its participants during the 50s and early 60s. This is attributable, in large part, to the role that war and arms production occupied in the global economy during this period. However, as noted by Cox, a crisis emerged in 1968-1975, which revealed the reality of the top-down management of the global order by the United States:
“During this period, the balanced compromise of Bretton Woods shifted towards subordination of domestic economies to the perceived exigencies of a global economy. States willy-nilly became more effectively accountable to a nébuleuse personified as the global economy; and they were constrained to mystify this external accountability in the eyes and ears of their own publics through the new vocabulary of globalization, interdependence, and competitiveness.”

**Ethnicity, globalization, and local politics**

Examining the establishment of the international economic order allows one to understand the importance of supranational institutions in relation to the domestic sphere of states. International economic institutions hold a vertical power relationship with governments, which implies that they are not accountable to any electoral body. In this sense, it is possible to say that the development of the international economic system has induced increasing levels of influence upon the population of states through economic regulation. Selma K. Sonntag, in *The Local Politics of Global English*, examines the influence of English on the populations of the United States, France, India, South Africa, and Nepal. Sonntag believes that the relationship between language and global politics is an essential dynamic of globalization. As said by Sonntag,

“The linguistic dimension of globalization is the ideal focus for an attempt to understand the relation between politics and culture [...] for language, as is widely acknowledged, is both a cultural marker and a means of communication. Embedded in language use is information about status and identity, as well as cold economic calculations based on efficiency and opportunity. The politics of global English are the politics of globalization, both economic and cultural.”

There are many ways that globalizing processes can influence a group’s perceived identity. One such example is how integrated economic systems have an effect on the transmission of cultural products. However, as brought to evidence by Brawley, “after reviewing these possible linkages, we need to turn to a second way in which the politics of identity get intertwined with issues about globalization: as a tactical or strategic
maneuver by political entrepreneurs.” In this light, if there is a significant group that opposes globalization within a society, politicians have an incentive to engage in politics of identity. In turn, politics of identity can be identified as a determinant factor of whether globalization processes further penetrate a society, or are contained by political backlash.

Cesare Poppi, in “Wider Horizons with Larger Details”, examines the dynamic between ethnicity and globalization. Poppi purports that “globalization must be understood as the condition whereby localizing strategies become systematically connected to global concerns.” In this sense, the tendency to emphasize “locality” and “difference” assumes a greater role in political rhetoric. These notions, however, are also congruent with the structuring of global relations of institutional communication and legitimization. The interesting contrast highlighted by Poppi is that within societies, groups seek to either redefine their identity in accordance with globalization, or they attempt to make identity claims in opposition to globalization.

For Poppi the contemporary situation of globalization resides in the transformation of the idea of global diversity into cultural differences. He claims that “Globalization provides the context for the systematic articulation of differences. As it moves on, the differential traits of a given cultural formation are made commensurable, and their difference can be made to appear as a determination of the ethnic subject.” Therefore, it would be accurate to infer that politics of identity occupy a central role in the mobilization of cultural groups in order to commensurate their differences with the global political and economic systems. Language is an aspect of ethnicity that is particularly resilient to the processes of cultural homogenization induced by globalization. Furthermore, it is also one of the best-suited instruments for politicians to establish how the processes of globalization are threatening a group’s identity through political discourses.

**Quebec’s Resistance to Globalization**

Michel de Coster, in *Les enjeux des conflits linguistiques*, provides an important synthesis of how the French language has been a central political and cultural issue in Belgium, Switzerland, and Canada. An important theme in de Coster’s analysis is that at the outset of a language debate, the issue is necessarily underlined by economic grievances. However, the recurrent use of discourses tying economic systems to
linguistic choice inevitably opens a space for political backlash. Therefore, a rationalist understanding would point to the politician’s incentive to make politics of identity central to the national debate, since it is an uncontestable mobilizing force.

The first Révolution tranquille is generally seen as the contemporary marker for the politicization of the language divide in Quebec. De Coster specifies that Jean Lesage, head of the Liberal party, which acceded to power in 1960, was the initiator of the Révolution tranquille. Lesage’s political agenda was framed around the internal divisions in Quebec espousing a desire to push back the anglicization of the province. Moreover, it was a decisive attempt to orient public policies within Quebec, as well as Canada, toward the equalization of employment discrepancies between francophone and anglophone communities. It was perceived that the economic and financial prowess of anglophones in Canada was limiting the job recruitment possibilities for French-speaking Canadians, especially access to higher-paid managerial positions. Effectively, from 1960 onwards, policy prescriptions to protect the French language within Quebec supplanted the political discourse of economic grievances felt by French-Canadians with a focus on ethnic identity.

Language within Quebec assumed unequivocal symbolic value, and became the center of political conflicts between the French and English communities. Particularly within the city of Montreal, as noted by de Coster, political discourse was continually seeking to affirm linguistic primacy. Examples of the rhetoric tensions engendered by politics of identity included various quarrels over the naming of streets, squares, and buildings. A particular debate engaged by nationalists related to the future naming of an important hotel in Montreal—the Queen Elizabeth for anglophones and the Château Maisonneuve for francophones—bears witness to one of the issues that became exacerbated by local media.

Marcel Martel and Martin Pâquet discuss the various issues concerning politics of identity in Canada and Quebec in Langue et politique au Canada et au Québec. They highlight that during the 1960s, the Canadian federal government had to increasingly address societal pressures arising from Quebec. The francophone discourse was gaining more ground in relation to the socio-economic disparity attributed to English-language dominance of the economy. Inevitably, how the federal government responded to these pressures would determine the political salience of the language discourse within Quebec. Ultimately, in 1969,
the decision was made to try and quell the fear of ethnic homogenization within Quebec by introducing French as the second official language.\textsuperscript{12} 

Ottawa’s solution to the widening language divide was to promote national unity through institutional bilingualism. Pierre Elliott Trudeau was the prime minister at the time that Canada adopted the Official Languages Act. Martel and Pâquet note that the scope of Trudeau’s decision aimed to make language an individual choice, which should be considered separate from cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{13} Therefore, regardless of one’s location in Canada, the multiple levels of the federal government would be required to provide services in both French and English.

According to Martel and Pâquet the francophone reaction to the adoption of French as a second official language varied. On one hand, the unilingual portion of the French-speaking population in Quebec equated the new language law with a legal tool destined to protect English within the province. On the other hand, those managing minority-group relations within federal institutions were quite supportive of the new law, since it provided much needed accessibility. However, there was a general reluctance to accept the law as fixed, since it had not been enshrined in the constitution. There was a fear that an anti-bilingual party could easily attain a majority of seats within parliament, and simply abolish the new law or render it powerless.

The goal of the first R\textit{évolution tranquille} was primarily to substantiate the increasing seclusion felt by French-Canadians with respect to the growing economic imbalance between French and English communities. It was not until 1977, however, that a resurgence of the R\textit{évolution tranquille} would emerge in the form of the infamous charter of the French language: Bill 101. As highlighted by de Coster, the essential motivation behind these laws was to ensure that the political ground that had been gained since the 1960s would not be lost. In the preamble to the passing of the Bill it was argued that the incorrect use of the French language in conjunction with the French-English divide, in both economic and social realms, was responsible for the inferior position of the French language within Canada.\textsuperscript{14}

An important focus was placed on the immigrant population of Canada that had arrived since the end of the Second World War. Claims were being made that since English was the primary language within the workplace, immigrants speaking neither official language would be directed towards learning English over French. However, the crux of the
argumentation behind Bill 101 put the focus on the apprenticeship of the French language within Quebec. First, the French language was seen as, on the whole, poorly taught and poorly spoken. Second, due to its scholastic weaknesses, it was seen as not being able to compete in the economic system.\(^{15}\) Therefore, the establishment of a linguistically oriented policy to define the nature of the French language within Quebec was pursued. Bill 101 effectively laid the groundwork for the justification of adopting institutional arrangements that essentially focused on a question of adopting national identity within Canada.

Bill 101 can be interpreted as a response to the Official Languages Act, which made both French and English the official languages of Canada. It rejected the notion of a provincial model based on stabilizing inter-linguistic relations for one that sought to renew the primacy of French as the common language spoken within Quebec. Bill 101, in its original form, attempted to penetrate existing social infrastructures. It made French the official language of the legal system, public administration, and education in Quebec.

As noted by de Coster in regards to schooling, the strategic framework that had been laid out in the 1960s by the \textit{R}é\textit{volution tranquille} foreshadowed the legislative form that a charter of the French language would assume.\(^{16}\) Bill 101 decreed the language of education within schools in Quebec to be French. It exempted students who had already begun their education in English as well as students who had parents that had previously attended an English school within Quebec.

The workplace was equally transformed. Prior to Bill 101, the use of French within an enterprise was on a voluntary basis. Bill 101, however, took a more coercive stance, since a radical change was sought in terms of how French was used within the realm of affairs in Quebec. In order to reflect the priority given to the French language, any enterprise that had fifty or more employees was forced to have a French language program for all non-French speaking employees.\(^{17}\) Moreover, all documents that were produced for in-office or public use had to be produced in French, and a committee was put in place to oversee the proper application of the new laws within enterprises.

The third transformative facet of Bill 101 brought to evidence by de Coster is the strict framework provided for the process of naming public places. The \textit{Commission de toponymie} of Quebec was established in order to regulate the application of the new language conventions,
which apply to street names, squares, historical sites, and other public
spaces. As mentioned by de Coster, although the revolution in the 1960s
belonged primarily to the struggle for socio-economic emancipation,
the new revolutionary wave undertaken in 1977 gave greater weight to
corns for French identity. This became accessible in light of the
importance attributed to language and culture in earlier periods. Although
it is hard to assess the qualitative impacts that Bill 101 has brought to the
rest of Canada, within Quebec there are some measurable changes that
reflect the stated goals of the French language charter. In 1996 census
data reported that 62% of Canadian citizens living in Quebec stated that
they were bilingual, compared to only 33% in 1971. Furthermore, the
socio-economic reorientation undertaken since the Révolution tranquille
has drastically changed the number of francophone employees within the
workplace. As brought to evidence by de Coster, in the greater region of
Montreal, which holds 75% of anglophones that live in Quebec, the mother
tongue of 88.2% of employees is French, and French has become the most
used language within the workplace. Additionally, as is seen in Table 1,
the language adopted by immigrants took a significant shift as a result of
the increasing entrenchment of the French language within institutions.
Comparing the periods before and after 1960, one observes that the impact
of the Révolution tranquille was monumental. The adoption of Bill 101
effectively resisted the influence of the processes of globalization by
giving a priority to the French language in critical aspects of society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language adopted by immigrants to Quebec</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1960</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1970</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1975</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1980</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1986</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1
Quebec and the Changing International Economy

Since the 1980s there has been a qualitative shift in the international economy, which has placed greater importance on the flow of financial exchanges between states. Scholars associate this trend with the emergence of the international neoliberal economic order, which has directed governments to reduce their control over the domestic market in order to provide corporations greater accessibility to the international market. In this sense, there has been an attempt “to alter the legislative landscape in countries around the globe in order to accommodate globalization, and to promote financialization of economic activities for short-term gains at the expense of long-term growth and development.”20 In Quebec, this has resulted in a shift of the political discourse concerning globalization to focus on exporting cultural products, rather than protecting language rights.

Emanuel de Silva and Monica Heller, in “From protector to producer: the role of the State in the discursive shift from minority rights to economic development”, elaborate upon the idea that Quebec has had to adapt its approach to safeguarding francophone communities in light of the changing international economic system. In this view, the consequence of political discourse and language laws during the 1960s and 70s led to the emergence of an economic crisis in the rural populations of Quebec. The increasing use of French within the working environment of urban centers has resulted in the urbanization of the labor force from the homogenous segments of rural Quebec.21 Competing interests within Quebec between minority rights and international economic competitiveness, in the neoliberal sense, have resulted in the establishment of a national program to bolster community economic development. As argued by de Silva and Heller,

“The neoliberal state’s focus on individual employability was curtailed by shared interests in the maintenance of francophone collective identity, harnessing an economic development discourse to an older one of community reproduction, in which the community in question was understood to be precisely the rural, homogenous communities in economic crisis. The question for the state has therefore become one of how to help those communities enter the globalized new economy.”22
There is a semblance of continuity in the policy orientation being adopted by politicians; however, the reality of Quebec’s stagnant rural population has shifted the discourse away from rights and towards access to the international market.

Nationalist politicians in the province have built their campaigns on the basis of championing minority rights within Canada since the 1960s. The approach to counter the economic crisis in rural Quebec has been to focus on language not only for its symbolic value, but also as a skill to develop a targeted, exportable, industry. As brought to evidence by de Silva and Heller, “the Canadian government in its Action Plan for Official Languages (2003) invested $20 million (CDN) to create a language industry association to coordinate the industry of translators, interpreters, etc., and to promote Canadian language products and services around the world.”

Since the global economy has ascribed greater importance to the ability of firms to generate capital (as opposed to states) the focus of the political discourse within Quebec has undergone a qualitative shift towards the exportation of language skills and cultural products. In this sense, although the focus of the discourse has changed from the protection of language rights to economic development, language has remained the central device for politicians to accrue political capital through politics of identity.

Conclusion

The central question of this paper has been to address whether or not local politics can effectively oppose the cultural influences of globalization. This question arises in light of the frequently observed power differential between international economic institutions and sovereign states. It is unquestionable that the processes of globalization have induced a vertical power relationship between unelected supranational entities and governments. These entities have power over the populations of countries because of their management of the international economy. Thus, the relationship between states and international institutions has resulted in the necessity of governments to act according to the fluctuations of the international economic system. Consequently, it is perceived that the processes of globalization are conducive to cultural homogenization. However, using the case of Quebec, this paper has argued that it is possible for local politics to generate a discourse, while effectively resisting the
cultural domination resulting from globalization.

Although the case of Quebec demonstrates that it is possible to defy the influences of globalization on culture, the new economy of the international system has put a focus on the adoption of neoliberal economic policies. Therefore, it has been presented that Quebec has had to change its approach towards the global economy by shifting its political discourse and policy prescriptions from minority rights to the exportation of language skills and cultural goods. This implies that the reality of the new international economy, in comparison to that of the 1960s, is making the nationalist discourse in Quebec increasingly difficult to maintain. Although the language divide remains present and politically salient within Canada, the qualitative shift observed within Quebec suggests that it may not be sustainable in the long run.
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A Convenient Canadian
Marriage of Interest
How the West Was Won, 1870-1914

David Nagel
A newly born Confederation was able to successfully incorporate the western provinces into a single nation. Considering the sheer distance that separated Quebec and Ontario, the political, economic, and population centres of Canada, from the unproven and largely unsettled western provinces, Canada’s achievement of westerly growth was a substantial feat. The process by which Canada ‘conquered’ the west spanned many decades, but the major groundwork was laid in the period immediately following Confederation. Concerned with maintaining provincial membership in Confederation, the Canadian government realized it had to act quickly to integrate the provinces into a single national infrastructure. This expansionist government policy aligned with business interests that were eager to take advantage of the vast, largely undeveloped expanse of the west.

