# On Language, Education and Identity:
# Minority Language Education Within the Canadian Context

**Deborah Shadd**

A dissertation submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
PhD degree in Translation Studies, with a specialization in Canadian Studies

School of Translation and Interpretation
Faculty of Arts
University of Ottawa

**Abstract:**

"The destiny of a people is intricately bound to the way its children are educated" (RCAP 1996, v. 3: 404). Firm in this belief, the current study undertakes an examination of language and education policy in Canada, seeking to understand how these two factors together impact the formation of identity, not only for individual students in a classroom, but more broadly for the linguistic and cultural communities of which they are a part, as these struggle to establish a place for themselves within the country's social sphere. Despite the rhetoric of multicultural equality which predominates in Canadian public discourse, the examination of a corpus of historical legislation, carried out within the framework of narrative theory and critical discourse analysis, plainly demonstrates a clear hierarchy of languages and cultures in Canada – established and enforced in law, rooted and reflected in social institutions, reinforced and replicated through formal systems of schooling. As a result, even as speakers of minority languages are taught as students that to achieve success in schooling, they must translate their speech, thinking, and ways of knowing into the language and manners of the majority, so as members of their communities do they learn that, in order to gain a place of full participation in society, they must also translate their ways of acting, of relating to others, and of being in the world. In short, they must translate themselves. Recognizing that students are in this manner transformed in the very movement between classroom and community; and that as these transformed students return to their communities, these are likewise impacted in terms of their sense of belonging in society; we seek to discern what new insights might be gained from the consideration of education in light of a translational paradigm, ultimately identifying three productive methods of entry into such critical reflection: through the variety of significant *questions* that are raised, through the consideration of specific theoretical *concepts* reassessed and applied anew, and finally through the reframing and retelling of *narratives* in translation.

 "Le destin d'un peuple est intrinsèquement lié à la façon dont ses enfants sont éduqués" (RCAP 1996, v. 3: 404). En supposant que cette déclaration est vraie, cette étude entreprend un examen de la politique de la langue et de l'instruction publique au Canada. On y cherche à comprendre comment ces deux facteurs – surtout dans leur relation mutuelle – influencent la formation de l'identité, non pas seulement pour des étudiants individuels dans une salle de classe, mais plus largement pour les communautés linguistiques et culturelles dont ils font partie – des communautés qui cherchent à s'établir sur le plan social à l'échelle du pays. Bien qu'une rhétorique de l'égalité multiculturelle soit prédominante dans le discours public, l'examen d'un corpus des lois historiques, mené dans le cadre de la narratologie et de l'analyse critique du discours, démontre clairement une hiérarchie des langues et des cultures au Canada. Cette dernière est établie et mise en vigueur par la loi; elle est également enracinée et reflétée dans les institutions sociales, de même que renforcée et répliquées à travers les systèmes formels de l'instruction publique. En conséquence, non seulement ceux qui parlent une langue minoritaire sont instruits pour réussir dans leur scolarité, ils doivent également traduire le discours et la pensée dans la langue et les mœurs de la majorité, et apprendre que pour participer pleinement à la société en tant que membres de leurs communautés, ils doivent de surcroît traduire leurs façons d'agir et d'être au monde. Bref, ils doivent s'auto-traduire. Puisque les étudiants sont de cette manière transformés dans le mouvement qui relie la classe à la communauté, et que dès lors leurs communautés respectives sont également influencées dans leur relation d'appartenance à la société canadienne, nous chercherons donc à déterminer quelles sont les nouvelles idées qui émergent de l'examen de l'instruction publique à la lumière d'une pensée traductionnelle. Un examen qui nous permettra d'identifier trois approches critiques: par la variété des *questions* importantes qui sont soulevées par la traduction, au travers de l'examen des *concepts* théoriques réévalués et réappliqués, et par le recadrage et la reformulation de *récits* en traduction.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of writing this dissertation has been a long and often winding road. Looking back, I am so grateful to know that I was never walking alone. To all those who have journeyed with me, I offer my deep and sincere thanks.

To my parents and my family, for their constant love and support in all aspects of my life.

To Joy, for her steady friendship, ready laughter, listening ear and eternal perspective.

And to Drs. Salah Basalamah and Annie Brisset, for their insightful feedback, endless patience, and unfailing encouragement along the way. Thank you for challenging me to always consider things from another perspective and to search for sometimes hidden connections. These are valuable lessons both for academia and for life.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AFN | ………… | Assembly of First Nations |
| IAND | ………… | Indian Affairs and Northern Development |
| OCOL | ………… | Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages |
| RCAP | ………… | Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples |
| RCBB | ………… | Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism |
| RSA | ………… | Revised Statutes of Alberta |
| RSBC | ………… | Revised Statutes of British Columbia |
| RSC | ………… | Revised Statutes of Canada |
| RSM | ………… | Revised Statutes of Manitoba |
| RSNS | ………… | Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia |
| RSNWT | ………… | Revised Statutes of the Northwest Territories |
| RSO | ………… | Revised Statutes of Ontario |
| RSPEI | ………… | Revised Statutes of Prince Edward Island |
| RSQ | ………… | Revised Statutes of Quebec |
| RSS | ………… | Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan |
| SA | ………… | Statutes of Alberta |
| SBC | ………… | Statutes of British Columbia |
| SC | ………… | Statutes of Canada |
| SCR | ………… | Supreme Court Ruling |
| SM | ………… | Statutes of Manitoba |
| SNB | ………… | Statutes of New Brunswick |
| SNS | ………… | Statutes of Nova Scotia |
| SNu | ………… | Statutes of Nunavut |
| SO | ………… | Statutes of Ontario |
| SQ | ………… | Statutes of Quebec |
| SS | ………… | Statutes of Saskatchewan |
| SY | ………… | Statutes of the Yukon |

# INTRODUCTION

The concept of identity is one that has garnered increasing academic attention of late. Once thought to be the naturally fixed result of one's relation to a series of discrete and easily distinguishable categories – male versus female or black versus white, for example – identity is now being recognized as a much more complex issue than previously assumed. Gender studies scholars argue that male can no longer be distinguished from female simply on the basis of biological differentiation; "gender definitions," they say, "are neither universal nor absolute manifestations of inherent differences but relatively local, constantly changing constructions contingent on multiple historical and cultural factors" (von Flotow 1999: 281). Similarly striking is the growing inconsistency of racial conceptions. Historians Rina Benmayor and Andor Skotnes (1994), for instance, write of one friend who

> was born and grew up in South Africa where he was officially classified as coloured (of mixed descent); when he moved to the United States he 'became' black; when he lived in Brazil for a period, he was surprised to discover that Brazilian friends considered him to be white. (7)

Indeed, further examples abound, all indicating that the nice, neat boundaries which formerly divided our reality into these discrete categories have at once dissolved and disappeared, leaving the concept of identity in a complexly fluctuating state.

Disciplines ranging from women's studies to sociology and from conflict studies to philosophy have all approached the topic in their turn, some seeking to address questions about individual subjectivity, while others focus their attention instead on the formation of national or cultural identities. Not surprisingly, within the broad corpus of writing that has emerged from this wide-ranging and multifaceted dialogue, countless notions have been put forward as factors

variously influencing the formation of identity, both individual and collective. Moving beyond the fairly standard elements of age, gender and ethnicity, scholars have explored the significance of temperamental and psychological disposition (Flanagan & Rorty 1990), religious beliefs and ideology (Mol 1985), social roles whether adopted or assigned (Downey, Eccles & Chatman 2005), shared cultural rituals and symbols (Ross 2007), historical narratives both written by and told to us (Hinchman & Hinchman 1997), the perceived future in addition to the realized past (Cassell 1991), citizenship and national politics (Mackey 2002); and the list goes on. The goal of the current project is to push this discussion still one step further through the careful consideration of two other factors which, though not altogether absent from the discussion to date, are yet deserving of much more attention, particularly at their point of intersection. Taken together, these two factors – language and education – have the potential to leave a deep and permanent imprint on the identity of countless individuals and, consequently, on the groups and communities of which they are a part, as they seek to find their place within the social structures of a nation.

Language, of course, has long been recognized as closely linked with identity. Sociolinguists have spent years expounding the many correlations between how a person speaks and various aspects of their background and identity, as well as the ways in which dialects and languages have often been used as signs of inclusion or exclusion from particular social or ethnic groups or communities. Similarly, international organizations and human rights advocacy groups around the world have time and again argued that "language is not only a tool for communication and knowledge but also a fundamental attribute of cultural identity and empowerment, both for the individual and the group" (UNESCO 2003: 16).

The connections between language and identity, however, run much deeper and further than mere correlation. History shows us that language has long been used not only to mark identity, but also to actively shape and form it. As Italy, for example, neared the end of its *Risorgimento* (that period between roughly 1814 and 1861 during which the variously-controlled regions and city-states of the area moved toward social and political unification), it was estimated that less than 12% of the population spoke anything like a 'standard' or 'common' dialect of Italian, greatly exacerbating the vast number of differing cultural, social and economic practices which could be found in the varying provinces (Ives 2004: 36). Consequently, the establishment and spread of a properly 'national' language became one of the first orders of business for the new Italian government, which called on Alessandro Manzoni to head the first Government Commission on Linguistic Unification in Italy. The result was the selection of the Tuscan dialect as standard and the subsequent subsidized publication of dictionaries and grammars to be delivered to schools across the country, schools which were staffed entirely by teachers from Tuscany (ibid.: 38). "Italy is a fact," wrote Massimo d'Azeglio, "Now we need to make Italians" (as cited in Ives 2004: 35). And language was one of the keys to actively forming this new national identity.