The west was won through a process facilitated by the government working closely alongside business interests. The first step in opening up the western frontier was clearing the path originally inhabited by American Indians, specifically the Plains Cree. The second step was the construction of a transcontinental railway that would allow for trade across the expanse of the Dominion, as well as western immigration and settlement. The railroad was an especially integral tool for conquering the western frontier, as it spearheaded settlement and served multiple purposes for both the government and private business. The third and final step was the habitation of the west, which was part of a larger government policy aimed at increasing immigration as a whole. The pivotal feature of Canada’s successful integration of the west was the alignment of political and economic interests; these augmenting forces led to policies that encouraged immigration to western provinces in a concerted national effort to settle the west.

**Pursuing the National Policy: The Integration of the Provinces**

The Canadian government’s efforts to settle the West can be seen as an attempt to consolidate Confederation by ensuring the integration of western provinces into the national economy. This government policy was formally established by the Conservative Party in its budget proposal in 1879. The success of the National Policy rested on three primary objectives: the construction of the transcontinental Canadian Pacific Railway, the settlement of the West through the Dominion Lands Act of 1872 and an aggressive immigration policy, and the promotion and
protection of national industry through protective tariffs. The National Policy predicated Canada’s aggressive expansion to the west and the policy’s success precipitated the process by which Canada would win the west.

The National Policy was a defensive governmental stance in light of the uncertain state of international affairs. Perhaps the direst threat to the newly established Confederation was the possibility of US expansionary ambitions affecting Canada’s national integrity. Indeed, as Vernon Fowke states, “Much of the drive for the development of the Canadian West in the last half of the nineteenth century was primarily a defensive reaction to the American Doctrine of Manifest Destiny.” Fears of American expansionism were heightened when a bill providing for the absorption of all British North American territories was introduced into the House of Representatives in 1866 (though the bill was quickly defeated).

By establishing a presence in the west, Canada could effectively defend its claim to its land. Furthermore, by connecting newly established settlements to central Canada via a transcontinental railroad, Canada would greatly strengthen its strategic position, for should any conflict arise, the railroad would enable the government to transport both troops and supplies across Canada with speed and efficiency. Prime Minister John A. Macdonald recognized the need to defend western Canada against the threat of US expansionism. Writing to the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, Macdonald acknowledged that “the United States Government [was] resolved to do all they [could], short of war, to get possession of the western territory.” In order to counteract the US threat, Macdonald wrote that “One of the first things to be done is to show unmistakably our resolve to build the Pacific Railway.” Although the threat of Manifest Destiny would never materialize, it played a prominent role in placing western development at the top of the Canadian government’s priorities.

Economic factors were another major influence in the development of Canada’s policy towards western development. The American Civil War interrupted Canada-US trade, and the resultant economic turmoil highlighted the need for Canada to develop industry of its own. The protectionist tariffs introduced by the National Policy were intended to stimulate domestic industrial growth, thereby reducing dependence on the US market. External political and economic factors caused Canada to focus on its domestic goals, particularly the development of the potential of the western frontier.
Domestic economic factors were greatly influential in the formation of the Canadian government’s policy of western development. Canada West was viewed as a vast and untapped resource with high potential for business enterprise. After gold discoveries of the 1850s and the contemporaneous renewal of interest in Far Eastern trade, British Columbia became much more important in terms of economic growth potential. Furthermore, the prairies represented an underdeveloped source for agricultural production that, with the help of a railway, could help supply central Canada with food, while the farming settlements in the west could constitute a substantial market for industrial goods coming from the east. The economic potential for both domestic and international trade drove Canadians westward.

Thus, both international and domestic economic and political pressures accentuated the importance of the development of Canada West. Not only would it provide economic growth, it would strengthen national unity and integrate the entire former British North America land holdings into a national infrastructure. However, prior to the implementation of the National Policy, there were a number of obstacles that had to be overcome if western settlement was to become a reality.

**Preparing the Path: The Subjugation of American Indians**

The opening up and holding of the extreme northwest of the North American continent was accomplished by an immense land grant courtesy of Charles II in the 17th century, but it would be centuries before substantial settlement could take place. Before western Canada could be settled, the Canadian government had to deal with the Plains Indians who inhabited key terrain in the Prairie Provinces. But despite the ambitions of the National Policy to develop the “agricultural potential of the West” and “open the land for railway construction,” the Canadian government initially had no plan for dealing with the Plains Indians. This would quickly change as settlers pushed westward in search of arable land.

No settlement of any sort could commence before treaties had been struck with the American Indians, for they would surely interfere with any farmers they encountered intruding into their lands. The Ojibwa of the North-West Angle “created the fear of violence against prospective settlers who crossed their land or made use of their territory.” Any violence had the potential to discourage settlers, and the Canadian government sought to avoid this at all costs.
The Cree had learned from the lessons of the American Indians in the United States, who were left with few recognized rights in the aftermath of their treaties. Thus, the Cree “made it clear that they would not allow settlement or use of their lands until Cree rights had been clearly recognized.”9 After the Plains Cree interfered with the geological survey and effectively prevented the construction of telegraph lines through their lands, it became clear that the government had to act in order to ensure westward expansion while avoiding military confrontation.10

The subjugation of the Plains Cree was accomplished through a number of tactics aimed at weakening the American Indians’ bargaining position before treaty negotiations had begun. Firstly, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Edgar Dewdney, sought to use rations as a means of getting control over the Cree.11 Although this tactic provoked violent protest on the part of many American Indians, the violence actually accelerated the process of their subjugation.

When the Cree attempted to negotiate a reservations agreement that would result in a concentration of the different bands, they found that Canadian officials were well aware of the potential strategic and political implications of such unity among the Cree.12 After Dewdney realized that “starving the Cree into submission was not the means to control them,” he adopted a policy of rewards and punishments involving rations and farming equipment.13 This policy met with limited success, however the Riel Rebellion of 1885 gave Dewdney the perfect excuse to use military force to drive the Plains Cree into submission.14 After arresting their principal leaders, the Plains Cree were effectively subdued by the North West Mounted Police.

Dewdney began the process of making the Cree an administered people that would cause little further trouble for farmers eager to settle the fertile prairie lands. While the means by which the Canadian government dealt with the Plains Cree were blatantly unjust and callous, this was an essential step in opening up the western frontier for settlement and the construction of the long awaited railway.

The Transformative Quality of Transportation: The Transcontinental Railway

The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was a radically transformative undertaking in the development of western Canada. It marked the beginning of numerous economic, political, and social
developments that would affect the entire country. The railway was involved in “the introduction of masses of immigrants from Europe; [...] the movement of goods to distant markets; the creation of railway townsites some of which grew to be important cities, and the development of petroleum, coal, lumber, and other natural resources.” The CPR gave Canada the means by which to settle the west, promote trade, and substantiate land claims that reached all the way to the Pacific Ocean.

The CPR facilitated the settlement and development of agriculture in the prairie provinces, but the ranching industry also flourished in the rolling plains of the western short-grass country. Where wild buffalo had once prospered, the cattle industry took off. The railway was indispensable to the cattle industry, as it transported purebred breeding stock into the region and shipped sale animals to eastern Canada and overseas. But the arrangement worked in the opposite causative direction as well: the development of the cattle industry helped justify the construction of a railroad across the plains.

The CPR gave Canada the means by which to settle the west, promote trade, and substantiate land claims that reached all the way to the Pacific Ocean. The CPR facilitated the settlement and development of agriculture in the prairie provinces, but the ranching industry also flourished in the rolling plains of the western short-grass country. Where wild buffalo had once prospered, the cattle industry took off. The railway was indispensable to the cattle industry, as it transported purebred breeding stock into the region and shipped sale animals to eastern Canada and overseas. But the arrangement worked in the opposite causative direction as well: the development of the cattle industry helped justify the construction of a railroad across the plains.

The widely recognized economic potential of western Canada helped stimulate the construction of the CPR. The profitability of the CPR’s enterprise into the west galvanized both public and private interests, and by 1897, CPR president William Van Horne described the prairie west as “our great gold mine.” The success of the CPR is evidenced by its exponential growth. By 1902, Van Horne wrote that “The development of our traffic, particularly in North-Western Canada, is beyond our expectations[...] our land sales indicate that settlers and land-seekers have their eyes on North-Western Canada, and that they are moving here in larger numbers than at any time heretofore.”

However, due to the direct involvement of the Canadian government in the construction of the CPR and its central role in the National Policy, the CPR was built in accordance to many political specifications. In some cases, national politics trumped economic interests in key aspects of the CPR’s construction. For example, when determining the route that the CPR would take, political considerations dictated that the entirety of the railway line be located within Canada’s borders, even if that meant higher costs. Therefore, Fowke notes that “Nationalism and the flag rather than economics located the Canadian Pacific Railway to the north of Lake Superior,” for though the CPR was an economic enterprise, the railroad remained an indispensable political tool that was critical to the success of the goals of the National Policy. The railroad did facilitate the
development of the economy in western Canada, but just as important as its financial success was its role in the ‘Canadianization’ of the west. The Canadian government clearly had a political agenda to fulfill through the realization of the CPR.

Case in point: the construction of the Crow’s Nest Pass line in the 1890s was a specific response to a well-established American presence in mineral-rich British Columbia. When Thomas Shaughnessy, a member of the board of directors of the CPR, visited the mines in the Kootenays, he was alarmed by the American character of the towns. From a business perspective, Shaughnessy noted that Americans dominated the import trade to the Kootenays, and thus Canadian businesses benefited very little from trade in this region. In response, the CPR built a line through the Crow’s Nest Pass of the Rockies into the mining centers of the East and West Kootenays so that it could redirect the region’s traffic from American to Canadian channels. The CPR would thereby effectively “Canadianize the Kootenays.” In the case of the Kootenays, the dual purpose of the CPR is evident; the railway was not only opening up the west to trade, it was establishing a Canadian presence to promote a nationalist economy.

The case of the Kootenays is exemplary in that the protectionist impulse of the National Policy promoted the expansion of national economic interests, and this aligned the government’s goals with those of many Canadian businesses. The completion of the CPR announced the Canadian intention of holding the central plains, but the intention only became actualized through economic utilization of this region. The development of the west as a market was a prerequisite for the success of the entire national project. Therefore, the Canadian government joined with Canadian businesses to help win the west.

“The Best Country for a Poor Man”:

Attracting Immigrants to the West

After the British North America Act of 1867, the newly formed federal Dominion of Canada had a keen interest in expansionary growth in terms of both the population and the economy. For although Canada had achieved greater autonomy from Britain, Confederation was threatened by the doctrine of Manifest Destiny, the widespread belief that Canada would inevitably be incorporated into the United States of America and lose its unique character and self-determination as a nation. Thus, the growth of the population of the newly formed nation was essential to its survival as
a Canadian entity. Immigration was the final ingredient of the National Policy and the key component in the strategy that would win the west for Canada.

The rate of economic growth during the late 19th and early 20th centuries was driven not only by the expansion of the railway but also the massive influx of immigrants. The fact that railway construction preceded settlement was only logical, since “Colonization railroads were clearly seen as a means of placing settlers in developing regions.”23 The immigrants served two of western Canada’s developmental needs: they served as a source of urgently needed labour, and their crops increased national revenue. Of course, the railroad would help settle the immigrants in Canada West. However, it is important to note that the relationship between immigrants and the CPR was reciprocal, since “immigration officials tended to see the recruitment of foreign labourers to work on railway construction as an aspect of the settlement process.”24 In this manner, the CPR, immigration, and settlement were all intrinsically linked as part of Canada’s goals for the west.

While the route of the CPR may have been determined by political interests, the issue of immigration was quite a different matter. Interestingly, “In the clash between the Immigration Branch and the Railroad companies, the federal politicians were inclined more often that not to support the interests of the companies.”25 Regardless of whose interests played a larger part in determining policy, however, immigration was essential to Canada’s ambitions for westward expansion.

Canada adopted the Land Act in 1872, which provided for making free land grants to intent settlers.26 However, the Canadian government soon realized that settlers were all too often ill-prepared for the harsh conditions of frontier life. In 1882, John Charlton, a Member of Parliament, asserted that “the Government should look after the interests of the settler.”27

In order to attract more settlers, the government spread issued statements. According to Thomas Spence, a typical publication focused on:

“Manitoba and the North-West of the Dominion, its resources and advantages to the emigrant and capitalist as compared with the western states of America; its climate, soil, agricultural and manufacturing facilities; its unparalleled salubrity [sic], growth and productiveness, in comparison with older provinces; and
The publication went on to provide extensive and detailed information as to the specifics of frontier living and all that a settler could expect, including estimated crop yields and soil type.

The Canadian government went to great lengths to increase immigrants to the west. Its success is measured by the population growth in Canada. The annual number of immigrants entering Canada steadily increased from Confederation until well into the First World War. Although there was a significant drop in immigration in the 1890s, the numbers rebounded in the following years. More tellingly, a great number of Canadians moved westward during this period as well, indicating that the Canadian government’s efforts towards publicizing and aiding settlers was largely successful. Settlers’ success on the western frontier was also well documented. At the request of Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, the government of Canada published a collection of “Settlers’ Experiences in Western Canada” in 1900. These letters spoke of the abundance of crops and great success that many settlers experienced; some mentioned the “happy independence,” and the great kindness of government and railway officials. Many settlers wrote encouraging statements such as “Hoping that your efforts in the matter of immigration may be successful.”

Concluding Remarks

Canada won the west through the successful implementation of the National Policy. However, it is important to deconstruct the step by step process by which westward expansion was accomplished in order to appreciate how this was achieved. Although the protective tariffs, encouragement of immigration, and construction of the CPR were all crucial steps towards the settling of Canada West, there were other domestic and external factors. The domestic economy was looking for expansion and the western frontier offered promising potential with its agricultural and mineral resources. In terms of international factors, the threat of Manifest Destiny helped stimulate the government into action concerning the need to establish a presence in the west. The successful execution of the National Policy, combined with the subjugation of the Plains Cree, allowed Canada to win the west and establish its nationhood from the shores of the Atlantic to the Pacific.
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Filmic Fabrications
The National Film Board of Canada and a 1950s Production of Identity

Lina Crompton
In 1950s Canada, the federal government was terribly interested in fostering a new form of Canadian identity. With high rates of immigration from outside the British Isles, the longstanding notion of Canada as a British nation would no longer do. In order to cultivate this multicultural identity, the federal government turned to the National Film Board of Canada (NFB) to create and disseminate educational films about the foreign element in Canadian society. Heavily influenced by the ideas of John Grierson, including top-down direct suggestion of an ideology that believed in unity in diversity, the films of the NFB in the post-war years had a considerable task to achieve. Post-Citizenship Act of 1946 but pre-Immigration Point System, some English films of the 1950s at the NFB grappled with reconciling the dire need for immigrants and quelling any fear, distrust, or racism that a wider, mainly British-based society may have felt towards foreign-born Canadians. This worked towards creating a multicultural identity for Canada wherein the immigrant population was depicted as an important, hardworking, and non-threatening stratum of society. One film which aptly demonstrates these ideals and issues is Roman Kroitor’s 1953 *Paul Tomkowicz: Street-railway Switchman*. This award-winning nine-minute documentary was part of the “Faces of Canada” series which celebrated the unsung heroes of Canada’s workforce. Although not explicitly about immigration, multiculturalism, or foreigners in Canada, these themes resonate strongly throughout the film. *Paul Tomkowicz* is constructed as a “day in the life of” an elderly Polish-born immigrant, who works as a switchman in Winnipeg. The filmmakers situate Tomkowicz as both an outsider to and integral member of 1950s Canadian society through visual and aural cues, setting, narration, and character description. This feature, written by Kroitor and narrated by Tommy Tweed, exists as both documentary and fiction, which a discussion of Trevor Ponech’s theories of non-fiction cinema will demonstrate is possible. Drawing on his work, the writings of John Grierson and Bill Nichols, and a close reading of the film, it is clear that the NFB played a crucial role in the creation of a burgeoning, if not yet fully formed, identity for Canada as a multicultural nation.

Documentary has historically been a strength of the NFB. Supposed to be representative of reality, documentary filmmaking has come under considerable fire from cultural theorists for its biases, inaccuracies, reconstructions, and methods that obscure objectiveness. However, in his book *What is Non-fiction Cinema? On the Very Idea of Motion Picture*...
Communication, Trevor Ponech instead presents a new definition of what constitutes the documentary as a form of non-fictional communication. Ponech is adamant that the sole signifier that a film is a documentary is the intentionality of the filmmaker and not the constituent parts of the film. If the filmmaker had the intention to produce a non-fiction, then whatever film has come from that can be designated a documentary. The viewer then determines if a film is a documentary based on certain stylistic features that indicate a verisimilitude between the filmic world and the real world. A documentary is thus a representational system which uses film, sound, special effects, (social) actors, and editing techniques to present a depiction of the world that the filmmaker wishes the viewers to adopt as true. Ponech postulates that a non-fiction documentary does not necessarily have to contain no fictional elements. Instead, fictitious material can play a major part in creating non-fictional meaning. Therefore, a documentary’s content need not necessarily be an accurate representation of the real world, but rather may be a projection of the filmmaker’s vision of how things ought to be.

This definition of documentary works particularly well with Kroitor’s Paul Tomkowicz, because, despite the film’s considerable amount of possibly fictional material, it was presented to the audience at the time, and presently, as a documentary about an otherwise unknown immigrant Canadian. To entirely discredit this film because of its fictitiousness would be to do it a disservice. It is an apt representation of how the NFB – at the time more closely linked with the federal government than it is now – was producing films and producing identities that would alter the existing British-based society of English Canada. Ponech’s theories about documentary mean that the historian can still use this film as an historical indicator of the thoughts and actions of a government grappling with issues of immigration and national unity. The parts of this film that are not overtly fictitious, such as the likelihood of people such as Tomkowicz existing in Canada, the very real setting of a cold, winter, Winnipeg night, and the probability of professions like that of a streetcar switchman are still important historical artefacts, even if the film as a whole must be taken with a grain of salt.

This documentary, as well as putting Ponech’s film criticism theories into practice, is also an apt representation of the processes and projects of the NFB in the 1950s. Though John Grierson, founder of the NFB, did not remain at that institution for very long, his ideas
enjoyed a long and productive life there. In “A Film Policy for Canada,” Grierson bemoans the narrative and frivolous fictional cinema created by Hollywood, and rather envisions an educational and uplifting cinema for Canada. He notes that “moods of relaxation” have fostered Hollywood’s light entertainments, but instead wants the Canadian film scene to use their “moods of resolution” to devise “a more creative citizenship.” He wanted the films of the NFB to “progressively cover the whole field of civic interest: what Canadians need to know and think about if they are going to do their best by Canada and by themselves.” For Grierson, the NFB was part of “a planned and scientific war to provide what might be described as a supplementary system of national education” through their production of films, as an arm of the federal government, to create a certain kind of citizenry. This legacy is very apparent in Kroitor’s *Paul Tomkowicz*, which creates a world in which the foreign element is a hardworking, humble, religious, and thoughtful section of Canadian society. The government, via the NFB and this film, was working to create a form of citizenship and identity that encompassed European immigrants as important constituent elements that made not only the streetcars of Winnipeg, but also the post-war society of Canada, run smoothly.

In Ponech’s frame for understanding non-fiction cinema, the intentionality of the filmmaker is the primary determinant of the film’s meaning. Thus in order to fully understand the background of this film, one has to understand the history and motivations of its creators. Roman Kroitor was the director, co-producer, and co-writer for this film. He enjoyed an award-winning career at the NFB, going on to become one of the founding filmmakers of the cinema verité movement. However, before his later fame, Kroitor worked on this film about the Polish-born Canadian Paul Tomkowicz as part of the “Faces of Canada” series. This film presents a typical, even stereotypical, view of a hard-working, unknown Canadian as part of a project highlighting the professions that, although marginalised, contribute to the daily life of all Canadians. Therefore, as a key developer of this film, Kroitor holds an important position as realiser of a 1950s created identity. He was able to make this film – produced solely for educational and not commercial purposes – with an air of verisimilitude because the portable Arriflex camera allowed the filmmakers to follow Tomkowicz on his night-shift. This would have been an impossible feat without the capital and technology afforded by the NFB.

Despite this feeling though, the film is not candid, but instead a
clever fabrication by Kroitor and others. It is presented as if the main social actor is narrating his work and his life in Canada, but it was actually Kroitor himself who penned the script, and the voice-over narration is provided by Tommy Tweed, a prolific employee of the NFB in his own right. In his other works, Tweed has an English-Canadian accent. Therefore, in *Paul Tomkowicz* he is affecting a stereotypical Polish accent, speaking in a manufactured and clear but broken English, designed to present a typical immigrant profile to the viewing public. Despite all these fabrications however, this film is still an important document, because, as Ponech elucidates, “the situations to which a non-fiction pertains may be actual, concrete, and particular; but they may be typical and imaginary too.” Another contention of Ponech’s is that without a directional plan, a non-fiction film would not be a documentary, for, as Grierson theorised, art is a hammer, not a mirror. Thus, without Kroitor’s carefully-planned intentions for the work this film would do, it would not have become an instructional identity-creating feature for the NFB. The viewer does not know if the man in the film is indeed Paul Tomkowicz, whether this was the actor’s story, or whether the whole film is in fact a complete fabrication. What the viewer can know, however, is the film’s role in incipiently teaching the Canadian public that the large foreign-born population of new Canadians are loyal, hardworking, lovely, and humble citizens. *Paul Tomkowicz* is successful in carrying out this goal, despite existing in a liminal space between documentary and fiction.

*Paul Tomkowicz* helps to create a harmonious national multicultural identity in multitudinous ways. One way in which the filmmakers execute this project is through visual effects and signage. One repeating and compelling motif of the film is a long street shot, taken down the centre of a main road in Winnipeg. At first, this shot is the background to the titles. Darkness makes the vista indistinct, illuminated only by street lamps and head lights. The only light that the viewer can see are these glowing orbs upon an otherwise featureless street. This situates the action of the film in night-time, demonstrating that Tomkowicz, while working, exists largely out of sight of the wider Canadian population. As the film progresses, Tomkowicz is brought into the light either on the streetcar or with the help of his coal-oil lamp when he is sweeping the switches alone in the night. Yet the true moment of illumination – of both the personage of Tomkowicz and the ideals propagated by the film – occurs half-way through, directly following his heartfelt reminiscences of the life in Poland he left behind.
As dawn begins to break over Winnipeg, the film returns to that same long shot up the street. This illumination works both literally and figuratively for the film. Yes, the street has now literally come into relief. At the same time however, the viewer is now enlightened of Tomkowicz’s harrowing past and productive present. The personal stories of this foreign member of society humanise him as a character, but also humanise the stories of all the immigrants that he represents. To reflect that, the dawn has broken over the city of Winnipeg, just as the dawn is meant to have broken over the new day of a harmonious and multicultural Canada.

However, there are also visual cues contained in this film which maintain Tomkowicz’s outsider status. These are manifest in the background shots of signs peppered throughout the film. Some of these are seemingly incidental, but their inclusion firmly situates this foreigner’s story in that of a very British Canada. Before the viewer hears from the heavily-accented character of Tomkowicz, they see him emerge from the streetcar next to an advertisement for milk. Thus, the viewer knows that this man is situated in a familiar context, where the linguistic and cultural hegemony of English Canada remains intact. Throughout the film there are visual cues such as this, predominantly in the form of advertisements. One example of this is for Buckingham Cigarettes, an obvious nod to the United Kingdom’s legacy and continuing presence in Canada. Another sign that situates Tomkowicz in an unapologetically English milieu is a sign for the Ritz, another overtly British institution placed in a Canadian context. When Tomkowicz comes in from the cold to eat breakfast at the end of his working day, rather than at the beginning of the work day like his compatriots in the diner, the shot focuses in on an Orange Crush clock. This creates an interesting relationship between Tomkowicz and the regular working day in Canada. He is ‘other’ in this instance in that even though he is eating a typical breakfast meal at the typical time of day, it is not at the typical point in a regular Western schedule. By highlighting that this time of day is tied to a certain product, Tomkowicz is able to engage in the consumerist life enjoyed in capitalist Canada as opposed to an entirely different life that he has left behind in communist Poland. However, he does so in a slightly shifted manner from the norm in North America. A final piece of background imagery with an underlying and forceful meaning is brought into relief through a lingering shot of Tomkowicz in front of a sign for Haven Diner. This situates him in the haven that is Canada. Here, he is safe from the violence, fear, and unemployment that many believed
was plaguing Eastern Europe during the communist takeovers. Therefore, although Tomkowicz can take solace in the peace, orderliness, and bounty of a capitalist Canadian society, there are still markers that demonstrate how he has yet to assimilate completely into a typical Canadian way of life.

The film also elucidates this dichotomy of Tomkowicz’s identity through its soundscapes. This is done through a mix of vaguely Eastern European-sounding folk music and the life-like sounds of the film’s world. The titles at the beginning of the film are underscored by this gentle folk music alongside the sound of howling winds, driving cars, ringing bells, and squealing wheels of the streetcar. The music quickly fades as the viewer is moved onto the streetcar with a crush of other passengers and Tomkowicz, before he becomes a distinct character and the main focus of the film. The combination of folk music and street sounds demonstrates that his traditions, and extrapolating out, the folk traditions of all of Canada’s immigrant groups, can enhance an understanding of Canada’s workforce, yet will not interfere with his responsibilities as a working Canadian. The music is then unheard until Tomkowicz begins to reminisce fondly about his childhood in Poland. This music fades away again when the light starts to break over Winnipeg, demonstrating that as the viewer learns more about the Canadian immigrant population, their folk traditions will be integral to the background of the nation’s character, but as the assimilation process continues, they will remain only as background. The music is the only signifier of any sort of folk tradition. There are no representations of other practices, costumes, or foods as are sometimes presented in earlier NFB films about immigrant groups. The purpose of this film is instead to show the successful integration of the immigrant into Canadian society, and so even though he reminisces about the old country throughout the film, Tomkowicz is situated firmly in his new, adoptive country.

The setting of this film is very important for creating a national identity which readily adopts immigrants. The film is unabashedly situated in Winnipeg. However, this film employs synecdochic techniques throughout – Tomkowicz can certainly be used to represent the whole of the European immigrant population – and in this case, Winnipeg can stand in for all of urban Canada. Set in the dead of winter, many Canadian cities share in the meteorological trials of Winnipeg. This is a particularly useful tactic for a country that is noted for its scenic diversity. When the harbours of the East look nothing like the prairies of the Centre, which
in turn look nothing like the mountains of the West, it is understandably challenging to create a national film which can interpolate viewers from all regions of Canada. However, by situating Paul Tomkowicz in an urban setting with common weather, this film is then able to stand in for the whole. The specific settings within the film in which Tomkowicz is situated also establish his connection with the wider hegemonic Canadian society. At the very beginning of the film, the focus is upon the streetcar driver and passengers. Tomkowicz is shown after these establishing shots. In this case he is constituted as part of a larger whole, rather than as someone outside of the regular workings of society. Following this first sequence, the camera focuses on the wheels and switches of the streetcar, still before we hear from Tomkowicz. This demonstrates that it is his career which has been his ticket into the film and into Canadian society. The setting also creates a view of Canada as a haven from the horrid world of communist Poland. Directly after the narrator tells the story of how Tomkowicz’s brother and brother’s family have been killed for no reason by the communists in his village in Poland, the shot changes from following Tomkowicz as he sweeps the switches to filming him from inside a store between two mannequins in furs. This is representative of the difference between capitalist, free Canada and communist, dangerous Poland. However, at the same time, this setting still marks Tomkowicz out as an ‘other.’ Even though he does not mind working at night, no one else is out on the streets at the hours he keeps. Thus, the filmmakers (and by extension the NFB) are inside on this cold night, watching him outside, doing this job that the average Canadian would not want to do. In this case, the average Canadian is personified by the mannequins as part of a normalised consumerist and capitalist system. Tomkowicz is engaging with this system, but in a way that is just different enough that he is in the system and outside of it at the same time.