By the very same token, however, linguistic strategies have also been used for tearing down, rather than building up, cultural and national identities. This truth is demonstrated all too clearly in the history of the Catalan people, for instance, who have more than once found themselves subject to authorities who tried to rob them of their language not only by way of laws declaring that every government and legal document be written in Spanish to be considered official, but even more damagingly by the banning of their language from schools not once, but twice, resulting in entire generations growing up with little or no ability to read or write their

mother tongue (Trudgill 2000: 129-130). Whether the point is illustrated with productive or destructive examples, however – albeit it recognizing that these can often be conceived as two sides of the same complex coin – it is not simply the relation between language and identity, but rather that one between intentional language management and the strategic formation of identity that quickly becomes evident.

Education, on the other hand, has thus far received surprisingly little attention in academic discussions of identity, a striking omission given the pivotal role formal education has come to play in the lives of young people everywhere (to say nothing of the obvious connection between the strategic linguistic practices just mentioned and the formal system of education in each context). Parents, educators and child psychologists alike have long recognized the early years as those in which children's minds and characters are most malleable, the time of life when they are most subject to the influence of those around them. The relation between education and the formation of identity should then be plainly apparent, particularly when we note the vast number of scholars who, despite approaching the discussion from quite different vantage points, yet seem to agree that no individual is singularly responsible for the shaping of his or her own self-image. Instead, those around us – whether authorities or peers, whether for us or against us – have a key role to play in the process.

Alasdair MacIntyre (1981), speaking in terms of narrative theory, insists that "we are never more (and sometimes less) than the co-authors of our own narratives" (199), and Mona Baker (2006), picking up on the same theme, further explains it this way:

> The way others 'story' us can have very concrete implications for our material, professional, social and psychological well-being. It can enhance or destroy our career, make us feel good about ourselves or throw us into despair, improve our social standing or turn us into outcasts. And all this naturally impacts on our own

> developing narrative of who we are and how we relate to the world around us, on how we 'narrate' ourselves. In the end, we become 'the beneficiaries, victims, or playthings of the narratives that others create and push in our direction.' (31)

And the modern classroom provides an ideal setting in which carefully constructed narratives can be 'pushed in the direction' of large groups of students all at the same time.

The potential significance of what goes on in the classroom for the process of identity formation only increases when we take into account the fact that, in most parts of the world, responsibility for and control of the formal education system lies largely with the nation-state's government – a government which, in the words of Antonio Gramsci, "is not agnostic but has its own conception of life and has the duty of spreading it by educating the national masses" (as cited in Crehan 2002: 109). Going well beyond the mere imparting of facts and figures, this is an education which validates or decimates entire ways of knowing, of seeing the world, and of understanding history in the broadest sense, both past and present, with social roles, relations and rules of engagement – including, surely, linguistic engagement – taught and learned right alongside. "Of course, many of these contrasting Virtues," observed Althusser,

> are also taught in the Family, in the Church, in the Army, in Good Books, in films and even in the football stadium. But no other Ideological State Apparatus has the obligatory (and not least, free) audience of the totality of the children in the social formation, eight hours a day for five or six days out of seven. (1971: 156)

Public education is, as a result, a tool of unparalleled importance for the government, for bodies of power who know all too well that the influential teaching that begins in the classroom – the narratives told and the relational structures established – reaches far beyond individual students to impact first the collective identities of those communities to which they belong and then, by extension, that of the nation as a whole. After all, as colonial officials were quick to admit,

"unguided individualism – of students and teachers – poses great social risks" (Axelrod 1997: 25).

For most children, then, notions of identity and understanding of their own, as well as their community's, place in wider society develop in parallel within the educational context; but alongside both of these comes the development of linguistic awareness. Since political scientist Abram de Swaan (1993) famously proposed his model of global linguistic inequality more than two decades ago, numerous scholars have built upon his work, examining not only the factors that contribute to a language's status as more or less dominant or dominated, but also the role that these linguistic factors, including translation, have played in creating and perpetuating social inequalities. And while few, if any, schoolchildren are aware of such models and discussions, all are aware of the language(s) spoken (or not spoken) at their own school; and for students coming from families or communities where a minority language is predominant, the realization that the language in which they are taught and in which they are expected to learn is not the same as that one spoken in their homes, by their parents, and by their grandparents is never insignificant. In such cases, the language of instruction quickly comes to be perceived as the language of knowledge and authority, a reality that cannot but have important consequences for such students in their process of identity formation.

For these students, the education system in which they find themselves requires a degree of transformation that penetrates more deeply than just the translation of their speech from one language to another; it also, and perhaps more fundamentally, requires the 'translation' of the children themselves from one culture to another, from one way of thinking to another, from one way of being to another. In reflecting on his own educational experience of this sort, that is, on his move from a tiny rural village to a *lycée* in Paris, Pierre Bourdieu recalls, "I could only meet

the demands of schooling by renouncing many of my primary experiences and acquisitions, and not only a certain accent" (as cited in Grenfell 2007: 40). Similarly, Louise Gauthier (1997) remarks that "quitter sa langue ne se fait pas instantanément. Il faut, pour y parvenir, changer son rapport à la réalité, […] il s'agit d'une tâche plus difficile que de changer de pays" (99). Considered in this way, then, linguistic translation can be recognized as only one element in a broader educational program which entails not only the general transformation of 'unguided individuals' into a collective and national identity, but also the more specific transformation of particular linguistic or ethnic groups into particular classes of citizenship or belonging within the hierarchy that is the collective whole.

  The goal of the current project, then, will be to draw the field of Translation Studies still further into the crucial, ongoing, interdisciplinary debates surrounding the formation of identity through the consideration of these two factors – language and education. More specifically, our discussion will seek to address two important questions:

1. How does the (often forced) movement from one language into another through the experience of formal education impact the formation of identity not only for individual speakers of minority languages, but more broadly for the groups and communities of which they are a part, impacting their positioning within the social hierarchies of a nation?

2. If, in light of recent discourses concerned with 'translated identities', we accept that this linguistic translation of students could be seen as but one element in a broader program of 'human translation' or 'identity translation' through education, then what new insight or understanding might such a reconsideration bring to the discussion as it currently stands?

Canada presents an especially interesting case in this regard because since the country's very inception, Canadian national identity has always been closely tied to multilingualism and multiculturalism in some form. Whether we speak only of the centuries old clash between anglophone and francophone Canadians or broaden our discussion to include the many other immigrant groups considered in our country's official policy of multiculturalism, introduced in 1971, the history of Canada has ever been marked by diverse linguistic groups jostling for position, struggling for the power to control their own destinies, fighting for the autonomy to craft their own narratives.

According to most English-Canadian textbooks, the official history of our country is largely an account of the evolving conflict between the anglophone majority and the francophone minority, and myriad documents and government policies exist attesting to this struggle by French-speaking communities to protect their language, their culture, and their right to educate their children as they saw fit and in their mother tongue. This is a story that is told, for the most part, with pride, one in which, despite brief moments of admitted discrimination and injustice, understanding and tolerance are generally said to triumph, resulting in a country of true bilingual and bicultural compromise.

Unfortunately, what all too often gets lost, or at least glossed over, in the midst of this 'myth of tolerance', as Eva Mackey (2002) calls it, is the reality that has been faced by generations of First Nations peoples across the country. Certainly their stories are never entirely erased; after all, "Aboriginal people are necessary players in the nationalist myths: they are the colourful recipients of benevolence, the necessary 'others' who reflect back white Canada's self-image of tolerance" (Mackey 2002: 2). However, as an ever-increasing number of studies, books and articles are making clear, this carefully constructed 'myth of tolerance' has done its best for

many years to cover up the countless ugly cruelties endured by Aboriginal Canadians. Rather than grateful recipients of it, they have more accurately been our "victims of benevolence" (Furniss 1998).

These injustices have come in many forms and touched all aspects of their lives, including, of course, the linguistic. Few Canadians today are aware that there were at one point nearly 80 indigenous languages spoken within our borders, none of which have been afforded the level of respect or autonomy claimed by French, the minority language granted official status and recognition in Canada, and many of which are quickly dying out, if they have not done so already (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2013). In fact, during the very same period in Canadian history when the francophone minority was being granted legislation that officially protected their language, and along with it their religion and culture, indigenous groups were witnessing the rapid disappearance of their own linguistic and cultural rights. Even as the 1829 *Syndics Act* was brought into force, for example, awarding greater autonomy to French-speaking communities in establishing and controlling their own schools and curricula, First Nations children were yet being forcibly removed from their homes and subjected to education that strictly forbid the use of their mother tongues and harshly punished the keeping of traditional practices.

What can be clearly seen in such disparate policy and practice, consistently carried out over the course of decades, is the establishment and entrenchment of two very different versions of what was deemed 'appropriate' education for linguistic minorities, sending two very distinct messages about the value of the languages and cultures concerned, and consequently influencing the identity formation of students in very disparate ways, with undeniable effects on the communities to which those students belonged. Furthermore, if we go on to consider the rules and regulations which would later come to govern the teaching of 'immigrant' or 'heritage'

languages in Canadian schools, we can perceive yet a third system of education fitting

somewhere between the other two. While it remains true, of course, that language and education

are but two of many factors influencing the formation of collective identity for First Nations and

other linguistic minority groups in Canada, as well as the establishment of their relative positions

within the social hierarchy of the country, these two elements, when considered at their point of

intersection and in light of the translational paradigm, exhibit a certain explanatory potential and

therefore deserve to be examined carefully and critically.