One of the strongest features that casts Tomkowicz as both an outsider to and yet still integrated in Canadian society is through the narration performed by Tommy Tweed. As Bill Nichols notes in Introduction to Documentary, the expository form of documentary, from which the style of this film heavily borrows, uses a voice-of-authority style of commentary. This style “emphasizes the impression of objectivity and well-supported argument.” Through Tomkowicz’s narration, the film presents an authoritarian, or at least typical, view of the experiences, thoughts, and aspirations of an average Eastern European
immigrant to Canada. His English is heavily accented, yet clear and simple, evident in phrases such as “In Winnipeg you can go in the street. Daytime, night-time, nobody is bother you.” Within the first few lines of narration, he tells of the murder of his brother and brother’s family back in Poland, immediately creating a juxtaposition between the harrowing circumstances from whence he came and the quiet and unmolested life he now enjoys in Canada. Later in the film, his reminiscences of Poland create a paradox as well: “Was born on farm. Small house [...] We used to chase the geese. Ah, was young then. Lots of good times. Go in village. Comrades. Dancing [...] But it was long time ago.” This stereotypical representation of life in the old country was written by Kroitor to bring to life the caricature of the harmless immigrant rather than that of an enemy within our midst. However, his use of “comrades” rather than “friends” is bizarre in this context, for that would typically be considered a communist word. Therefore, despite his soothing recollections of a peaceful, rural life, he is still relegated to be slightly other through his (or Kroitor’s) choice of words. The film ends with a narration of Tomkowicz’s plans for the future. In the diner at the end of his day, he muses: “One more year, then I be sixty-five. I go for retire. That’s the law,” demonstrating his integration into the typical Canadian workforce. He continues: “No more work. Summertime and my garden, grow tomato. Got my motorcycle. Take a trip!” reinforcing that he is a Canadian now and that he will be staying in Canada, enjoying his life, and travelling in and integrating into Canada after years of service to the city of Winnipeg.

A final tactic that the film uses to advance an ideal of a multicultural Canada is its focus on one character. This tactic has one man act as a representative for how the filmmakers want all viewers to see immigrants in post-war Canada. Tomkowicz’s personality is crafted in order to show the middle-of-the-road Canadian that the ‘foreign element’ is nothing to be afraid of. In other NFB films about immigrant groups, the social actors often remain voiceless (largely due to technological constraints), therefore telling the story of one man through his ‘own’ voice is a novel and innovative tactic for promoting integration through humanising immigrants. This is performed through his simple and hardworking nature when he utters phrases such as: “Sweep them up, sweep them up. Is not hard. I am healthy man.” His gentle narration over sweeping the snow, a task that the average Canadian must likewise perform all throughout the winter to their own property, demonstrates that he is partaking in Canadian
traditions and doing so for the good of society via Winnipeg. Another
t feature that highlights his trustworthiness and harmlessness is his love of
gardening. Early in the film Tomkowicz speaks of his time as a gardener
in France, and by the end of the film he tells the viewer that when he
retires he hopes to continue tending to his garden, growing tomatoes. This
dedication and nurturing spirit are favourable qualities for the NFB to
cultivate as belonging to new Canadians. This disseminates to the viewing
nation that all immigrants are gentle, willing to integrate, and will not be
a bother once they are here. This tactic continues when he states that:
“Tonight I got night off. No work. Maybe take a bath [...] Read the
Bible. Newspaper.” Casing Tomkowicz as a literate, religious man ¹helps
ease his integration into a largely Christian nation. With a country as
disparate as Canada there are few qualities that run throughout, but this
film elucidates a few which helps outline the integration of immigrants in
a British-Canadian post-war nation.

This nine-minute 1950s filmic representation of immigrant
integration opens a window into how the NFB, and by extension the federal
government, wanted to create a version of a multicultural Canada. The
humanising of the Polish-born Paul Tomkowicz is indicative of a federal
system that privileged an integrative national character which would see
Canada through a post-war, more open immigration system. Though
presented as a documentary, this constructed piece is demonstrative of the
urgency of the government to foster this identity and is therefore a useful
source for understanding the mind-set of a government mired in identity
issues.
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Exiles or New Citizens?
American Vietnam War Resistors as Symbols of Canadian Autonomy

Laurin Liu
When I checked into this place
fumbling w/ manuscripts-bag typewriter & wineskin
she said Ah vous êtes américain – (No from toronto I pro
tested but she wouldn’t listen)– I get many of
you – Too much wars down there non?

- Excerpt from “Three Québec City Poems” by George Fetherling,
draft dodger and Canadian poet

The Vietnam War took place in a period of social and moral turmoil. Americans, unable to come to terms with their country’s aggressive foreign policy, sought venues of escape. One venue of escape was literal exit. Some of these migrants went overseas to European countries and to Australia, but, more often than not, they crossed the northern border to Canada. Between 1966 and 1976, Canada’s reception of American immigrants doubled from the previous decade, and the number of these immigrants swelled to more than 250,000.¹

Recent historians of the period, the most influential of which have been David Churchill and John Hagan, have maintained that draft dodgers and war resisters² were objects of anti-Americanism, but that they were also exploited as symbols of Canada’s autonomy vis-à-vis the United States. Here, I will begin by showing that feelings towards American objectors were mired in ambivalence. To begin with, American war resisters and draft dodgers entering Canada were conceptualized as criminal and moral deviants by various gatekeepers³, including border officers, public officials, employers and newspaper reporters and editorial boards. However, these migrants were also defended by sympathetic Canadians, among which were war resisters aid groups, student unions, denominational organizations and private individuals, and received assistance in the form of aid and counseling. My principal claim is that, ultimately, gatekeepers tended to perceive them as an asset, rather than a detriment, to the Canadian project of national rule. This was because draft dodgers and war resisters served important Canadian nationalist ends, as both symbols that embodied Canadian autonomy with regards to the United States, and as new, active agents in the Canadian nationalist movement. To demonstrate this, I will discuss the ways in which the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) approached the draft dodger issue and the fact that some American immigrants became adherents to Canadian
nationalism. As well, it can be said that the framing of the issue of draft dodgers as a nationalist question had important repercussions on Canada’s immigration policy.

War resisters and draft dodgers in Canada were often seen as morally deviant, and moral criticisms against them went above and beyond disapproval of their opposition to the war. Their opponents frequently accused them of cowardice 4 or of being “slobs,” “campus rowdies” or “marijuana smokers.” 5 J.G. Showler, the senior immigration officer at the Thousand Islands crossing, accused the “typical” draft dodger as being “a college dropout who has tried two or three courses and flunked them all, has never held a decent job and has probably got more than a little familiar with marijuana.” 6 One article in the Toronto Daily Star noted that some residents of the borough of York saw a draft dodger as being the moral equivalent of “a man who was separated from his wife.” 7 The idea that war resisters were moral deviants summoned perceptions that war resisters were criminally deviant as well. William Ross, chairman of the Toronto Board of Education, linked draft status with criminal drug activity, claiming that two high school students reported that they bought marijuana from draft dodgers, and calling for a police investigation.

These prejudices came with the corollary belief that the political beliefs and behavior of draft dodgers and war resisters could corrupt Canadian wholesomeness. Ross, quoted in a statement that appeared in the Toronto Daily Star, made statements that had reverberations of anti-Americanism, such as “[Draft dodgers] have the [drug] connections in the United States,” 8 implying that the dubious morality of the United States would bleed into Canada with the arrival of war resisters. Another example was that of Gregory Spears, a 22-year-old who was denied permanent employment status with the Borough of York, purportedly for being a “pacifist” (“pacifist” here was used as a euphemistic term for “war resister,” as Spears was not the former). The borough’s personnel committee allegedly expressed concerns that Spears would “corrupt the minds of the children with [his] views if [he] were given the job.” 9

It is a widely circulated claim among cultural theorists that television mirrors civilization, and, sure enough, the conceptions that surrounded draft dodgers also materialized in pop culture. The movie Explosion (1969), produced by Canadian filmmaker Jules Bricken, featured a psychopathic, homicidal, and suggestively homosexual draft-dodger protagonist on a murderous rampage across British Columbia. A movie
reviewer writing for the *Toronto Daily Star* accused the film of “[offering] cheap justification for the hate that is being encouraged towards [draft dodgers].”\(^{10}\) However, while *Explosion* deliberately catered to American anti-draft dodger sentiments and drew offence from some Canadians, it nevertheless indicated a Canadian undercurrent of unease associated with American draft-dodgers on Canadian territory. When Americans were not perceived as an active threat, they were perceived as a latent one, and one that would “explode,” given time.

Not all Canadians, however, were opposed to war resisters and draft dodgers. One way to detect support for these migrants is through the aid that was offered to them by sympathetic Canadians. However, provisions of aid were constantly up for negotiation; they were sporadic and subject to continual criticism by Canadians critical of draft dodgers or skeptical that Canadians should intervene in their favour. Toronto students attending University College voted in 1967 to support a fund drive launched by forty University of Toronto professors to provide U.S. draft dodgers with money for temporary shelter, job placement, and legal aid for those wishing to apply for landed immigrant status.\(^{11}\) However, in March of the same year, the student council of the University of Waterloo voted 12 to 1 against providing assistance to draft dodgers. This reversed a decision taken by the previous council to provide aid, a decision that provoked a campus referendum in which students voted 1,676 to 596 against providing aid.\(^{12}\)

Draft dodgers also received aid from religious organizations, such as Unitarian and Quaker groups.\(^{13}\) The Commission on Canadian Affairs of the Canadian Council of Churches was an important source of aid funds, and the Canadian Council of Churches (CCC) encouraged individual churches to assist war resisters and provide them with special ministry. In September 1970, Canon Maurice Wilkinson of the CCC reported that the Council had raised $20,000 in the previous year to distribute to local resistance organizations.\(^{14}\) Despite this support, aid from members of the CCC was not unequivocal. In 1967, the United Church cancelled a $1,000 grant to aid U.S. draft dodgers in Canada because the church’s evangelism board vetoed the grant, citing qualms about “[encouraging] people to defect from a country.” United Church moderator Rt. Rev. Wilfred Lockhart accused the Secretary of the United Church board of evangelism and social service Rev. J.R. Hord of “urging and welcoming Americans to break the law.”\(^{15}\) A high United Church official also informed the *Toronto Daily Star*
that the grant was vetoed in fear of losing contributions, although Rev. Wilfred Lockhart denied this allegation.\textsuperscript{16} In any case, a survey conducted in 1968 by the United Church Observer showed that, among the 2,201 United Church laymen polled, more than 50\% felt that Canadian Christian organizations were not justified in aiding American draft exiles.\textsuperscript{17}

Of utmost importance to the discussion of Canada’s reception of draft dodgers was that it occurred against the backdrop of a burgeoning Canadian nationalist movement. A facet of Canadian nationalism was its virulent critique of American modernity. Canadian nationalists believed that there should be a distinct Canadian worldview in the face of American imperialism. Some allies of war resisters used this to critique Canadians opposed to war resisters, accusing them of subscribing to the American worldview pertaining to war resisters instead of forming their own. This sentiment was expressed in an editorial that appeared in the \textit{Toronto Daily Star} on Thursday, January 2, 1969: “[Canadians who accuse draft dodgers of being cowards, traitors and unfit persons to be admitted to Canada] evidently regard the United States as somehow different from other foreign governments. They feel that it has a claim on the loyalty and allegiance of Canadians […].”\textsuperscript{18} Of the vast discussion that can be had about post-war Canadian nationalism, there are two aspects of it that are worth emphasizing here: the potency of \textit{symbols} and the potency of \textit{myth}. Symbols were important in the project of constructing what Andrew E. Kim calls the “pan-Canadian civil religion” because of their ability to promote national unity and sustain individual commitment toward national goals.\textsuperscript{19} Meanwhile, the proliferation of national myth was a way in which governments could generate legitimacy and prospective influence.\textsuperscript{20} One crucial nationalist myth was that of Canadian multiculturalism and open-mindedness with regards to immigration, and discussions of draft dodgers often explicitly harkened back to this myth. For example, after Minister of Manpower and Immigration Allan MacEachen’s May 22 announcement that American military deserters would be eligible for status as immigrants, Edward Broadbent of the New Democratic Party reiterated to the House of Commons that Canada had an important tradition of welcoming political refugees, which included United Empire Loyalists fleeing the American Revolution. In another instance, an editorial that appeared in the \textit{Toronto Daily Star} on Saturday, November 4, 1967, called Canada’s open-door policy “traditional,” citing Canada’s past as a political refuge for European and American political exiles and dissenters.
For this reason, on the official front, Canada was generally content to take no direct action to deter or oppose draft dodgers. John Munroe, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, voiced Canada’s unwritten policy concerning draft dodgers:

An individual’s status with regard to compulsory military service in his own country has no bearing upon his admissibility to Canada either as an immigrant or as a visitor; nor is he subject to removal from Canada because of unfulfilled military obligations in his country of citizenship.\textsuperscript{21}

Tom Kent, a policy adviser to Prime Minister Lester Pearson and later deputy minister of Immigration, worked towards the implementation of Operational Memorandum (OM) Number 117 on January 14, 1966, which stated that “Officers will not refuse an immigrant solely on the grounds that he is known to be, or suspected of being, a draft evader.”\textsuperscript{22} Kent thus solidified the view that the questioning of intending immigrants should not inquire into draft status. Jean Marchand, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, made it clear that American draft resisters, irrespective of their draft status, should be allowed to enter the country and apply for Landed Immigrant Status at their point of entry.\textsuperscript{23} Marchand stated in 1968 that “there is no specific prohibition against the permanent or temporary admission to Canada of persons who are subject to, or who appear to be avoiding, compulsory military service in their homeland.”\textsuperscript{24} In official statements made overseas, this position was reiterated. Prime Minister Trudeau stated at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on March 25, 1969, that “[draft status] was an irrelevant question with regards to [Canada’s immigration] policy.”\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, 1969 was a landmark year in making sure that this open-door policy included military deserters as well as draft dodgers. On February 8, five Canadians attempted to enter Canada from five different border points, all impersonating an American Air Force deserter by the name of William John Heintzelman.\textsuperscript{26} Testimonies of their negative receptions at border points received extensive press coverage and contributed to a public outcry. Finally, in May, Immigration Minister Allan MacEachen announced that desertion would not be grounds for turning away immigrants from the U.S.\textsuperscript{27}

The Canadian government actively perpetuated the impression that Canada had undertaken a linear path towards the liberalization of its
immigration policy concerning draft dodgers and deserters. As a result, the metaphor of open gates or doors is often used to designate Canada’s reception of U.S. war resisters. Moreover, the federal government increasingly took initiative in the legal role that gatekeepers (in this case, border officers) played, especially through the instauration of the points system in 1967. Government policy with regards to draft dodgers and military deserters was strongly influenced by the fact that the draft dodger issue was clearly framed as a question of national sovereignty. From this perspective, the lack of active political action against draft dodgers and active government monitoring of border immigrations admittance was party due to the utility of draft-dodgers and war resisters as symbols of Canadian nationalism and of defiance vis-à-vis American pressure on Canada to ban draft-dodging Americans, to extradite them, or to assist in criminal investigations against them.

Draft dodgers became nationalist pawns in other ways as well. Canada saw the FBI’s incursions into its national borders in pursuit of draft dodgers as being a violation of its sovereignty. The 1966 Glen Biscoe case, which revolved around an alleged draft dodger from Port Moody B.C., is one that caught the national eye. The scandal was triggered by revelations that FBI agent Alfred Gunn, working out of Bellingham, Washington, crossed over the border to Vancouver to “check on” Biscoe. In response, Tommy Douglas, leader of the New Democratic Party and speaking in the House of Commons, asked if the government would “clarify the position of Canadian citizens,” noting that Biscoe’s case was not an isolated one. In response to Gunn’s actions, Canadian ambassador Charles Ritchie made a diplomatic trip to Washington, and Prime Minister Lester Pearson announced intentions to issue a full statement on the incident. The episode also led to the directive that an FBI agent could only speak to an alleged draft dodger in Canada in the presence of the RCMP. Although Biscoe himself was British, not American, his case put Canada on the defensive against American intelligence forays into its territory in pursuit of draft dodgers.

Moreover, the RCMP came under attack whenever they were perceived to be acting in concert with U.S. interests. Such was the case when Charles Blewett, a deserter who was questioned by RCMP after the Mounties received information about his whereabouts, was charged with making a false statement in connection with his admission to Canada. Indignant Canadians argued that the actions of the RCMP served no
domestic purpose and illustrated their servility to American interests. These cases, and many others, framed war resisters as a symbol of national sovereignty because these migrants had become caught in the crossfire of tensions between the RCMP and the FBI, and these tensions endangered the nationalist symbolism that the RCMP embodied. Therefore, refraining from persecuting American draft dodgers (at least publicly) once they were on Canadian territory saved the RCMP from losing its institutional symbolic force.

While war resisters and draft dodgers were used as personal symbols that signified independence and defiance towards the United States, a number among them were also cultural and political actors who reinforced the precepts of Canadian nationalism. These individuals saw Canada as a place to become “real,” reinforcing the Canadian nationalist perception of the nation as a “real place”; a lieu of authenticity and self-realization, and in novelist Margaret Atwood’s words, a “not-America.” Though a few draft dodgers saw Canada as a de facto colony of the United States, the fact that dissatisfaction with the American way of life motivated some American migrants to go north meant that they were participants in charting Canada’s route towards a vision of modernity that differed from that of its Southern neighbor. Indeed, as Churchill notes, a significant number of politically active American expatriates in Canada “converted” to Canadian nationalism, using it as a discursive arena for critiquing and rejecting the United States and, at the same time, for articulating commitment to their new homeland. Some Americans also adopted a Canadian nationalist perspective over time, through involvement in political causes such as local politics and new left-wing social movements.

The question of civic virtue framed arguments in favour of draft-dodgers and war resisters mostly in concepts and principles of utility. The fact that American immigrants tended to come from high-income families and to be educated certainly helped to endear them to Canadians, and the economic contributions of professional American immigrants were stressed by draft dodgers and their allies. Key in the discussion of civic virtue was the question of an immigrant’s loyalty. Draft dodgers and war resisters were frequently referred to as being “people without a country.” This identified them as exiles, whose main preoccupation was that of amnesty in the United States, rather than as “New Canadians.” Some Canadians feared that war resisters and draft dodgers took advantage of the safety that Canada offered without forming meaningful ties to the
Moreover, it was feared that individuals who ostensibly could not be loyal to their country of origin would correspondingly be disloyal to their receiving country. Those who believed this argued that American opponents to the war who were capable of forming national loyalties were those who stayed in their own country and attempted to effect change rather than immigrating. Herb Gott, who hosted a CBC radio program, reiterated this point, saying of heavyweight champion Muhammad Ali, who served a prison sentence for his refusal to serve, “at least he [stayed] in his own country and [stood] up with courage for what he [believed] in.”

War resisters and their allies responded by stressing the commitment of the former to mainstream Canadian civic values. Student Michael Wilkomir noted that migrant war resisters simultaneously “[gave] up the rights and obligations of U.S. citizenship,” and assumed the obligations of Canadian citizenship, having found Canadian policies “more acceptable.” In the same vein, as one Torontonian draft dodger claimed, “Draft dodgers become super-Canadians,” and, to justify his policy towards them, Pierre Elliott Trudeau claimed that they were “good […] orderly students” and that their intentions were not to “upset a particular order of things.”

Between 1965 and 1977, Canadians felt ambivalence about the arrival of draft dodgers. However, this framing of the draft dodger issue as a matter of national sovereignty played an important role in cutting through this ambivalence. After time, and as it became increasingly clear that prejudiced views of war resisters and draft dodgers were, in fact, misconceptions, these immigrants were eventually accepted as more of a benefit than a detriment to the Canadian project of national rule. It was because of this acceptance that many war resisters and draft dodgers remained in Canada, assimilated successfully into Canadian society, and assumed Canadian identities that superseded their American loyalties.
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Le fait anglais et français y a-t-il deux presses au Canada?

Éléna Choquette
«As presented by the broadcast media, Canada is in a state of deep schizophrenia: if English and French Canadians were on different planets, there could hardly be a greater contrast of views and information.»

Extrait du Rapport du Comité d’enquête sur le service national de radiodiffusion

Les normes et idéaux régissant l’industrie médiatique anglo-saxonne moderne, c’est-à-dire l’ensemble des valeurs qui encadrent le comportement des journalistes, semblent dominer nombre de salles de presse à travers le globe. Il suffit de penser aux normes d’«objectivité» ou «d’impartialité» dont presque tous les journalistes se réclament, surtout lorsque questionnés sur la légitimité de leurs publications. Or, l’essai suivant tente de montrer en quoi la définition du journalisme, tel qu’on l’entend aux États-Unis et dans la partie anglo-saxonne du territoire canadien, est essentiellement un héritage de la philosophie qui a organisé la presse britannique du 18e siècle. Selon Hanusch et d’autres universitaires, les différents paramètres circonscriptant le travail des journalistes seraient plutôt inféodés aux cultures nationales au sein desquelles il évolue.

En outre, cet essai vise à mener une étude comparée et systématique sur les cultures journalistiques canadienne-française et canadienne-anglaise à l’aide des instruments conceptuels élaborés par Hanitzsch dans Deconstructing Journalism Culture: Toward a Universal Theory. Il sera ainsi démontré que les deux cultures journalistiques se distinguent essentiellement par le rôle institutionnel qu’elles confèrent au journalisme, et à leurs approches épistémologiques respectives. La troisième dimension identifiée par Hanitzsch, soit l’idéologie éthique, semble, au contraire, mal expliquer les différences observées entre les cultures journalistiques francophone et anglophone du Canada. Il sera toutefois montré que quelques autres facteurs culturels et linguistiques peuvent aussi rendre compte d’une partie des différences entre les deux cultures journalistiques.

Différents journalismes

Bien entendu, il existe des similarités entre les rôles joués par les journalistes de la planète; certaines semblent défier les barrières géographiques, culturelles, sociales, religieuses et ethniques. Certains
chercheurs (anglo-saxons pour l’essentiel) seraient même tentés de croire que les structures organisationnelles, les procédés d’édition et les routines professionnelles sont les mêmes partout. Il n’est d’ailleurs plus surprenant d’entendre un journaliste se réclamer des valeurs dites universelles du monde journalistique, ayant souvent à voir avec la nécessité de demeurer objectifs, justes et impartiaux face aux faits à rapporter. Dans un article signé par Graham Fraser et Howard Ross, un ancien directeur-général de TVA, Michel Héroux, affirme qu’il n’y a effectivement pas de différences substantielles entre les philosophies de la nouvelle télédiffusée en français ou en anglais au Canada.

Or, en quoi le traitement médiatique anglo-canadien semble-il différer du franco-canadien à certains égards? Siegel, dans son étude comparative des nouvelles de la Société Radio-Canada (SRC) et de la Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) de 1977 a trouvé que les deux réseaux ont très peu en commun en ce qui concerne la nature de l’information et son traitement. Dans le rapport de la Commission Royale sur les Quotidiens, publié en 1981, Fletcher écrit que les événements politiques sont interprétés de manière radicalement différente par la presse francophone et anglophone. Finalement, au début des années 70, le Comité spécial du Sénat sur les moyens de communication en venait à la conclusion qu’au Québec, “The traditions, the audience preferences, the mythologies, the economics of publishing and broadcasting, all are shaped by the French fact.”

De semblables conclusions mènent nécessairement à la question suivante : Existe-il un seul monde journalistique au Canada, ou plutôt deux? Comme l’ont soutenus Hanitzsch et Elkin, cet essai tente de montrer en quoi les cultures journalistes diffèrent dans les parties anglo-saxonne et française du pays. Ce faisant, sera d’abord définie la culture journalistique, seront subséquemment décortiqués les rôles institutionnels que les différentes cultures journalistiques confèrent à leurs salles de presse, et sera finalement analysée l’importance que les journalistes accordent à l’objectivité

**Culture journalistique**

Si le concept de la «culture» a ailleurs été bien circonscrit, la «culture journalistique» se définit par la connaissance culturelle, ancrée dans la conscience de ceux qui l’exercent, soit les journalistes, constituant leur identité et leur fonction sociale. La culture journalistique représente ainsi un consensus sur ce qu’est un ‘véritable’ journaliste, et un ‘véritable’ journalisme. Quoiqu’elle change à travers le temps, cette culture maintient
son autorité sur la manière dont le journalisme est (et doit être) compris et exercé.

À partir de cette définition, on peut inférer la définition d’une culture journalistique *nationale*, une culture journalistique inscrite dans une région géographique et une période donnée\(^{13}\). Quoique les cultures journalistiques nationales ne soient pas forcément homogènes, on peut tout de même restreindre notre analyse à la culture journalistique *dominante*\(^{14}\). C’est ce que nous ferons pour les cultures journalistiques propres aux sociétés anglo-saxonne et française du Canada.

**Les rôles institutionnels**

La première dimension identifiée par Hanitzsch pour arriver à saisir l’essence des différentes cultures est le rôle institutionnel qu’une société offre à son industrie journalistique\(^{15}\). Par le passé, les cultures journalistiques nationales ont attribué à l’industrie journalistique un rôle de participant/plaideur dans les affaires publiques, ou encore un rôle de reporter, confiné à la stricte observation et à la plus complète neutralité. Cette dimension se décompose en trois aspects, (a) l’interventionnisme sur le plan politique, (b) la position vis-à-vis du pouvoir, et (c) la position face au profit de l’industrie.

Ces trois dimensions sont définies par trois spectres, s’étirant entre deux extrêmes que l’on ne rencontre que rarement au sein des cultures journalistiques. Nous examinerons la position des cultures journalistiques des communautés anglo-saxonne et française sur ces trois axes.

**Interventionnisme**

Si la norme prescrite par la culture journalistique anglo-saxonne s’approche de l’extrémité «détachement/désintérêt complet» plutôt que de celui de «participation active/militantisme»\(^{16}\) sur le spectre de l’interventionnisme des journalistes dans les affaires publiques, il en va autrement pour la culture journalistique francophone. En effet, à travers l’héritage de la culture journalistique de la France (coloniale et contemporaine) et de la situation sociopolitique (impériale et actuelle) du Québec, la culture journalistique canadienne-française tend moins vers cet idéal anglo-saxon du détachement vis-à-vis l’engagement politique.

Il est d’abord vraisemblable que le Québec ait hérité d’une partie de la culture médiatique de la France du 19\(^{ème}\) siècle, largement influencée par les sphères littéraires et politiques\(^{17}\). En effet, comme l’explique Chalaby
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dans son article intitulé *Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention*, l’importance et le prestige du milieu littéraire et politique français ont retardé l’arrivée du ton neutre et du style télégraphique de la nouvelle anglo-saxonne à l’intérieur des frontières françaises : “A significant proportion of French journalists continued to write in the tradition of publicists, writing to propagate political doctrines and defend the interests of a particular political group.”

Les conditions sociales, politiques et économiques de la fin du 19ème ont également contribué à forger l’actuelle culture journalistique du Québec. Comme l’explique Gagnon, les journalistes les plus illustres de l’époque étaient, d’abord et avant tout, de brillants politiciens et orateurs. Puisqu’à cette époque la presse s’avérait être le médium le mieux adapté pour influencer l’opinion publique, plusieurs esprits engagés s’y sont adonnés. La nécessité de solutionner le problème de la faiblesse des revenus générés par la vente de journaux ont aussi fait basculer le camp des journalistes dans celui des partis politiques et celui de l’Église catholique; pour gagner une rémunération décente, les journalistes se sont fait les auteurs de textes parfois très partisans ou très pieux. De Bonville ajoute que les déclarations soi-disant «‘indépendantes’ émanent souvent d’un journaliste partisan qui espérait mieux convaincre sous le couvert de la neutralité».

Même au milieu du 20ème siècle, la presse canadienne-française continue de disséminer les idées largement partisanes, sans toutefois supporter expressément un parti politique.

Les mêmes conditions sociales, politiques et économiques ont amené les journalistes à revendiquer des avantages financiers de leurs employeurs. L’isolation linguistique des journalistes de langue française ne leur permettait pas de quitter la province pour obtenir de meilleures conditions salariales. Au contraire, leurs homologues anglophones pouvaient jouir d’une mobilité professionnelle significative. Pour cette raison, les premiers se sont regroupés pour revendiquer différentes prérogatives professionnelles. Non seulement les journalistes cherchaient-ils ainsi à gagner davantage en termes financiers, mais ils cherchaient aussi à obtenir plus de latitude éditoriale. À ce sujet, Taras rappelle que l’industrie médiatique a été touchée par de nombreuses grèves, dont celles des journalistes de *La Presse* en 1958, 1964 et en 1977, en plus du lockout de 1971. En plus de leur conférer un plus grand contrôle sur les couleurs éditoriales de leurs articles, le militantisme des journalistes les aurait encouragé à embrasser des positions politiques claires vis-à-vis le

Aujourd’hui, ces influences se traduisent par le principe normatif selon lequel les journalistes canadiens-français peuvent conserver un semblant de droit de regard sur les débats publics du Québec29, notamment par le biais de l’entrelacement du commentaire et de la nouvelle. Du reste, plusieurs politiciens francophones sont encore aujourd’hui issus du monde journalistique et vice versa30. René Levesque en est surement l’exemple le plus saillant, mais on peut aujourd’hui penser à Bernard Drainville31, Christine St-Pierre32 ou Gérard Deltell33.

Gagnon écrit que cette conjoncture peut être due au rôle institutionnel conféré au monde journalistique qui le presse de «former», par l’interprétation, plus que d’«informer» l’opinion publique québécoise34. Je propose, pour conclure cette section, que la composante «interventionnisme» soit celle qui explique le mieux, à elle seule, les différences entre les cultures journalistiques anglo-saxonnes et françaises au Canada.