The first chapter of the discussion which follows will begin by intentionally positioning

the issue at hand relative to the various other discussions with which it enters into dialogue.

Firstly, the argument will be positioned relative to the evolving discourses of identity and

translation, tracing the conceptual evolution of 'identity' from its earliest appearance in the

English language in the sixteenth century forward to the point where, in more recent discussions,

it has begun to be connected to the idea of 'translation'. Attention will then be focused on the

struggle to find balance between prototypical and paradigmatic conceptions of 'translation' in

that space where the two concepts and discourses meet, as well as on the benefits of bringing

theoretical notions of language and education into the dialogue specifically at this point. After

briefly introducing the broad outlines of narrative theory as a framework to help guide our

thinking along the way, the second part of the chapter will position the argument relative to

ongoing discussions of Canadian national identity and social structuring within Canada. Building

on Mackey's (2002) exploration of the management of difference in establishing national

identity and Thobani's (2007) of social hierarchy in national institutions, we will establish why

the consideration of language and education in Canada in particular can make an appropriate and useful contribution to this discussion as well.

Chapters 2 and 3 will seek to address the first of the two central questions already posed in the introduction, that is, that of how the movement from one language into another through the experience of formal education impacts identity formation for speakers of minority languages and for the groups and communities of which they are a part. Based on an examination of the legislation that has historically governed language and education in Canada, we will see clearly demonstrated the establishment of a policy-driven hierarchy among linguistic groups that corresponds quite directly with that of other national institutions, as previously laid out by Thobani (2007). Following an overview of the legislative complexities that influenced the determination of the corpus to be considered, we will examine how various languages – and consequently the groups of people who speak them – are variously treated in the laws of the country, resulting in a hierarchical arrangement that is continually reproduced and sustained, aided and enabled to a great extent by the structuring of our education systems as public institutions. Our study will broadly cover a corpus stretching over the 142 years between Confederation and the official statement of apology at last offered by the Canadian government to survivors of the residential school system. More specifically, however, attention will be focused on four particular moments in Canadian history, chosen to serve as the foci around which we will orient our discussion – four particular documents or events, the ripple effects of which can be traced outward as waves of influence seeking to realize change in the education policy and directives of the country. The first, not surprisingly, will be the official founding of the nation in 1867; the second, the tabling of the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* (1967-70); the third, the adoption of multiculturalism as official

government policy; and the fourth, the controversy surrounding the Meech Lake Accord and Elijah Harper's historic filibuster in the Manitoba legislature.

In chapter 4, we will turn to a consideration of the second of the two questions posed above, that is, the question of what might be gained by reconsidering our central argument in light of a 'translational paradigm', imagined in line with and in light of recent discourses concerned with 'translated' identities. After briefly surveying a number of examples of more recent usage of this metaphoric or paradigmatic concept of 'translation' and giving some consideration to what demands might need to made of such a metaphor for it to be critically and usefully productive, we will approach the issue of public education in Canada as one example of an intercultural encounter and context which might be beneficially explored in this way and which could, in time and in turn, come to inform some aspect of the broader discussion already ongoing. After drawing out the broad strokes of this comparative analysis of translation and education, we will take time to consider three potential modes of entry into the sort of critical reflection being sought, these being first, the variety of significant questions that the metaphor enables us to raise; second, the consideration of specific concepts that can be usefully reassessed and reapplied in new context; and third, the reframing and retelling of both personal and public narratives in translation.

As we progress further into the 21st century, the nature of Canadian national identity is once again being called into question, due largely to an increasingly mobile global population; as people from a growing number of countries and ethnic backgrounds come to claim Canada as their home, old definitions of what it means to be Canadian are found to be less and less satisfactory. At the very same time, calls for the Government of Canada to make further

reparation for past wrongs to First Nations communities also seem to be gaining volume and attention, and it is important that we do not miss the crucial link between these two phenomena. As René Dussault and Georges Erasmus, co-chairs of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), pointed out, "the legitimate claims of Aboriginal peoples challenge Canada's sense of justice and its capacity to accommodate both multinational citizenship and universal respect for human rights" (1996, v.1: 7). The ever increasingly diverse nature of Canadian communities is constantly presenting new challenges with regard to discerning what may be the best policies and shape of governance to promote social equality and justice. However, in order to move forward suitably prepared to address these fresh intercultural concerns, Canada must do everything possible to redress those intercultural conflicts which have not simply been a part of our history, but which continue to play an active role in shaping who we are as a nation even into the present.

In recent years, the government has begun to make strides in this direction through gestures ranging from the 1999 creation of the Nunavut Territory to the 2008 apology over the residential school tragedy. However, true reparation demands that we move beyond gestures to examine how the very institutions that structure our society have time and again aided in the recreation and perpetuation of those relations of inequality that have come to mark Canadian society. The education system is one such institution that must in this way be critically examined.

## CH. 1 – L̲AYING THE G̲ROUNDWORK:̲
### T̲HEORETICAL AND C̲ONTEXTUAL C̲ONSIDERATIONS

**1.1 R̲econceptualizing Identity – A̲n Evolving Concept**

Identity is a curious thing. As a concept, it is notoriously difficult to grasp. It is an idea treated so many different ways by so many different people that at times it can be nearly impossible to distinguish what the common thread might be that could somehow tie all of these diverse discussions of 'identity' together.

For some, identity is a statement. It is a source of strength and pride, a reassuring reminder of their history and a solid rock on which to build for their future. For others, identity is instead a question. The search for its answer leads them out over uncertain terrain and its contemplation seems more often to end in insecurity and anguish than in comfort or belonging.

Some see identity as an intensely personal issue. It is that which makes you who you are as an individual, governing how you perceive the world, how you relate to others, and how you go about finding your own place in the midst of it all. Others, by contrast, view identity as a collective concern. It forms the basis of that sense of community that may arise among otherwise isolated individuals, binding them together as an identifiable group and enabling them to differentiate between those who belong and those who do not.

For some, any discussion of such collective identity is framed in primarily cultural terms. It is a matter of shared ethnicity or ancestry, a bond characterized by a common language, by historical tradition, by collective memory. Yet others are more likely to frame their argument in political terms. For them, it is an issue of fixed geographical borders, of clear governmental structures, of legal citizenship status with its presumably equal rights and responsibilities.

Regardless of such varying perspectives and angles of approach, however, all who have recently engaged in these discussions of identity do seem to agree on at least one thing: in a globalized world where countries, cultures and communities are being brought into contact and conflict more frequently and more extensively than ever before, identity is an issue that has somehow become urgently important, and the discourse surrounding it increasingly intense. Some, like Michael Cronin, have gone so far as to insist that identity is now "*the* principal way of structuring political communication" (2006: 1, emphasis mine). "This is not to say," Cronin explains, "that the issues raised by ideological critiques somehow disappeared or were no longer important but issues such as marginalization, dispossession, powerlessness were increasingly mediated through discourses of identity" (ibid.: 1-2). It is hardly surprising, then, that identity has lately become the subject of such vigorous debate and the focus of such strict attention.

But how exactly has all this come to be? How was it that we arrived at this place where the discourse surrounding identity is so complicated, so diverse, at times even so obscure? Philip Gleason (1983) suggests that at a certain point in its discursive evolution, the term 'identity' "reached the level of generality and diffuseness that A.O. Lovejoy complained of so many years earlier in respect to the word *romantic*: it 'had come to mean so many things that, by itself, it means nothing'" (914). The first question we must consider, then, is what our current understanding of the concept should be as we attempt to engage with the debates over 'identity politics' now so undeniably important on the global plane. What do we mean when we say 'identity'?

**1.1.1 A Brief History of Identity**

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1961), the word 'identity' – from the Latin root *idem*, meaning 'the same' – has been part of the English language since the sixteenth century. Though in some circles early use of the word by philosophers did invest the term "with great intellectual significance and moral seriousness," for most 'identity' remained a word used less formally to simply refer to individuality or personality well into the twentieth century (Gleason 1983: 911). Stuart Hall (1992), who traces the concept back as far as the Enlightenment in his work, explains that such early understandings of identity were

> based on a conception of the human person as a fully centred, unified individual, endowed with the capacities of reason, consciousness and action, whose 'centre' consisted of an inner core which first emerged when the subject was born, and unfolded with it, while remaining essentially the same – continuous or 'identical' with itself – through the individual's existence. The essential centre of the self was a person's identity. (275)

While philosophical debates over the 'unity of the self' have no doubt been carried out over the course of centuries, this notion of unified and essentially unchanging individual identities for so long remained predominant that its mark was clearly left on countless aspects of modern society as it developed.[1] Not least among those arenas subject to its broad and persistent influence were the practices of social science which, during the years of their early development into established disciplines, were clearly governed by this particular concept of identity, coupled with the assumption of an essential difference between the Self and the Other, and of a clear division found between the two. This primary duality, not surprisingly conceived as a hierarchical one, naturally paved the way for a whole series of subsequent and related binarisms

---

[1] See, for example, Robert Langbaum's discussion of John Locke and David Hume in *The Mysteries of Identity: A Theme in Modern Literature* (New York: 1965/1977).

which "radically distinguished as well as hierarchized 'home' and 'abroad', the West and the Orient, the center and the margin, and the subject of study and the disciplinary object of study" (Lavie & Swedenburg 1996: 1). This dialectic between, on the one hand, the civilized and known Self and, on the other, the perhaps varied, yet always equally different and savage Other routinely governed the practices not only of anthropologists, but also of translators, historians, politicians and policy makers.