Distance vis-à-vis le pouvoir

Hanitzsch propose que l’on compare les cultures journalistiques entre elles à l’aide du deuxième instrument conceptuel qu’est la position face du pouvoir. Le continuum vise à mesurer le degré de confrontation qu’offre l’institution médiatique au gouvernement en place. Le journalisme qui remet l’autorité gouvernementale en question a une longue histoire dans le nord de l’Amérique. Du reste, l’industrie journalistique est souventqualifiée de «quatrième pouvoir» ou de «chien de garde de la démocratie»35. Fletcher ajoute que, tout comme les reporters australiens et britanniques, les reporters anglo-canadiens considèrent qu’une partie essentielle de leur travail consiste à demeurer sceptiques, et hostiles même, par rapport aux politiques et positions gouvernementales, suggérant du coup qu’il existe un genre une tradition à travers l’ensemble des pays du Commonwealth quant à l’exercice de la profession de journalistes36.

Bien que les journalistes travaillaient autrefois à promouvoir de
la manière la plus loyale possible les plateformes des partis politiques qui les finançaient\textsuperscript{37}, les journalistes canadiens-francophones sont aujourd’hui plutôt perçus comme étant des critiques efficaces du pouvoir gouvernemental\textsuperscript{38}. Taras écrit que, toutefois, “The French press has a natural tendency to side with the government when this government is under attack from outside,”\textsuperscript{39} signifiant que les journalistes pourraient adopter certaines attitudes visant à légitimer les instances et décisions gouvernementales. Selon Fletcher, l’industrie médiatique québécoise s’est investie de la mission de défendre les intérêts de ceux qui partagent sa langue et sa culture vis-à-vis du reste du Canada\textsuperscript{40}. La relation de complicité entre le gouvernement et la presse serait même une « dimension importante de la crise identitaire canadienne\textsuperscript{41} »\textsuperscript{42}. Il est toutefois permis de conclure que, malgré quelques soupçons dirigés à l’égard des journalistes québécois lorsque leur gouvernement est l’objet de critiques étrangères, les deux cultures journalistiques du Canada ont intégré une vision «antagoniste» face au pouvoir en place.

\textit{Orientations entrepreneuriales}

La dernière dimension institutionnelle étudiée par Hanitzsch est l’orientation lucrative de l’industrie médiatique. D’un côté du spectre, les journalistes s’affairent à couvrir ce que les acheteurs veulent savoir (dans l’objectif de générer des revenus pour l’entreprise), alors que de l’autre, les journalistes travaillent exclusivement à rapporter ce que les citoyens doivent savoir pour, par exemple, faire un choix éclairé aux prochaines élections\textsuperscript{43}.

Il semble dangereux de tenter d’associer l’une ou l’autre des cultures journalistiques à l’un ou l’autre des extrêmes, d’autant plus que ces deux pôles ne sont pas mutuellement exclusifs. Il est assurément vrai que l’industrie de la presse anglophone a longtemps été plus lucrative que son homologue francophone\textsuperscript{44}, mais il n’en demeure pas moins que la concentration des entreprises médiatiques et leur rentabilisation est aujourd’hui la réalité journalistique, francophone ou anglophone\textsuperscript{45}.

En guise de conclusion provisoire, notons que l’aspect institutionnel explique bien les différences dont font preuve les cultures journalistiques les plus proéminentes au Canada, notamment à travers les spectres d’interventionnisme dans les affaires publiques et d’antagonismes envers les forces au pouvoir. La section suivante s’affaire à déconstruire l’aspect épistémologique des cultures médiatiques et en évaluer l’utilité pour
expliquer les différences culturelles de l’univers journalistique.

**Approches épistémologiques**

L’approche épistémologique peut être définie par la manière dont les journalistes arrivent à connaître, la manière dont ils appréhendent et traitent dans leurs écrits, la réalité politique de leur milieu. L’approche épistémologique vise à comprendre la manière dont les professionnels du métier justifient leurs croyances, se réclament de l’objectivité et discernent le vrai du faux, le probable du factuel. Cette approche est importante à considérer puisque “The legitimacy of journalism is intimately bound up with claims to knowledge and truth.”

**Objectivité**

Le premier aspect, et le plus important, de la dimension épistémologique des cultures journalistiques est la notion d’« objectivité ». Elle est définie par Hanitzsch à partir d’un spectre allant de la « réalité factuelle » jusqu’à la « réalité construite ».

Le monde anglo-saxon semble s’attacher à rapporter la réalité qu’il veut factuelle, c’est-à-dire qui existe indépendamment de la perception que l’on a d’elle ou des biais qu’on y accole. Historiquement, les journalistes américains et britanniques auraient d’ailleurs inventé les pratiques journalistes « discursives, centrées sur les faits » en fabriquant les articles journalistiques américains (et britanniques, dans une moindre mesure) du 19ème siècle étaient écrits à partir de nombreuses entrevues, et construits autour de déclarations factuelles, qui contrastaient avec les spéculations mal-informées courantes dans la presse française.

Au Canada, Taras avance l’argument selon lequel La Presse Canadienne (PC) a grandement contribué à inculquer une culture d’objectivité au sein de l’industrie de la presse anglo-saxonne, et ce, dès sa création en 1917. La PC aurait ainsi normalisé le contenu et le style journalistique en établissant les critères d’une dépêche «standard» qui correspond aux besoins de tous les journaux du pays : selon Taras, “The CP “sausage machine” relentlessly stripped away local flavour, colourful language, and political rhetoric.” La Presse Canadienne n’offrira pas de services continus en français avant 1951.

Les journalistes francophones du Canada auraient plutôt adopté l’idée selon laquelle la nouvelle est une représentation du monde, parmi d’autres, qu’on a préféré, traité, voire construit. L’idée de la compétition
des subjectivités est beaucoup plus près de la manière dont les journalistes québécois semblent entrevoir la quête de la vérité, essentielle à leur mandat professionnel.

Historiquement, cela s’explique. La notion même de la liberté d’expression dans la France du 18\è siècle impliquait le droit de chacun de disséminer leurs opinions, aussi partisanes soient-elles. Au contraire, la liberté d’expression dans l’industrie de la presse anglo-saxonne se voulait être le serviteur et le reflet de l’opinion publique\(^56\). Qui plus est, les journalistes français avaient rarement accès aux sources des nouvelles anglaises, les décideurs politiques refusant souvent de répondre aux questions des journalistes. Ces premiers préféraient écrire des articles eux-mêmes, ou publier leurs discours textuellement\(^57\). On ne saurait d’ailleurs mettre trop d’accent sur le fait que la France d’alors pratiquait (et le Canada-français a subséquemment emboité le pas) une confusion de deux genres journalistiques, le commentaire et la nouvelle. En conséquence, les journaux français étaient plus marqués par l’opinion et d’actualité commentée.

Rieffel et Watine écrivent que, aujourd’hui, la France et le Québec sont témoins d’un intérêt renouvelé pour la nouvelle dite intersubjective. À travers une analyse du format utilisé par les journalistes du *Devoir* et de *La Presse* pour renvoyer aux propos de leurs intervenants, soit le discours rapporté direct ou indirect, les auteurs en viennent à la conclusion que le journaliste, plus que jamais, « engage son identité sociale et professionnelle »\(^58\) dans sa mission professionnelle et l’inscrit dans ses textes\(^59\). Tout ceci est d’autant plus vrai aujourd’hui que la forte concurrence médiatique et l’abondance de l’information contraint les journalistes « à se distinguer en affichant plus ouvertement plus de subjectivité »\(^60\).

**Empirisme**

La dimension empirique des cultures journalistiques, c’est-à-dire les moyens utilisés pour parvenir aux vérités que les journalistes souhaitent publier, peut aussi être utilisée pour différencier les cultures journalistiques. Selon lui, l’empirisme se mesure grâce à la dichotomie «empirisme/analyse»\(^61\).

La justification empirique des énoncés mis de l’avant par les journalistes priorise la mesure, les preuves factuelles, l’observation et l’expérience sensorielle. Selon Carlin, envoyé spécial pour CBC Radio News, cette sorte de justification est largement privilégiée dans la culture journalistique anglo-saxonne\(^62\).
Par opposition, les justifications analytiques des affirmations journalistiques mettent en valeur l’argumentation rationnelle, les idées, les valeurs, l’opinion et l’analyse. Selon plusieurs, cette manière de faire, héritée du journalisme français, est aussi propre à la presse canadienne-française. Gagnon ajoute qu’au Québec, les journalistes ont tendance à traiter l’information de manière plus conceptuelle, et non pas seulement en termes d’événements et de personnages.

En somme, l’approche épistémologique contribue à la conceptualisation des différences entre les cultures journalistiques francophone et anglophone au Canada, essentiellement à travers la démonstration d’un fort attachement de la dernière pour la (re)présentation fidèle de la réalité sensorielle à travers une démarche empirique, et d’une tendance historique des premiers vers l’intersubjectivité et l’analyse rationnelle de l’information apportée par les réalités politiques.

**Conception de l’éthique**

Le dernier des aspects proposé par Hanitzsch concerne la manière dont les théories morales sont appréhendées et institutionnalisées dans les cultures journalistiques nationales. Concrètement, ce volet cherche à déterminer ce qu’il y a de commun et de systématique dans les décisions que les journalistes prennent lorsqu’ils se retrouvent face à des dilemmes éthiques.

La première dimension, le relativisme, vise à mesurer la possibilité, telle qu’elle apparait aux professionnels, que les décisions individuelles puissent être prises à la lumière de préceptes moraux universaux. La deuxième, l’idéalisme, repose sur les conséquences des décisions prises. Si certains croient que de bons résultats puissent être ultimement obtenus même s’ils impliquent un quelconque mal dans le processus, d’autres croient qu’aucun moyen préjudiciable ne peut être employé, même dans le cas où les résultats de la démarche pourraient s’avérer substantiels.

Des pratiques moralement douteuses peuvent-elles ainsi être justifiées pour mener une enquête journalistique à bien, pour les journalistes francophones ou leurs homologues anglophones?

Quoique *L’Éthique de l’Information* de Saint-Amant constitue un ouvrage de référence en ce qui a trait aux mœurs des journalistes québécois, peu de recherches universitaires portent véritablement sur une étude comparée de la conception théorique de l’éthique telle qu’elle évolue au sein des cultures journalistiques francophone et anglophone.
Il peut néanmoins être affirmé que les deux cultures semblent permettre certaines pratiques, telle la protection des sources anonymes. Or, il ne semble pas nécessairement y avoir consensus, même entre adhérents à une même culture, lorsque vient le temps de justifier l’achat d’information, le harcèlement, l’utilisation non-autorisée de documents, etc.\textsuperscript{66}

Il pourrait être possible de se rabattre sur l’étude des codes déontologiques qui font autorité au sein des cultures journalistiques en question. Or, il faudrait investir temps et effort pour faire ressortir les principes qui sous-tendent les codes déontologiques de la Fédération professionnelle des journalistes du Québec, de l’Association Canadienne des Journalistes, ou les décisions du Conseil de Presse du Québec. Il peut cependant être noté que les normes qui prévalent à la SRC et à la CBC sont les mêmes, et sont détaillées dans leur politique journalistique\textsuperscript{67}.

En somme, il semble que la conception éthique inscrite dans les cultures journalistiques nationales ne soit pas à la source de leurs plus substantielles différences.

**Autres déterminants culturels**

Quelques autres déterminants d’une culture journalistique sont toutefois négligés par la théorie de Hanitzsch, dont la mécanique de la langue. En effet, la structure, la phonétique et la grammaire de la langue pourraient être une partie de la justification des différences culturelles des industries anglo-saxonnes et francophone du Canada. En effet, pour justifier la nature moins «agressive» de la couverture canadienne-français, Michel Guénard, un ancien journaliste pour le réseau TVA, a fait allusion à la structure de la langue de Molière\textsuperscript{68}. De manière analogue, Palmer conclut que la langue de Shakespeare est la langue la plus «médiatique» en ce qu’elle est très flexible, riche en mots monosyllabiques et en ce que son vocabulaire précis permet une économie de mots, lesquels sont organisés en phrases courtes et efficaces\textsuperscript{69}.

D’autres facteurs pourraient également expliquer les différentes cultures journalistiques, tels que la culture individualiste, par opposition à collective, cette dernière étant plus valorisée par les Canadiens-français que par leurs homologues anglophones\textsuperscript{70}. On pourrait également tenter de tirer une explication du niveau d’aversion de chaque société vis-à-vis l’incertitude\textsuperscript{71}, mais généralement, ces distinctions ne permettent pas de distinguer les cultures journalistiques à l’étude.
Conclusion

Les cultures journalistiques semblent ainsi bien inféodées aux expériences, croyances, valeurs, attitudes et significations nationales, aux pratiques locales, et aux histoires sociales, politiques et économiques particulières. En conséquence, l’idée que l’on se fait de la définition « universelle » du journalisme correspond le plus souvent aux normes anglo-américaines de l’industrie. Il n’en reste pourtant pas moins que l’univers de la presse francophone conserve certains traits propres à elle, notamment grâce à sa langue et à sa culture.

Ceci n’est pas sans conséquence. Des arguments élaborés précédemment, il faut sûrement considérer l’influence que les cultures nationales ont les unes sur les autres. Pour quelque raison que ce soit, certaines cultures journalistiques tendent à primer sur les autres72. Ce fut notamment le cas de la culture journalistique anglo-saxonne, qui a réussi avec le temps à devenir la culture journalistique par défaut, non seulement dans le Canada anglais, mais presque partout en Occident.
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In the introduction to Canadian Cultural Poesis, George Sherbert states that, “accepting the lack of a universal Canadian identity as an empty place, offers a more hospitable version of cultural identity because it compels all Canadian cultural groups to negotiate their identity on an ongoing basis.” This notion of negotiating an often fragmented and disparate Canadian cultural identity is at the forefront of the Sobey Art Award exhibition, as many of the featured finalists’ artworks exemplify attempts to visually articulate their sense of “Canadian self-hood.” This theme is particularly resonant in Karen Tam’s Kitschy Kitchen Mao and Children’s Toxic Playroom, Brendan Lee Satish Tang’s Manga Ormolu vers. 5.0-e and 5.0-C and Brendan Fernandes’ Neo-Primitivism II. These works can be considered on both a micro- and a macro-level. On a micro-level, the specific works can be investigated in terms of the physical materials and objects, or rather cultural artifacts, presented as evidence to be read by the audience in order to determine the artist’s immaterial sense of identity. On a macro-level, they can be discussed in terms of their place within the framework of the Canadian cultural industry as well, how the Sobey exhibit conforms to the branding of Canada as a “multi-cultural mosaic.” These levels of analysis will be paired with Ralph Rugoff’s essay More than Meets the Eye and Aidan While’s Locating Art Worlds: London and the Making of Young British Art respectively, in order to ground the Sobey artworks within the context of conceptual art history, and to reveal how traditions of art-worlds, art-making and art-reception have informed these pieces.

I have selected these particular works for my analysis as I felt the artists’ use of cultural artifacts make their work particularly dependent on the viewer’s ability to recognize these artifacts’ cultural significance in order to understand the artists’ motives, ideas and ultimately, their personal disposition towards cultural identity. Karen Tam’s Children’s Toxic Playroom and Kitschy Kitchen Mao, two of Tam’s Pagoda-Pads, are room-sized installations saturated with objects and furniture which Karen believes exemplifies “traditional Chinese-ness.” An inventory check between these two rooms yields a broad range of objects from photographs of China’s communist-party leader, Mao, to Chinese children books, action-films and karaoke tapes. Though Tam’s décor was collected from real-life Canadian-Chinese households and Montreal’s Chinatown, ultimately these are false environments and merely play on the Westerner’s consumption of Chinoiserie or items which are seemingly reflective of
The ways in which individual viewers navigate these false-environments, a navigation encouraged by Tam, is compromised by the cultural baggage one brings to her pagoda pads. However, a common attribute of the viewing experience is the spectator’s use of a “scanning gaze” to search the objects for clues. In his essay *More than Meets the Eye*, Ralph Rugoff coins the term “Forensic Aesthetic” to describe a mode of aesthetic perception that marks objects as a diffuse set of clues lingering from a past action. The spectator is forced to immerse himself or herself in the art as they try to assemble a complete-picture, or rather a sense of gestalt. In Tam’s case the clues presented are the abundance of *chinoiserie* objects scattered across her rooms. However, rather than aiding the viewer-turned-detective, these cultural artifacts lead them astray, as a result of the objects’ misrepresentation of the “Chinese-Canadian” identity. Fortunately, this confusion is rectified by knowledge of Tam’s specific past actions and motives in assembling these false environments. Furthermore, Tam’s installations make a case for one’s attempt to define oneself through commodities, as well as how one (falsely) attempts to define others. This notion of misidentification leads to a transformation of the viewer from neutral witness observing Tam’s pagoda pads to a culprit made guilty by their false assumptions of the pads as genuine “Chinese” personal dwellings. The viewer’s experience of inhabiting these false-environments highlights the way in which, as Canadians, we live in close proximity to individuals with different cultural histories. However, as Tam warns, we must tread carefully through the space of others, and be wary of misjudging the so-called “markers” of another person’s culture.

Brendan Fernandes makes a similar case for the use of commodities and the ways in which they stand in as signifiers of one’s cultural identity. *Neo-Primitivism II* features plastic deer with white “African” masks on their faces, set against the backdrop of a vinyl white picket fence made of spears. Fernandes’ installation also relies on the viewer’s ability (or inability) to discern the cultural significance of this seemingly random array of objects. Fernandes is of Goan ancestry and is a Kenyan immigrant. Through this combination of cultural signifiers, Fernandes sought to highlight the transitory nature and hybrid formation of new identities upon arrival in Canada. The deer masks are actually of a specific tribe, the Nairobi tribe, but to the uninformed viewer they merely fall under the umbrella of “African” artifact. On the other hand, the vinyl spears are based on their lack of materiality (they are two-
dimensional) and were purchased by his parents on leaving Kenya. These two signifiers of so-called “African-ness” are paired with the deer decoy, a symbol of Canadian wilderness. As in Tam’s piece, the viewer is once again immersed in an environment of artifacts that are not necessarily as they seem and is forced again into the role of detective. Fernandes employs objects characterized by their plasticity and juxtaposes them against one another to highlight the falsehoods and absurdities that arise out of interpreting our own and another person’s identity, especially within Canada. Fernandes’ piece illustrates “the curious mechanism by which an artifact’s meaning is uncannily doubled […] where much of this century found objects have been reframed to take on meanings that have little to do with their everyday use.” The lack of use-value of these plastic objects is transformed within the gallery space, which presents them as relevant objects, or clues, reflective of Fernandes’ self-perception of his cultural identity. Like Tam’s installations, these cultural clues arranged by Fernandes serve as vestiges of past-action, where their contingency on their history is important to solving the piece.

Lastly, Tang’s Manga Ormolu vers. 5.0e and 5.0c further exemplify notions of cultural hybridity through a mixture of high- and low-brow materials which characterize the Westerner’s perception of the “orient.” In Tang’s case, he crafts together ceramic sculptures that fuse Ming-dynasty porcelain and Manga into one disfigured object. His crafting technique represents “the French tradition of ormulu, a practice that originated in the 18th-century when antique porcelain vessels were imported from Asia and decorated with high karat gold.” Tang subverts this French elitist practice through the synthesis of the vessels with low-brow manga-esque elements. I chose these two specific versions as they were particularly reminiscent of the human body, where the porcelain can be thought to resemble a torso, with the Manga elements jutting out as limbs. This resemblance to the human body exemplifies the entanglement between self-hood and materiality. Tang’s sculptures, once again, require the viewer’s active participation to read the materials as evidence of the cultural practice of ormulu and their relationship to Western perceptions of the Orient. As in Tam’s piece, the Western viewer is confronted with their distorted notion of “the Orient” as well as Tang’s concern with the impossibility of “pure” culture, a concern perhaps motivated by his ethnic background, as an Irish-born Trinidadian-Canadian.

The use of culturally borrowed materials in these six art works
exemplifies the contemporary custom of the “forensically aestheticized” art-object. However, the artworks also comply with a secondary tradition: the ways in which a specific cultural climate affects the display and creation of artwork. This tradition is discussed in Aidan While’s *Locating Art Worlds: London and the Making of Young British Art*. Though While’s essay focuses specifically on the conditions which permitted London, England to become a reigning “art center” and the formation of YBA, the effects of culture on art production and notions of cultural branding are relevant to a discussion of Canada’s Sobey Art Award. First, the award selection is reminiscent of the “official patronage systems of salon prizes, juries and commissions” present in other urban art centers, such as Paris and London, where the prestige of being one of the “best Canadian artists” is in part determined by one’s ability to network with established dealers, commercial gallery directors and curators. As well, the Musée d’Art Contemporain, as a renowned art institution within downtown Montreal, confers further prestige on the artworks and artists. Following this prerequisite to even entering the contest, the judging panel appears to have had a specific agenda in the selection of finalists, based on the trending theme of “Canadian-Cultural Identity” within the aforementioned art works. This trend exemplifies While’s notion of “bolstering the cultural image of a nation, city or region;” in this case, the image of Canada as a “multi-cultural mosaic,” ripe with diversity. The Sobey judging panel’s focus on this aspect of Canada is consistent with the interests of other non-art related sectors within the Canadian cultural industry; for instance, “Heritage Minutes” or CBC’s “Canada: A People’s History” or , which attempt to highlight the migrant and diverse background of Canadians. Furthermore, the Sobey art exhibit exemplifies While’s notion of contextual contingency, where the packaging of the YBA as “cool Britannia” was consistent with the “hip” characterization of the urban end of London during the 1960s.” As While states, “As centers of social and cultural foment, the urban experience of certain city-regions at certain moments in history has stimulated distinctive ways of seeing as well as being.” This contingency on specific cultural environments underlies Tam, Tang and Fernandes’ work, where the common experience of being from different backgrounds within Canada has acted as a major influence on their respective artworks. Though their works are deeply personal and individual, within the framework of the Canadian arts and cultural industry they are indicative of an issue that exists across the nation. This issue of
hybrid, and often misconceived, identity is one that is ever more prevalent within the current time-frame of the 21st century as immigration and multi-racial families become increasingly common.

In conclusion, Canadian cultural identity is framed as hybrid, diverse and often distorted, within the artworks themselves, and as a result of the artists’ personal experience and the Sobey art exhibit itself. Tam’s, Tang’s and Fernandes’ artworks present identity as something that their audiences discern, or rather falsely discern, from commodities and specific materials, which, when presented in a gallery setting, engage the viewer as a cultural detective. Furthermore, this confusing conception of “Canadian” identity can be attributed to cultural ambassadors, such as the Sobey art award judges, who promote a typical brand-image of Canada as a “multi-cultural mosaic.”
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Justice Plenipotentiary
The Role of the Judiciary in the Making of Canadian Foreign Policy

David Zuluaga
The Westminster system of government is characterized by the fusion of the legislative and executive branches of government. In such a system of government, there are limited mechanisms of counterbalance to restrain the will of the government. This paper intends to engage in a brief review of the role that the judiciary has had in shaping Canadian foreign policy, and to demonstrate that the judiciary—in its role of interpreting the constitution—is one of the most important checks on the power of the government to pursue its foreign policy agenda.

The *British North America Act of 1867* (hereinafter the *Constitution Act, 1867*), is a document primarily concerned with the relationship between federal and provincial orders of government. In 1875, the federal government chose to create a general court of appeal to arbitrate disputes—an umpire of federalism. Although it was created nine years after Confederation, the Supreme Court of Canada did not become this country’s highest-ranking court until 1949, when the government of Louis St. Laurent ended appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC) in London. Until then, as the court of last resort, the JCPC had the power to overturn Supreme Court decisions, and the last judgment binding on Canadian law was not pronounced by the JCPC until 1959. In the eighty years that the JCPC played an active role in Canadian jurisprudence, it had the opportunity to set important precedents that have greatly influenced the making of Canadian foreign policy.

**Umpire of Federalism**

When the Fathers of Confederation drafted the *Constitution Act, 1867*, they had a vision of Canada that placed it firmly within a larger British Empire. There is little mention made of foreign relations in the legislation, as it was assumed that Canada’s foreign policy would be the prerogative of officials from the Imperial Parliament. The only provision in the Act that dealt with external relations was Section 132, which empowered the federal parliament to implement into Canadian law only those treaties that had been negotiated by an Imperial Executive responsible solely to the Imperial Parliament in London. It did not set out rules for treaties negotiated by the local government. This constitutional vacuum, trivial at the time of Confederation, became an important point of contention between the federal and provincial orders of government, when the responsibility for the conduct of the external affairs of Canada was entrusted to the dominion.

The First World War dealt a fatal blow to proposed plans of
establishing a common foreign policy for the entire British Empire, with input from all member nations. This set the dominions on a course towards independence from Great Britain. At the Imperial Conference of 1926, pressured by Prime Ministers W.L. Mackenzie King from Canada and J.B.M. Hertzog from South Africa, the British government issued a declaration—known also as the Balfour Declaration—that recognized the status of each dominion as a sovereign nation within the British Commonwealth. The Statute of Westminster in 1931 formally severed colonial ties, authorising each dominion parliament to enact laws having extra-territorial operation and stating that no British law would have effect in the dominions unless the local governments explicitly desired it. Effectively, Westminster meant that the responsibility for the conduct of Canadian external affairs devolved onto the local government.

The Constitution Act, 1867 did not explicitly set out what order of government—provincial or federal—would have exclusive power to conduct Canada’s foreign relations. Laura Barnett, writing for the Library of Parliament, explains, “The [federal] executive branch is the only branch of government with the authority to negotiate, sign, and ratify international conventions and treaties.” However, if any contract with a foreign state requires a change to domestic law, only Parliament may modify the existing legislation. The dispute that arose in the late 1930s was whether the federal parliament, in an attempt to honour Canada’s external obligations, could legislate in matters that were part of provincial jurisdiction per the Constitution Act, 1867.

In 1937, in the Labour Conventions Case, the JCPC ruled that the federal government could not intrude in matters of provincial concern simply by agreeing to an international treaty. The Judicial Committee declined extending Section 132 to treaties negotiated by the national government by stating that, although the framers could not have foreseen that Canada would one day negotiate its own treaties, “It is impossible to strain the section as to cover the uncontemplated event.” Another argument advanced by the government, that the power to implement treaties flowed from the Peace, Order, and Good Government Clause in Section 91 of the Constitution Act, 1867, was also rejected by the court, as their Lordships judged such authority to threaten the federal-provincial division of powers and the guarantees established in the constitution for provincial autonomy. Writing for the court, Lord Atkin argued that “The Dominion cannot merely by making promises to foreign countries clothe itself with
legislative authority inconsistent with the constitution which gave it birth [...] While the ship of state now sails on larger ventures and into foreign waters she still retains the water-tight compartments which are an essential part of her original structure.” This means that the implementation of a treaty, if it requires action in an area of provincial competence, must be done in concert with each of the provincial legislative assemblies. The federal government, while still empowered to sign any treaty it wishes, would leave the Canadian state in default of its international obligations if it neglects to seek provincial approval before ratifying an international convention that is concerned with matters of provincial jurisdiction. Thus, treaty implementation and compliance are an area of federal, provincial, and territorial responsibility. The narrow definition of the Constitution Act, 1867 presented by the JCPC in the Labour Conventions ruling is understood best in light of the federal balance of power the court sought to maintain. It ensured that the federal executive was forced to respect provincial rights guaranteed in the Constitution Act, 1867. This early form of intervention would foreshadow judicial action when the constitution was amended to include protected rights for individuals.

Constitutional Supremacy

A remarkable feature of the Constitution Act, 1982 was that it included an entrenched bill of rights, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Charter, as well as the larger Constitution Act, 1982, marked a change in government in Canada from a system of parliamentary supremacy to one of constitutional supremacy. Section 52(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982 establishes that “The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect.” Moreover, Section 24(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982 allows the judiciary to provide to those individuals who claim to be victims of a Charter violation a remedy “as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances.” Given the new constraints on the actions of both federal and provincial agents, the Supreme Court revised its stated purpose as the umpire of federalism to that of guardian of the constitution.