Identity, then, was long understood by most to be a sort of ontological reality, possessed by people whether as individuals or as groups, rooted in the unalterable differences upon which it depended for uniqueness, and simply demanding of recognition. "According to this view," wrote postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha (2000), "a culture's quiddity, its singular 'difference' that needs to be protected and propagated, is already 'in place' within the normative, naturalizing structures of a culture's most enlightened self-understanding" (189-190).

By the mid-twentieth century, however, when 'identity' was beginning for the first time to gain real currency as a quasi-technical term in the social sciences (Gleason 1983: 910), philosophers, psychologists and cultural scholars alike had begun to question this prior ontological assumption, as society's increasing complexity began to wreak havoc with overly simplistic conceptions of the world. "It is common knowledge," wrote Hendrik Ruitenbeek in 1963, "that identity becomes a problem for the individual in a rapidly changing dynamic and technological society such as we have in America" (3).

Slowly but surely a more sociological understanding of identity began to emerge, one that, while not rejecting altogether the notion of a person's constant inner core, saw this core as one that shifted, changed and evolved throughout a lifetime as the direct result of social interaction. Over the course of the 1950s and 1960s, a number of differing theoretical models

were developed – from role theory (Birenbaum & Sagarin 1973) to reference-group theory (Hyman & Singer 1968) to symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1969) – each unique in its own nuancing, but all based on the shared premise that no individual is truly autonomous, that we live and grow and find our place within a society or community that fundamentally influences and shapes us. It is in the midst of constant interaction between Self and Society that lessons are learned, meanings are understood, choices are made, and roles are adopted, molding and modifying identities through continuous dialogue.

The basic idea underlying this shift in thinking was not, of course, altogether new. As early as 1807, in writing his book *Phenomenology of Spirit*, G.W.F. Hegel expressed that he

> did not conceive of the 'self coming to itself,' or self-consciousness, as a process that transpired in monadic isolation, but as one that was mediated, reflected – quite literally – through the eyes and the presence of another. In doing so, Hegel moved from an ontological dialectic between same and otherness (*das Andere*), […] to an existential encounter between self and other, that is, to a reflexive confrontation with a personified other (*der Andere*). (Hanssen 2000: 138)

One hundred and fifty years later, Hegel's thoughts became newly relevant for those seeking to better understand the complexities of identity, culture and difference in the context of their rapidly changing world; and in the disintegration of long-accepted concepts, these scholars heard simply the echo of Hegel's earlier movement from 'ontological dialectic' to 'existential encounter'.

In reality, this changing perception of identity was only one symptom of a much broader trend within the social sciences which soon saw theories of identity moving in parallel with those of culture, as the notion of cultures as realities existing in stable, unchanging forms also gave way to an array of newly proposed definitions which, while again varying significantly in their detail, all shared a focus on the active role that human beings play in creating meaning and sense

in the world around them, in this way constructing and performing their own dynamic cultures and cultural identities.

One of the many grand assumptions that had long characterized traditional views of both identity and culture, but that was fundamentally shaken in the course of this Hegelian movement, was that of their inherent connection to spatial location. Although archaeological research has long since made clear that the migration of peoples and the intermingling of cultures has been a reality in our world almost since its beginning, nonetheless nineteenth century conceptions of fixed identities and cultures had allowed this spatial assumption to persist well through the colonial age. Certain cultures, certain peoples with certain identities were considered to be inevitably linked to certain places; for, of course, if the Self is 'here', then the Other must necessarily be 'over there'. In the wake of colonialism, however, and with the subsequent rise of globalization, previous patterns of global population flow were forever changed as people began to move about the planet in unprecedented numbers and in unexpected directions. The resultingly renewed recognition of a world in which "diasporas run with, and not against, the grain of identity, […] in which diaspora is the order of things and settled ways of life are increasingly hard to find" (Appadurai 1993: 803), the presumed identity-location link could no longer be sustained, and in its shattering, yet another aspect of the prevailing understanding of 'identity' was shown to be insufficient and unsatisfactory, both from the perspective of individuals – who often found themselves separated from the majority of others who shared their culture and beliefs and who previously would have bolstered their sense of self – and from that of displaced groups – which found their members, and consequently their cultural practices, spread across the globe rather than gathered in a single spot.

The resulting shift in our conception of identity was twofold. First, it led to the realization that not all identities are rooted only and ever in one place or cultural tradition. "Everywhere," wrote Stuart Hall (1992),

> cultural identities are emerging which are not fixed, but poised, *in transition*, between different positions; which draw on different cultural traditions at the same time; and which are the product of those complicated cross-overs and cultural mixes which are increasingly common in a globalized world. (310)

These are identities marked in many ways by duality – dual loyalty to two places, to two languages, to two cultures, to two ways of looking at and understanding the world. Given their history and experience, such individuals refuse identification *solely* with one side just as much as *solely* with the other; on the contrary, they necessarily identify with both, accepting, in the words of Bhabha (1994), a "hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (4). "The problem is not of an ontological cast," Bhabha later explains,

> where differences are effects of some more totalizing, transcendent identity to be found in the past or the future. Hybrid hyphenations emphasize the incommensurable elements – the stubborn chunks – as the basis of cultural identifications. What is at issue is the performative nature of differential identities. (ibid.: 219)

At the same time, this latest shift in the way we think about identity has led to a deeper understanding of the degree to which identity is not just influenced by but actually constituted through representation. In his masterpiece *Les Misérables* (1862/2008), Victor Hugo insightfully reflected on the fact that "true or false, what is said about people often has as much bearing on their lives and especially on their destinies as what they do" (3). And Hugo, of course, is not alone in his contemplations. A similar line of thinking can be found in numerous more theoretical writings, ranging from Gramsci's discussion of hegemony (Gramsci 1975/1992) and Althusser's of interpellation and subjectification (Althusser 1971) to more recent explorations of

narrative theory (Somers 1994; Baker 2006) and postcolonial studies (Clifford & Marcus 1986;

Cheyfitz 1997). The basic idea is that representations make a very real difference in people's

lives. Through their ubiquity and persistence, representations, once created and circulated as

normative and authoritative, slowly but surely transform our perceptions of reality – of ourselves

and of those around us. In turn, our perceptions, thus transformed, slowly but surely affect our

actions, reactions and interactions. In essence and effect, then, "by calling someone something,

especially from a position of authority, you transform that person into the thing named"

(Robinson 1997: 23).

In considering representations of identity through history, it does not take long to discern

that the traditional hierarchical arrangement of Self and Other discussed above was in large part,

if not entirely, a result of the fact that for so long all sanctioned representations of identity

proceeded only from the dominant authority of the Self, fixing the ontological identity of the

Other as 'savage', 'uncivilized', or 'irrational'. [2] And as long as this was considered a true

reflection of reality, there was no room for alternate views. In actuality, however, we know that

representations can only ever be partial and incomplete, and so by recognizing that identity is

largely formed through representation, a space is opened up for both contestation and resistance.

No longer are minority or subordinated cultures, or their individual members, condemned to

accept a fixed identity thrust upon them; rather they can fight to position themselves within the

world of their own experience and to negotiate the representation of their own identities.

Thus we see that as traditional conceptions of identity gave way to more sociological

ones, the idea of the autonomy of individual identities was surrendered and the influence of

---

[2] Russell (2009) draws this line of argument as far back as the Greco-Roman Empire, writing as follows: "Christian claims to universalism and the attitudes that led the colonist to claim for themselves the land they had discovered […] were shaped culturally within the Greco-Roman Empire, which believed itself to be a universal empire containing the one true humanistic culture.' In order to be considered human, people had to assimilate into that culture. Those who didn't were called 'barbarians'." (40)

others acknowledged. The movement from sociological to postmodern and postcolonial conceptions in turn refocused our attention on how identity is "formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us," insisting that "it is historically, not biologically, defined" and leading us toward the simple conclusion that "[t]he fully unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is a fantasy" (Hall 1992: 277).

## 1.1.2 Discourses of Identity

Naturally, over the years, the discourse and vocabulary used in discussing identity have evolved in step with the developments of the notion itself. As we noted above, earlier, more traditional understandings of the concept assumed identity to be a sort of fixed reality or unchanging fact and so, not surprisingly, no distinctive discourse was really developed at the time. After all, a set reality needs only to be recognized; it does not merit extended attention, discussion or debate. This perception is clearly reflected in the standard definition provided by the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1961), a definition emphasizing both sameness – "absolute or essential sameness […] of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances" – and continuity – "the condition or fact of remaining the same person throughout the various phases of existence" (19). Although there were certain philosophers who were far ahead of the game in questioning and problematizing this particular view of identity, the language in which their very objections were framed is still telling. Even while arguing against the assumptions made by others, David Hume, for example, yet spoke of identity in terms of its "continuance in existence", and John Locke in those of "that same continued Life" (as cited in Langbaum 1977: 26). Even in articulating protest, ideas of sameness and continuity remained key.

As more sociological understandings gained ground, however, and the importance of social interaction was brought to the fore, the discursive landscape began to change. E. H. Erikson (1968), who is largely credited with popularizing the word as a theoretical term and promoting its initial use in academic circles, made it clear that he did not conceive of identity as a simple 'quality' or 'fact', but rather as a 'process' – "a process 'located' *in the core of the individual* and yet also *in the core of his communal culture*" (22). By locating the process within *both* the individual and the communal culture, Erikson did his part to underline the role played by society in shaping the individual. His complex theorization of identity, however, aimed at understanding  a wider range of factors than just this, taking into account both biological maturation and historical situation, in addition to social interaction.

Alongside 'identity', then, the process of 'identification' was soon also a topic of much discussion, making its appearance in the writings of scholars ranging from Sigmund Freud (1922) to Nelson Foote (1951), who defined it as a person's "appropriation of and commitment to a particular identity or series of identities" (17). Like Erikson, Foote also emphasized the importance of social interaction in forming identity, in fact proposing the concept of 'identification' as a way of accounting for why social interaction happens the way it does. But an equally significant aspect of Foote's definition of 'identification' is the way in which it so definitively rejects the notion of identity as something innate or given, instead introducing an element of choice or decision into the existing discourse. After all, one must first choose what to appropriate before any appropriation occurs; one must decide to commit before any commitment is made.

This idea, once seized upon, was taken up and developed in several different ways by varying groups of sociologists. Role theory, for example – which, according to Gleason, traces

its roots even further back to Ralph Linton's *The Study of Man* (1936) – argued that identity

resulted from the appropriation of one or more particular social roles, as outlined and assigned by

the society of which the individual is a part. Reference theory, for its part, also maintained the

notion of a set stock of pre-established social roles; it differed from role theory, however, in its

suggestion that

> identities of this sort were not imposed by society in an absolute way, and as one grew
> older and was exposed to a greater variety of social situations, one could combine and
> modify identities by conscious choice more effectively than was possible for a child or
> a young person. (Gleason 1983: 916-917)

A further in-depth study of the use of 'identity', 'identification' and other related terms,

such as that one conducted by Philip Gleason, would clearly demonstrate that not all sociological

discussions used the term in exactly equivalent ways. Erikson's understanding of 'identity' does,

in certain ways, differ significantly from Erving Goffman's (1959) use of the term, just as

Foote's explanation of 'identification' can be distinguished from Freud's earlier use of the

concept. Each of these in their own way, however – along with countless others whose names

could be drawn into our discussion here – reflects the same broad discursive shift in the general

conversation about identity away from 'ontological fact' toward 'ongoing process', away from

'innately given' toward 'socially bestowed'. Perhaps it was Peter Berger (1963) who summed it

up best when he wrote, "Looked at sociologically, the self is no longer a solid, given entity. […]

It is rather a process, continuously created and re-created in each social situation that one enters,

held together by the slender thread of memory" (106).

With the decline of colonialism, the rise of globalization, and an increase in population

movement all over the globe, the societies with which individuals were interacting and the social

situations in which their identities were being formed began to change at a remarkable pace. At

the same time, the discourse surrounding identity underwent yet another transformation as it attempted to furnish terminology sufficient to account for the experience of those who had been uprooted from one place and transplanted to another, as well as that of those who yet found themselves only part way through their journey – that is, all those with identities "not fixed, but poised, *in transition*, between different positions" (Hall 1992: 310). It was the attempt to talk about, to describe and to explain the situation and reality of these individuals – individuals belonging neither here nor there, or perhaps better both here and there – which gave rise not only to the discourse of 'hybridity', but also to that of the 'in-between'.

The phenomenon of 'in-betweenness' was, of course, neither altogether new nor restricted only to dialogue surrounding identity. Margaret Mead (1974), for example, famously saw her position as an anthropologist as that of a person standing *in between* the culture she studied and the culture for whom she wrote her explanations, insisting on the need for what she termed a reflective 'pause' located "at the very point where the perspectives of the observer and the observed merge, thus transcending the dichotomy of the agents involved" (Wolf 2002: 187). Derrida's concept of *differance* is also essentially rooted in a conceptual in-between: "difference coming not out of that which already is, but as something that once manifested is renewed into something else – that is, difference as something that generates difference" (Maranhão 2003a: xvi). Unlike a fixed and stable difference that may consistently exist between two fixed and stable entities, the space of the 'in-between' is instead characterized by "a *differance* that does not posit a supraessential reality beyond existence or beyond essence" (ibid.: xvi).

The notion of the 'in-between' has found new life in current discourse, however, thanks in large part to Homi Bhabha's explication of it in *The Location of Culture* (1994). Building on foundations laid by Derrida (1987/1998) and Benjamin (1923/1996) before him, Bhabha

develops the notion of the 'in-between' as an idealized space for intercultural relation. Within the totality of any society or culture, he explains, there are certain elements which, once displaced from their original settings, cannot be adequately represented in any other language or culture. These are "the interstitial passages and processes of cultural difference that are inscribed in the 'in-between'" (Bhabha 1994: 217). These differences in culture or in identity do not reside in either the space of the first, nor in that of the second, but rather in some other space altogether – a Third Space. They are, as Bhabha states emphatically, "neither One nor the Other but *something else besides, in-between*" (ibid.: 219).

The significance of this Third Space, so the argument goes, is not simply that such *differance* exists there, but rather that within this shared space, emergent differences and the tensions they create can be reflectively and cooperatively negotiated. It is conceived of as a space where mediation and translation take place, not only between languages, cultural practices and knowledge structures, but also, and perhaps most significantly, between identities. As such, it is not understood to be an interposed space that widens the gap between the Self and the Other, but rather an interactive one where this gap is suddenly collapsed, where the Self and the Other are brought closer together and set face to face, and where the negotiation or mediation taking place "is envisioned as the reciprocal interpenetration of Self and Other" (Wolf 2002: 189).

Such an idealized envisioning of the Third Space is not, of course, above critique, and the past two decades have accordingly seen much discussion erupt around the topic by those who have sought to problematize it in various ways (see, for example, Tymoczko 2003). Our priority here, however, is less to rehearse these arguments and critique them as such, than to recognize the extent to which these debates have again shifted the discursive terms used to talk about issues of identity. Whereas sociological discussions had centred on the influence of others and the

weight of social interaction in the formation of identity, postcolonial discussions go much further, insisting instead on the mutual interdependence or 'reciprocal interpenetration' that both differentiates and binds together the Self and the Other. And while some sociologists had indeed introduced the notion of choice into their theories of identity, the degree of agency ascribed to an individual in the latter framework is immeasurably greater. No longer is it simply a matter of selecting a role from a set range of options or even of making modifications to a prescribed role; instead, individuals are seen as having the ability to bring together elements and experiences from often boldly contrasting cultural traditions in order to forge something altogether unique.

Thus the discourse of selection, appropriation and modification is replaced with that of negotiation, hyphenation, hybridity and performance; and what was previously primarily acquiescence to an assigned role within a given cultural or social group becomes an act of empowerment as individuals begin to strategically practice identification with and differentiation from the various groups that surround them. "The subject can no longer be imagined as a form of personhood that is prior to the cultural performance, standing apart from the social process," concludes Bhabha (2000). "The subject is not simply what you start with, as an origin, nor where you end, as a closure. The subject is a strategy of authorization and differentiation" (188). "Identity, here," agrees Jonathan Friedman (1994), "is decisively a question of empowerment" (117).

## 1.2 <u>Narrating Identity</u> – <u>A Conceptual Framework</u>

As the representational aspects of identity were recognized and a discourse that underscored agency, negotiation and performance emerged, scholars became conscious of the need for a new conceptual framework that would allow them to address the complexities of

identity while avoiding the pitfalls of imagined categories which, even when multiplied to add depth and texture, still inevitably imposed misrepresentative boundaries. "While being black has been the powerful social attribution in my life," reflected P.J. Williams in 1991,

> it is only one of a number […] by which I am constantly reconfiguring myself in the world. Gender is another, along with ecology, pacifism, my peculiar brand of colloquial English, and Roxbury, Massachusetts. The complexity of role identification, the politics of sexuality, the inflections of professionalized discourse – all describe and impose boundary in my life, even as they confound one another in unfolding spirals of confrontation, deflection, and dream. (256-257)

It was in direct response to this frustration that Margaret Somers, three years later, published a seminal article entitled "The Narrative Constitution of Identity" (1994). In it, she argued that although categories of identity would no doubt always retain a certain usefulness in the context of daily social interaction, they could never be sufficiently complexified to form the basis of an effective social theory; instead, she insisted, scholars should turn their attention to a consideration of narrative:

> There is no reason to assume a priori that people with similar attributes will share common experiences of social life, let alone be moved to common forms and meanings of social action, unless they share similar narrative identities and relational settings. Bringing narrativity to identity thus provides the conceptual sinews that produces a tighter, more historically sensitive coupling between social identity and agency. (635)

In taking up the discussion of narrative theory, of course, it is first necessary to clarify the concept of 'narrative' that is to be understood. For although in continental Europe the notion of narrative already held a well-established place in discussions of discourse analysis, particularly among certain circles of French and Russian academics (cf. Benveniste 1966; Bakhtin 1934/1981; Genette 1972/1980; Bal 1985), in North America scholarly use of the term at the

time remained primarily in the field of text linguistics (cf. Bruner 1990; Gergen 1994; Longacre 1996). It was for this reason that Somers took pains to distinguish the sociological concept of narrative she wished to examine from that one spoken of by analytical text linguists who have generally considered it as but one of a number of set discursive forms selected for use by a speaker who then shapes his or her speech according to certain fixed linguistic parameters or norms. Instead, Somers followed in the line of those who understood narrative as a critical heuristic tool that we all employ every day, whether consciously or not, to make sense of our lives, of our selves, and of the very world around us. "While the older interpretation of narrative was limited to that of a representational form," we read,

> the new approaches define narrative and narrativity as concepts of *social epistemology* and *social ontology*. These concepts posit that it is through narrativity that we come to know, understand, and make sense of the social world, and it is through narratives and narrativity that we constitute our social identities. (1994: 606)

The basic argument is as follows: Every day of our lives, in every situation and circumstance, we are bombarded by countless stimuli – sights, sounds, smells and sensations, events, actions, reactions, and so on. We cannot possibly process them all, and so we choose what we will attend to and what we will disregard. Consciously or unconsciously, we decide what things are significant enough to deserve our attention and what things we feel we can ignore with impunity. No two people will prioritize the stimuli encountered in exactly the same way or choose to attend to exactly the same phenomena, the result being that, from any given situation, each individual present will walk away having perceived their own version of the event or experience and having pieced together their own interpretation of its significance; that is to say, they will walk away having strategically constructed their own narrative, whether only slightly or quite drastically unique. It is by this same process that all of us undertake to actively

make sense of our experience on every level. Narratives, then, do far more than simply "describe ready-made events; rather, they provide the central means by which we *create* notions as to what took place, how the action unfolded, what prompted it, and the social effects of the events" (Briggs 1996: 22-23). In the end, narratives are the "semiological apparatuses" that enable us to make sense of our world (White 1987: x).