The Court’s ruling in Operation Dismantle v. R. (1985) is paramount to understanding the role the Charter plays in the external affairs of Canada. In Operation Dismantle, a coalition of non-governmental organizations, unions, and pressure groups challenged the federal cabinet’s decision to allow the United States to test cruise missiles in Canada. The
appellants argued that such a policy violated their right to life, liberty, and security of the person under Section 7 of the Charter by increasing the risk of nuclear conflict.¹⁵ Although the court ruled in the government’s favour, the judgement provided an important foundational statement on the constraints that the Charter places on the Crown’s prerogative power. Justice Bertha Wilson wrote in her decision:

If the Court were simply being asked to express its opinion on the wisdom of the executive’s exercise of its defence powers in this case, the Court would have to decline. It cannot substitute its opinion for that of the executive to whom the decision-making power is given by the Constitution[...]. The question before us is not whether the government’s defence policy is sound but whether or not it violates the appellants’ rights under s. 7 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is a totally different question. I do not think there can be any doubt that this is a question for the courts[...]. I do not think it is open to [the Court] to relinquish its jurisdiction either on the basis that the issue is inherently non-justiciable or that it raises a so-called ‘political question.’¹⁶

As a corollary of this decision, it is now a well-established principle in Canadian jurisprudence that the actions of the executive government in the conduct of external affairs are justiciable under the Charter, and that the court retains the discretion, in the event of a constitutional violation, to prescribe a remedy per Section 24(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982.¹⁷

The Extradition Question

The early seventies found the United States and Canada in the middle of negotiations on a new extradition treaty between the two countries. The previous agreement, the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, dated back to 1842, and it was judged that the two nations were in need of an accord that better reflected modern realities.¹⁸ At the time, U.S. officials were experimenting with a temporary ban against the use of the death penalty. At the request of the Nixon administration, Article 6 of the agreement was written out to specify:

When the offense for which extradition is requested is punishable by death under the laws of the requesting State and
the laws of the requested State do not permit such punishment for that offense, extradition may be refused unless the requesting State provides such assurances as the requested State considers sufficient that the death penalty shall not be imposed, or, if imposed, shall not be executed.\textsuperscript{19}

The Canadian government acceded to these terms, and the \textit{Extradition Treaty between Canada and the United States} was signed on 3 December 1971.

The \textit{Extradition Treaty} gave rise to a series of \textit{Charter} challenges in the late 1980s. Joseph Kindler was convicted of first-degree murder by a Pennsylvania court in 1984. After being sentenced to death, Kindler escaped from a maximum-security prison and crossed the border into Québec. Canadian police arrested him in New Brunswick in 1988.\textsuperscript{20} The United States asked the Minister of Justice to issue an order of extradition, which was granted.\textsuperscript{21} However, before he could be deported, Kindler filed a suit against the Canadian government claiming that the Minister was constitutionally bound by Section 7 of the \textit{Charter} to seek assurances from the United States that Kindler would not be put to death. Although Kindler was a U.S. citizen, it had been established by the Supreme Court in \textit{Singh v. R.} (1985) that the rights guaranteed by Section 7 apply to every person physically present in Canada, independent of their immigration status in this country.\textsuperscript{22} While the Kindler case made its way through the courts, a second incident brought national attention to the extradition question. Charles Ng, a former U.S. Marine, was arrested in Calgary in 1985. Ng was wanted for twelve counts of murder in the state of California, which could result in a death sentence if convicted.\textsuperscript{23} As in the Kindler case, the United States sought to have Ng transferred into U.S. custody, and the Minister of Justice of Canada issued an order of extradition without seeking Article 6 assurances from his U.S. counterparts.\textsuperscript{24} When Ng appealed to the courts, the Canadian government referred the case to the Supreme Court to be heard concurrently with the Kindler appeal. The Minister of Justice defended the government’s actions by arguing that “Article 6 assurances should only be sought in special circumstances [...] As a matter of public policy, Canada should not become a safe haven for those accused of murder in the United States.”\textsuperscript{25} The Supreme Court of Canada ruled 4 to 3 in favour of the government in both \textit{Kindler v. Canada} (1991) and \textit{Reference re Ng Extradition} (1991). The Court explained that
the substantial legal protections present in the U.S. justice system gave leave for the Canadian government to extradite Kindler and Ng without seeking assurances. Justice Beverly McLachlin added in the Kindler judgement that “Effective relations between different states require that Canada respects the differences of its neighbours and that it refrains from imposing its constitutional guarantees on other states.” Canada reacted swiftly to the decision, and deported the two men within hours of the ruling.

Although the Kindler and Ng Reference precedents appeared to have clearly outlined the obligations owed by the Canadian government to individuals that it seeks to extradite to jurisdictions that use the death penalty, the Supreme Court decided to revisit the matter in 2001. Glen Sebastian Burns and Atif Ahmad Rafay were accused of triple-homicide by the police department in Bellevue, Washington, in 1994. The two men, who are Canadian citizens, were later arrested in Vancouver. The United States initiated a request of extradition, which Minister of Justice Allan Rock granted without seeking Article 6 assurances. In early 2001, the Supreme Court of Canada upheld their claim in a unanimous decision. In the judgement in United States v. Burns (2001), the Supreme Court explained the change in the constitutionality of extradition without assurances as a product of the evolution of the Canadian position on the death penalty. The Court argued that “Canada’s support of international initiatives opposing extradition without assurances, combined with its international advocacy of the abolition of the death penalty itself, leads to the conclusion that in the Canadian view of fundamental justice, capital punishment is unjust and should be stopped.” The Court also dismissed the argument that requesting assurances could be detrimental to good relations with the United States by pointing out that the mechanism was explicitly established in the Extradition Treaty and that Canada would merely be living up to its international obligations by requesting them. Andrew Thompson summarises the Court’s judgement: “The suggestion was that Canada had a duty to see that international customary law evolved such that the prohibition of capital punishment would one day become a predominant norm within the world community.”

Extradition without assurances became unconstitutional in the vast majority of cases, allowing for rare situations that might present “exceptional” circumstances.

The extradition question is a particularly illustrative example because it highlights the reasoning process used by the Supreme Court in
challenging the government’s discretion to conduct foreign affairs. When the *Kindler* and *Ng Reference* cases were being considered, the abolition of the death penalty was still a relatively recent development in Canadian criminal law. At the time of the ruling, Parliament had considered reinstating it a mere four years earlier. In light of the unsettled nature of the debate, the Court decided that it was appropriate to defer to the discretion of the Crown in requesting assurances. However, by accepting international agreements such as the *Rome Statute*, the Canadian government implicitly gave its support to the abolitionist cause, holding Canada to the same standards as like-minded jurisdictions. In the decision in *Burns*, the Court was not creating a new doctrine of foreign policy, but following the direction set by the government’s own international activity throughout the 1990s. By departing from its ruling in *Kindler*, the Supreme Court signalled its intent to hold the Canadian government accountable for its international commitments.

*In the Age of Terror*

In the aftermath of the attacks of 11 September 2001, the Supreme Court appeared undaunted at first to consider cases with national security implications. In *Suresh v. Canada (2002)*, the Court ruled that it is unconstitutional to deport someone to a country where they may face substantial risk of torture, save for those persons who pose a demonstrably serious threat to the security of Canada. After this ruling, however, a reluctant attitude appeared to develop in Canadian case law to apply the Charter extraterritorially. It had been established in *Operation Dismantle*, and confirmed as recently as *R. v. Cook (1998)*, that, although the Charter does not apply to the actions of foreign governments, it does apply to the actions of Canadian officials acting in foreign jurisdictions. Kent Roach puts it summarily as the principle that “Canadian officials [take] the Charter with them when they [go] abroad.” The Supreme Court appeared to reverse this doctrine with its ruling in the case *R. v. Hape (2007)*. In *Hape*, Lawrence Hape sought to have evidence gathered by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) in the Turks and Caicos Islands excluded from a money laundering prosecution against him under s. 8 of the Charter—protection against unreasonable search and seizure—because it was obtained without a warrant. The Court ruled that the evidence was admissible because RCMP agents were acting under the authority and supervision of Turks and Caicos Islands police, and the evidence was
gathered in a manner that was consistent with local regulations.\textsuperscript{39} Roach suggests that this new precedent establishes that “The Charter can still be applied extraterritorially, but only when Canadian conduct breaches its international obligations.”\textsuperscript{40} Such a situation would come before the Supreme Court only a year later, when the Omar Khadr saga began to make its way through the Canadian judicial system.

A point of constitutional interest in Canada’s participation in the War on Terror is the controversy regarding the imprisonment of Omar Khadr at Guantanamo Bay. The Toronto-born Khadr was captured by the U.S. Army in July of 2002 outside of Khost, Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{41} At the time of capture, the fifteen-year-old boy was serving as a translator for a group of Al-Qaeda fighters. When the U.S. Air Force destroyed the building where they were barricaded, Khadr was the only occupant who managed to survive the bombing. A detachment of soldiers then came across him when they went in to survey the damage. Khadr was accused of launching a grenade at them, which resulted in the death of Sergeant Christopher Speer, and spent the next four months receiving medical treatment at Bagram Air Force Base in North-eastern Afghanistan, before being transferred to Guantanamo Bay in October of 2002.\textsuperscript{42} In 2003, agents from the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) and the Foreign Intelligence Division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) interrogated Khadr at Guantanamo Bay. Canada made the information obtained during these interviews available to U.S. authorities.\textsuperscript{43} In March of 2004, DFAIT agents interrogated Khadr again, knowing that he had been subjected to the “frequent flyer program,”\textsuperscript{44} a method of sleep deprivation used to make subjects more pliable before interrogation. Khadr was formally charged with war crimes in September of 2004.\textsuperscript{45} In Canada (Minister of Justice) v. Khadr (2008), the Supreme Court ruled that these interrogations constituted a violation of the principle of fundamental justice. The Court ordered the government to disclose all the information obtained from Khadr, whether it was shared with U.S. authorities or not, to his defence lawyers, in order to mitigate the effects that Canadian involvement might have on his prosecution.\textsuperscript{46}

A year after the disclosure ruling, the Khadr defence team initiated a second lawsuit against the Canadian government. In Canada (Prime Minister) v. Khadr (2010), the defence demanded that the Canadian government seek Khadr’s repatriation from Guantanamo Bay. In 2009, Mr. Justice James O’Reilly, of the Federal Court Trial Division, ruled
that the government had violated Khadr’s Section 7 rights, and issued an order to the Crown to seek the repatriation of Omar Khadr as soon as practicable. The Federal Court of Appeal (FCA) heard the case in mid-2009 and upheld the ruling by Justice O’Reilly. The government appealed the decision to the Supreme Court, which partially reversed the ruling by the Federal Court of Appeal. In a judgement similar to those reached by the lower courts, the Supreme Court found that the Canadian government had violated Khadr’s Section 7 rights in sharing information with U.S. authorities and was complicit in Khadr’s detention. Writing in a unanimous judgement, the Supreme Court strongly criticised the government by stating that:

While the U.S. is the primary source of the deprivation, it is reasonable to infer from the uncontradicted evidence before the Court that the statements taken by Canadian officials are contributing to K’s continued detention [...] The interrogation of a youth detained without access to counsel, to elicit statements about serious criminal charges while knowing that the youth had been subjected to sleep deprivation and while knowing that the fruits of the interrogations would be shared with the prosecutors, offends the most basic Canadian standards about the treatment of detained youth suspects.

However, the Supreme Court also concluded that, while Khadr was eligible for a judicial remedy under Section 24(1) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ordering the federal cabinet to issue a request of repatriation was beyond the authority of the judiciary. Instead, the Justices offered that “The appropriate remedy in this case is to declare that K’s Charter rights were violated, leaving it to the government to decide how best to respond in light of current information, its responsibility over foreign affairs, and the Charter.” The precedent set by Operation Dismantle established that the judiciary has the power to review the constitutionality of the actions of the federal government in the exercise of the royal prerogative. A judicial remedy under Section 24(1) must be just and appropriate to the circumstances of the Charter breach. The Supreme Court found that repatriating Khadr would satisfy those requirements. However, the Court also echoed the judgment in Doucet-Boudreau v. Nova Scotia (Minister of Education) (2003) by stating that a judicial remedy also “must employ
means that are legitimate within the framework of our constitutional democracy.”53 The Supreme Court sought to distinguish the Khadr case from the Burns decision by pointing out that, unlike in Burns, the remedy sought by the respondent would not guarantee a cease to the Charter breach; it remains entirely possible that the United States will not accede to a repatriation request.54 Moreover, contrary to what the circumstances appeared like in Burns, the Supreme Court felt that it did not have enough information to judge accurately what effect a request of repatriation would have on Canada’s relations with the United States. In light of these problems, the Court decided that the most prudent course of action would be to offer a declaration of unconstitutionality, in hopes that it would “provide the legal framework for the executive to exercise its functions and to consider what actions to take in respect of Mr. Khadr, in conformity with the Charter.”55 After the ruling was made public, the government of Stephen Harper reiterated its refusal to request the repatriation of Omar Khadr.56

The key criterion in judging the verdict handed down by the Supreme Court is not whether the Government of Canada acted lawfully in not repatriating Omar Khadr—and international precedent strongly suggests that it did not—but whether the Supreme Court acted appropriately and consistently in deferring to the discretion of the executive.57 In its judgement in Khadr, the Supreme Court accurately highlighted the difficulty in properly assessing the political consequences of requesting his repatriation. In early March 2010, reports surfaced in the National Post that the Obama administration was quietly pressuring the Canadian government to accept custody of Khadr. The paper reported that officials within the administration “don’t have the stomach to try a child for war crimes.”58 On 19 March 2010, however, the Globe and Mail reported that the U.S. government had decided to prosecute Khadr in a military court, which would later result in Khadr pleading guilty.59 It is evident from the contradictory and obfuscatory nature of these reports that only the government was privy to the complete set of facts necessary to make an accurate judgement of the effect that a request of repatriation would have had on Canada-U.S. relations. The Supreme Court risked acting against the national interest if it had imposed conditions on the executive. By providing a declaration of unconstitutionality, the Court lent legitimacy to Khadr’s demands to be returned to Canada without unduly interfering with the government’s prerogative.
It should be evident from the discussion in this paper that the Canadian judiciary has had a storied career in reviewing the decisions made by the government in regards to the conduct of foreign affairs. That the Court has been able to influence the development of Canadian foreign policy is undeniable, in large part because its decisions have established the rules under which Canadian government agents and agencies interact with their peers abroad. The Labour Conventions doctrine informs the way that Canada negotiates its treaties up to the present day. The precedents set by Operation Dismantle, Hape, and Khadr (2010) force Canadian agents to act abroad in a manner respectful of the Charter and of international law. From the discussion on extradition, it has been amply established that the Supreme Court has acted to hold the Canadian government accountable for its commitments made to foreign states only by forcing the government to act consistently with its own policy. As the discussion on post-9/11 case law illustrates, the Court has also been flexible in light of situations, such as national security concerns, which the executive is best prepared to address. In a spirit keeping with Justice Wilson’s foundational statement in Operation Dismantle, the Supreme Court has concerned itself with judging not the quality or wisdom of Canada’s foreign policy, but its constitutionality. In this, the Court has performed remarkably well in its role as guardian of the constitution. The cabinet cannot act in a manner that is inconsistent with the constitution from which it derives its authority. The ship of state will not survive its ventures into foreign waters intact if care is not taken to protect the integrity of the hull that supports it.
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