This perspective understood, it is not difficult to grasp the connection between narrative and identity. For if we once accept that "the fully unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is a fantasy" and that identity is instead "formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us" (Hall 1992: 277), then the potential of a narrative framework to help us understand this destabilizing of identity, even in the process of its formation, soon becomes clear. "One way to avoid the hazards of rigidifying aspects of identity into a misleading categorical entity," Somers writes,

> is to incorporate into the core conception of identity the categorically destabilizing dimensions of *time*, *space*, and *relationality*. […] An energetic engagement with this new ontological narrativity provides an opportunity to infuse the study of identity formation with a relational and historical approach that avoids categorical rigidities. (1994: 606, 607)

In this way, the continual formation of socially-situated identities and the active construction of narratives designed to make sense of social reality can be said to go very much hand in hand.

But the notion of representation must also be underlined as key here. For just as shifting notions of identity can be traced back, at least in part, to what has been termed the 'Crisis of Representation' of the 1970s, so too does the acceptance of narrative as an epistemological tool find its roots in that same crisis; that is, in the questioning of

an essentially realistic epistemology, which conceives of representation as the production, for subjectivity, of an objectivity that lies outside it [and] projects a mirror theory of knowledge and art, whose fundamental evaluative categories are those of adequacy, accuracy and Truth itself. (Jameson 1984: viii)

Dennis Mumby, in his discussion of the relationship between narrative and representation, emphasizes that there are two main aspects which must be considered. The first is precisely this challenge to the belief in a single and certain objective account of reality, which opens the way for multiple and contesting representations, or narrations, of the same set of events. "But second, and just as important," he writes, "it is a crisis about the process of political representation and about who gets to play a role in the constitution of societal meaning systems" (1993: 2). It is not just a question of how something or someone is represented, he goes on to argue, but also very much a question of who gets to do the representing. And just as both sides of this question have been shown to be key to the formation of identity, so too are both integral to the construction of narrative which, rather than simply reflecting reality, instead actively constitutes it, "ceaselessly substituting meaning for the straightforward copy of the events recounted" (White 1987: 2).

This constitutive nature of narrative, thus understood in its relationship to identity, is made all the more evident if we pause to underline three central and unavoidable aspects of narrative construction. The first of these, already mentioned above in fact, is *selective appropriation*. "Every narrative," White assures us, "however seemingly 'full', is constructed on the basis of a set of events that might have been included but were left out" (ibid.: 10). There is no narrative broad enough to encompass all that takes place in reality and no narrator who is not inherently limited by his or her own perspective and experience. Even our grandest attempts at generating objective, historical accounts of a certain set of events or circumstances ultimately fall short; for in the end they can do only that – account for a *certain set* of events or circumstances.

Every time a narrative is constructed, choices are made. Some occurrences will be included. Others will be left aside, silent and unmentioned; and yet they too happened, even if not selected for inclusion in the narrative, and they linger, waiting for recognition.

Given this inevitable process of selection, then, the question we are faced with next is this: according to what criteria are such selections made? The answer brings us to a second inalienable feature of narrative, that is, its *relationality*. Just as identities are formed and reformed in light of social relationships and systems, so is the construction of narrative similarly governed. It is the society to which a narrator belongs or with which a narrator identifies that provides the "diacritical markers" that lead us to judge one event as being more important than another, more fraught with meaning than another, more worthy of inclusion in a narrative than another (White 1987: 10). Selective appropriation is carried out as events are considered not as isolated occurrences, but rather in relation to other times, other places, other actions and events judged to have had ethical, moral or historical significance for a given society or culture. It is this relationality that provides the framework within which we can derive meaning from that which takes place, in accordance with the ideologies to which we subscribe. As Mumby asserts,

> Narrative is a *socially* symbolic act in the double sense that (a) it takes on meaning only in a social context and (b) it plays a role in the construction of that social context as a site of meaning within which social actors are implicated. (1993: 5)

So we see that narratives are constructed by selecting out from the myriad of proceedings to which we bear witness only those instances deemed to be significant enough for inclusion when considered in relation to the social systems within which we live and locate ourselves. However, even so, merely placing the resulting inventory of events side by side in chronological order is not sufficient for the creation of a meaningful narrative. For this, the events must again be recognized as relating to one another, this time arrayed in the arc of a plotline, with plot

understood to be "a structure of relationships by which the events contained in the account are endowed with a meaning by being identified as parts of an integrated whole" (White 1987: 9). It is this *emplotment* – the third imperative feature of narrative – that accords meaning to individual occurrences as they happen, finding a place for them within a story that makes sense to us, that has import and implication for our daily lives. "The meaning of real human lives," White concludes,

> whether of individuals or collectivities, is the meaning of the plots, quasiplots, paraplots, or failed plots by which the events that those lives comprise are endowed with the aspect of stories having a discernible beginning, middle, and end. A meaningful life is one that aspires to the coherency of a story with a plot. (ibid.: 173)

Here we see the true significance of narrative, viewed from the sociological perspective of narrative theory – no longer a simple representational form, but an actual "ontological condition of social life" (Somers 1994: 614), essential to that process by which we both make sense of the world around us and establish our own place within it, a fundamental counterpart to the ongoing formation and transformation of identity.

Beyond this, however, there is yet one further tenet of narrative theory which White simultaneously underlines in his assertion: there is never just one narrative; there is never just one plot; there is never just one way of understanding. On the contrary, at every turn, we find ourselves confronted by diverse and changing narratives – narratives which differ depending upon their creator, the perspective from which they are told, and the scope of activity they are intended to explain. We locate and relocate ourselves every day relative to multiple fragmented and ever-unfolding stories.

One of the most useful typologies of narrative to have emerged to date is that one presented by Somers (1992, 1994), and again by Somers and Gibson (1994). According to this

typology, there are four distinct types of stories which must be considered in seeking to understand the shifting narrative network within which identities are formed. These are as follows:

- *Ontological narratives* – Our personal stories, our unique biographies, our individual attempts to shape our often disparate experiences into the sort of 'meaningful lives' that White speaks of – lives with "the coherency of a story with a plot" (1987: 173). Through them, we are positioned as parts within a greater whole, as members of families and of communities, with relationships and consequent rights and responsibilities toward the people who surround us.

- *Public narratives* – Accounts "attached to cultural and institutional formations larger than the single individual, to intersubjective networks or institutions, however local or grand" (Somers 1994: 619). These are the stories that give rationale to our groupings and organizations – the stories of our family, of our ethnic group, of our religious denomination, of our social class, of our government, or of our country. They are the narratives that draw us together and provide the broader backdrop for the shaping and understanding of individual ontological narratives.

- *Meta-narratives* – Stories that recount "the epic dramas of our time: Capitalism vs. Communism, the Individual vs. Society, Barbarism/Nature vs. Civility", and so on (Somers 1992: 605). These are the narratives that link communities, cultures and nations to the grander arcs of world history, sometimes drawn out explicitly and obviously, but more often operating "at a presuppositional level of social-science epistemology or beyond our awareness" (Somers 1994: 619).

- *Conceptual narratives* – Those narratives crafted and told by social researchers in their attempts to link together in meaningful ways various elements from each of the first three narrative levels, drawing out connections between "the ontological narratives and relationships of historical actors, the public and cultural narratives that inform their lives, and the crucial intersection of these narratives with other relevant social forces [i.e. market patterns, institutional practices, organizational constraints]" (ibid.: 620).

Each narrative type is, to a certain extent, distinctly identifiable; yet each finds itself in a relationship of interdependency with the others. Meta-narratives emerge from and depend on the way in which we string together and understand entire complexes of public narratives. Ontological narratives are constrained by the public narratives that determine what is socially acceptable or unacceptable, circumscribing "the stock of identities from which individuals may choose a social role for themselves" (Baker 2006: 21). And so it goes, until it becomes all too clear that the narratives we live by have neither absolute fixed form nor set discrete boundaries. They are instead malleable constructions, intertwined with one another, ever open to transformation, ever vulnerable to manipulation.

In considering the question of how identities are molded and transformed through systems of formal education – influenced as they are by existing social hierarchies and the vested interest of those in power to perpetuate the status quo – it is necessary to take into account the first three levels of narrative at least. However, given the close link that exists between the power to shape public narratives and the exercise of political power more broadly, it is on this level in particular that we will train our gaze; because the public narratives of any society – constructed, elaborated and circulated by the dominant social institutions – are crucial to the maintenance and perpetuation of established power structures. The authority to write the public narrative is, White

tells us, for all intents and purposes, "the authority to decide what history means, what it teaches, and what obligations it lays upon us all" (1987: 183-184). Public narratives are thus sated with ideological significance, recognizable principally in

> their capacity to naturalize particular constructions of conflict and of social relations in general. Sound symbols and other techniques of verisimilitude, subtle grammatical patterning, and rhetorical structures can be used in creating the sense that the events unfolded naturally just as the narrator described them. (Briggs 1996: 29)

Public narratives, then, can be used to reproduce, in an apparently artless manner, both structures of authority and the ideologies that uphold them. Told and retold countless times and in countless fragmented forms, decontextualized and recontextualized as many times as needed to reach broad segments of a population, and taking full advantage of the normative force that comes from constant repetition, public narratives can soon become a pervasive social and political influence, often difficult to challenge, even once recognized. "In this sense," Mumby concludes,

> the construction of social reality is not spontaneous and consensual but is the product of the complex relations among narrative, power, and culture. The relationships among social actors in institutional settings are thus as much political as they are social. (1993: 6-7)

At the same time, however, the relationship between ontological and public narratives is far from unidirectional; it is rather, as we have already stated, one marked by interdependence. For just as surely as ontological narratives are informed and shaped by collective ones, so too do public narratives rest in dependence on these personal stories, relying on a significant degree of steady conformity on the part of ontological tales to help maintain their more broadly overarching storylines and structures. "Shared narratives require the polyvocality of numerous personal stories to gain currency and acceptance, to become 'normalized' into self-evident accounts of the world and hence escape scrutiny," explains Baker. "Only unquestioning

subscription by numerous individuals […] could sustain the collective narrative in each case" (2006: 30).

All this taken into account, we can discern the several benefits of adopting narrative theory as a conceptual framework for the current discussion. To begin with, it provides us a natural way of talking about the representations that are being presented and the stories that are being told to Canadians about the various linguistic and cultural groups that make up our population and the way these groups are supposed to fit together in the social and political realms. These are stories that are told not just through the curricula taught in our schools, but also through the structuring of the educational system itself, and revealed in many ways in the legislation that governs it. Moreover, the recognition that narratives are not told every time in their entirety – beginning at the start and going straight through to the end – but that they are instead often recounted in fragmented form, as pieces ranging through an entire series of texts, gives us a useful way of envisioning how the various texts within our corpus come together to form a cohesive whole. This allows us not only to see more clearly the collective force of recurrent narratives repeated at different times, by different voices and from different directions and reinforcing social structures of power, but also to recognize the ways that apparently similar texts can in fact function in almost opposite ways when recognized as fragments and contextualized within the broader whole. Finally, narrative theory is also valuable in that its approach to the interdependent nature of various levels of narrative provides a way for us to explore how the public narratives circulated both through legislation and through the systems of minority language education it structures can go on to exercise influence over ontological narratives, impacting the formation of both individual and collective cultural identity.

**1.3 <u>Where Translation and Identity Meet</u>**

Let us return for a moment to our prior reflection on the discourse of identity, as we traced the movement from terminology concerned with 'sameness' and 'continuity'; through discussions of 'process', 'choice' and 'identification'; to a marked turn toward notions of agentive 'negotiation', 'performance' and 'hybridity'. For along this same trajectory, we have still one more step to take.

While the discourses of hybridity and of the in-between are indisputably still very present and even now often seem to predominate academic debates regarding identity, nonetheless from their midst one more distinct strand of this discussion has begun to emerge, one of particular interest to us as it strains to shift the discourse of identity yet once more, this time in order to frame it in terms of translation. One of the earliest clear examples of such an attempt can be found in a 1995 article entitled "Tradition and Translation: National Culture in its Global Context." In it, David Morley and Kevin Robins reflected on the fundamental differences between those representations of cultural identity that remain focused on fixed forms of the past, leaning heavily on the notion of Tradition (with a capital 'T'), and those that recognize and acknowledge the ever-changing realities of an increasingly global world, looking forward instead through the lens of what they call 'Translation'. According to their argument, representations of Traditional identities are characterized by a "prevailing concern with the comforts and continuities of historical Tradition" which is, in their view, merely a "protective illusion" embraced in response to a rapidly changing global reality, but which cannot, or at the very least should not, be allowed to persist (Morley & Robins 1995: 106). By contrast, Translation – set forth as the difficult, unsettling, and yet necessary alternative to Tradition – recognizes the reality of constant political and historical change and the partiality of representation, as well as the fact

that there is no way back or, in truth, any 'pure' identity to get back to. "Continuity and historicity of identity," they conclude, "are challenged by the immediacy and intensity of global cultural confrontations. The comforts of Tradition are fundamentally challenged by the imperative to forge a new self-interpretation based upon the responsibilities of cultural Translation" (ibid.: 122).

It cannot be denied that, in many ways, the opposition thus set up between Tradition and Translation was overly simplistic, and for that, the article might be severely critiqued. And yet the article holds to its credit the achievement of having sparked a significant discussion, as evidenced by the fact that Morley and Robins' argument has been taken up again by a whole list of scholars – including the likes of Stuart Hall (1992), Homi Bhabha (2000) and Eva Mackey (2002) to name only three – who have since gone on to nuance, critique and expand the central idea that it presented. And yet it is but one example of this shifting trend toward talking about identity, its transformation and its re-formation using the vocabulary of translation. Over the past two decades, the idea of 'identities in translation' or 'translated identities' has been addressed by a growing number who have come to view translation as

> a way of thinking about how languages, people, and cultures are transformed as they move between different places […and] as a way of describing how the individual or the group can be transformed by changing their sense of their own place in society. (Young 2003: 29)

Some, like Salman Rushdie, have employed this new discursive strand in self-reflective pieces; in *Imaginary Homelands* (1991), for example, Rushdie repeatedly depicts himself as a 'translated man' – both bilingual and "borne across the world" (17). Others have explored it from a more theoretical vantage point; in "The Question of Cultural Identity" (1992), for instance, Stuart Hall argued that all those who migrate, whether by force or by choice, "must learn to inhabit at least

two identities, to speak two cultural languages, to translate and negotiate between them"; they are, as a result, "irrevocably *translated*" (310).

At the same time, this discursive approximation of identity and translation has been matched by a growing body of works that draws attention to an important conceptual connection also being established between the two, as scholars now seek to better understand the complex relations of language and translation to identity. In a book entitled simply *Translation and Identity* (2006), Michael Cronin asserts that

> in a world and in a century where identity has become one of the key sites of struggle, translation is particularly well situated to make a positive and enabling contribution to debates around the issue, a contribution which respects complexities of allegiance while demonstrating the need for reciprocity and dialogue. (5)

Likewise, in his own book on the subject, Edwin Gentzler (2008) also insists that "translation constitutes one of the primary means by which culture is constructed and is therefore important to any study of cultural evolution and identity formation" (2).

The works which comprise this body of research linking identity and translation have been produced by academics working in a surprisingly broad range of disciplinary fields beyond Translation Studies itself. And yet while all appear to share the common goal of bringing together these two concepts and exploring the relationship between them, it is by no means certain that they always, or even often, follow the same route in approaching this goal. For while those pieces written by researchers at home in Translation Studies generally seem to demonstrate a steady progression which begins from an initial mode of thought clearly fixed on the textual and the interlingual and slowly moves outward to make room for wider perspectives, those who write about translation from other locations, drawing on other disciplinary points of view, are

easier about rooting their arguments in more metaphorical conceptions, allowing for more sweeping statements and the highlighting of more general parallels.

The vast majority of works which have thus far emerged 'from within' Translation Studies, so to speak, and aiming to address this problematic have made their approach from one of three closely related, yet still distinct, angles. The first of these focuses attention on the identity of the translator as it is written into the text, revealed through the choices that he or she has made in foregrounding or backgrounding particular textual elements, adding explanatory or paratextual materials, leaving aside what is deemed to be 'unnecessary' or 'superfluous', and so on. These choices, whether consciously or subconsciously made, can reveal much about the attitude and the identity of the translator, even as they shape the representations thereby created in the text. Barbara Folkart's *Le conflit des énonciations* (1991) and Theo Hermans' "The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative" (1996) represent two important examples, with further instances ranging from Venuti's *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995) – which focuses on "translators' self-presentations" and on their use of discursive effects to continuously efface their own presence (7) – to Nikolaou and Kyritsi's more recent edited collection entitled *Translating Selves: Experience and Identity Between Languages and Literatures* (2008) – which considers the experience of the 'translator-self' as a reflective, multilingual being in relation with the text and with the original author. These are studies which seek to demonstrate the complexity of the translator's position as one moving and operating within and between multiple languages, cultures and social spheres, through the examination of translated texts and discovery of the traces left therein.

A second angle of approach to the question – one which opens up the notion of translation one step more broadly – can be discerned in those studies which train their gaze more

closely on the social impact of a translator's choices, that is, on the very real ways in which translated texts inform the perceptions and constructed realities of their receptive audiences. In "The Formation of Cultural Identities" (1998), Venuti argues that it is not just the specifics of the translation strategy that need to be examined, but also the method of textual selection, of publication, review, teaching and other use, for all of these factors affect the way that foreign texts are received and understood, as well as the cultural stereotypes that may eventually be formed in their wake. "In creating stereotypes," he explains,

> translation may attach esteem or stigma to specific ethnic, racial, and national groupings, signifying respect for cultural difference or hatred based on ethnocentrism, racism, or patriotism. In the long run, translation figures in geopolitical relations by establishing the cultural grounds of diplomacy, reinforcing alliances, antagonisms, and hegemonies between nations. (1998: 67-68)

In his own later book on the topic, Michael Cronin (2006) nuances this point somewhat further, arguing that, given the intricate nature of migratory flows and the increasing commonality of multicultural and multilingual realities within even individual nation-states, "we now have a situation where translation pressures are endogenous rather than exogenous" (58) and where the cultural representations created through translation are just as often of our neighbours as they are of an Other to be found somewhere across the sea. Works such as these, which begin from a recognition of the fundamentally representational and inherently partial nature of translations and move to highlight the cumulative weight and impact of oft-repeated discourse and imagery in shaping our view of the world around us, have a social and sociological bent which naturally results in a more nuanced discussion of the complexities of identity, as well as of those of translation.

The third group of writings to have emerged 'from within' includes all those which seek to emphasize the ways that translations have been or can be used to negotiate and re-negotiate

identity through self-translation and other subversive strategies. Sunny Singh's "Writing in My Own Foreign Language: Dilemmas of an Indian Writer in English" (2006) would be a classic example of this approach, as would Daniel Gagnon's "Cross-Writing and Self-Translating: One Canadian/Quebec Experience" (2006). Drawing heavily on postcolonial theories and ideas, these are often works which aim at critiquing the cultural and social policies of colonialism, at highlighting the possibilities that arise from fragmented narration, and at finding a way to re-shape shared cultural spaces. Of the three categories considered, it is here that we see the most intricate picture drawn of identity as something being constantly, actively and intentionally formed and reformed, as well as the broadest use of the translation concept in what are sometimes non-textual or non-traditional ways.

All three of these approaches to our central problematic have proven to be both useful and insightful. They have shed light on the ways that selective and strategic translation has impacted the formation and perception of cultural identities the world over, serving in the process to help create and reinforce certain structures of power; and they have helped us envision new methods by which translation can be used in turn to reformulate these same identities and undermine these same power structures, serving in stark contrast as a tool of resistance. Yet as much as they may vary, with hardly an exception all of these works produced by Translation Studies scholars still hold as central an immediate connection to a linguistically translated text.

Those who have begun to speak of translation and identity from other disciplinary perspectives, on the other hand, have generally demonstrated a lesser concern with keeping their discussions tied to specific instances of textual translation and a greater freedom to use the vocabulary and discourse of translation to offer more sweeping observations, highlighting more general parallels that often focus on particular or selected aspects of translation. In the health

sciences, for example, it is the pragmatic communicative function of translation that is in focus; even within a given language, culture or community, it is observed, the same information needs to be communicated in different ways to different groups of people – here ranging from researchers, to practitioners, to policy makers, to members of the public (Sudsawad 2007). Translation, in this instance, is conceived of primarily as a communicative process that is user- and context-specific. In the discussion of jurisprudence, it is the reality of recontextualization that is key; a given original may have countless variant manifestations in countless variant contexts, with translation conceived as a tool for minimizing and managing the effects of changing settings and circumstances (Crapanzano 2003). Here translation is viewed first and foremost as a continual process of de-contextualiztion and re-contextualization, yet with some central element believed to remain relatively constant throughout. When it comes to the writing of fiction, Jhumpa Lahiri (2000) suggests that it is in turn the inevitable partiality and limitation of any representation that renders the discourse of translation most relevant. In none of these cases is a prototypical conception of translation as a process of interlinguistic and intercultural translation taken up as a whole; and yet in each of these instances, with their different selected emphases, something true of translation is spoken.

The same holds when we turn to consider the work of historians, authors and literary critics who write about 'translating identity',  often while holding comparative elements beyond the linguistic at the forefront of their minds. Eva Hoffman, a Polish-Canadian author who now lives between New York and London and whose autobiography is entitled *Lost in Translation: A Life in a New Language* (1989), writes eloquently and at length about the challenges that came with learning a new language when her family emigrated to Canada in 1959. Yet her account of having to learn to 'translate' her identity includes far more than just the linguistic elements; it

stretches instead to include the cultural, the social and the relational adjustments that were simultaneously required of her. "In the politics of daily perceptions," she reflects,

> I'm at a distinct disadvantage. My American friends are so many, and they share so many assumptions that are quite invisible to them, precisely because they're shared. These are assumptions about the most fundamental human transactions, subcutaneous beliefs, which lie just below the stratum of political opinion or overt ideology: about how much "space," physical or psychological, we need to give each other, about how much "control" is desirable, about what is private and what public, about how much interest in another person's affairs is sympathy and how much interference, about what's a pretty face or a handsome body, about what we're allowed to poke fun at and what we have to revere, about how much we need to hide in order to reveal ourselves. To remain outside such common agreements is to remain outside reality itself – and if I'm not to risk a mild cultural schizophrenia, I have to make a shift in the innermost ways I have to translate myself. (210-211)

The translation she speaks of here clearly goes well beyond the substitution of one vocabulary set for another; it operates at a much deeper and more fundamental level. It is a translation of beliefs, of understanding, of ways of knowing, of ways of relating to those who are around her. These are the deep transformations which underlie every translation, of course, and yet unlike those strict Translation Studies scholars who consider these complexities only ever in relation to a given instance or set of instances of textual translation, Hoffman feels herself free to focus directly on these broader implications, to use the discourse of translation in a more sweeping manner, to centre her thoughts on the translation of a person – an identity – without being tied to consideration of a particular written or spoken text.

The same could be said of Salman Rushdie's (1991) reflections on his own migratory experience. Migration for him, as for Hoffman, entails a translation of the self, complete with the

same disruptions, complications and sometimes questionable results. "A full migrant suffers, traditionally, a triple disruption," he explains.

> He loses his place, he enters into an alien language, and he finds himself surrounded by beings whose social behaviour and codes are very unlike, and sometimes even offensive to, his own. And this is what makes migrants such important figures: because roots, language and social norms have been three of the most important parts of the definition of what it is to be a human being. The migrant, denied all three, is obliged to find new ways of describing himself, new ways of being human. (277-278)

Roots, language, and social norms. A physical displacement matched by a linguistic and a social one. In Rushdie's view, these three disruptures suffered by the migrant are the same three which commonly characterize translation as well: a text reproduced in a new setting (whether geographical, temporal or both), in a new language, and for a new audience, part of a new culture governed by different social norms and behaviours. And just as the translator is obliged to seek out ways of recreating the text in the midst of all this newness, so the migrant is forced to recreate himself and his identity in the context of a new situation. The parallels are clear, even without reference to any specific translated text, and so Rushdie, like Hoffman, co-opts the discourse and vocabulary of translation almost completely divorced from any specific textual translation project.

This, then, is the complex discursive terrain on which we find our problematic. The discourses of identity are constantly evolving, as are conceptions of translation and understandings of which discussions properly belong to the field of Translation Studies. And while some fight to maintain clear links with the textual, even while broadening their notion of the term, others push toward the metaphorical and the paradigmatic, leaving the textual to fade almost to the background in their view. These latter, non-prototypical considerations of

translation at times strike us as troubling, running the risk, as they often do, of being less than systematic in their analytical procedure, and yet it does not automatically follow that they are therefore less revealing, neither that they are less instructive; on the contrary, it is precisely the lack of a single, fixed or determined meaning that lends any figurative construction its richness and its power, in this case enabling the metaphorical conceptions of translation to draw attention to the deep complexity of the process anew, especially in its relation to the formation of identity.

Even so, in the movement from prototypical to paradigmatic models, it is sometimes better to go by single steps and increments than by leaps and bounds, and this is perhaps one of the greatest advantages of inserting a discussion of education just here, at the intersection of translation and identity; for in considering the languages allowed or disallowed, underscored or dismissed, in the context of schooling, we start from quite solid prototypical grounds, looking at the transition from one language to another, citing specific documents, policies and statements. Yet the effects of these specifics, we soon realize, are much broader, encompassing not only language, but also culture, perception, and identity, in this way flowing naturally into the realm of the metaphoric and, hopefully in time, the paradigmatic.

The increasingly disjunctive nature of the school experience for many students allows for the drawing of numerous parallels between education and migration as we have heard it discussed, especially when our focus is narrowed from education in general to that of students from minority language and culture groups more specifically, wherever they may exist within a broader majority context. For these students – often, though certainly not always, migrants themselves – entrance into the formal education system is an experience that is jarring not only linguistically, but also culturally and socially. It is a system that requires them to speak a language other than their own, but which moreover teaches them new narratives about the world

and its history, new patterns of reasoning and logic, new values, beliefs and social norms – all of which may or may not be consistent with lessons previously learned in the context of their own cultural communities. In such cases, then – just as Hoffman and Rushdie argued was true of migration – formal education requires more than the straight translation of speech from one language to another, according to our most prototypical understanding of the term; it also and more fundamentally requires the translation of the children themselves from one language to another, from one way of thinking to another, from one way of being to another. If migration is a form of translation, then so too must education be; and if the migrant is a translated being, could not the same be said of these students thus transformed by the requirements of a formal education system?

In the midst of this complex terrain, and in light of prior discussions like that one that has surrounded the idea of migration-as-translation – an idea which, it should be noted, has since been taken up by Translation Studies scholars as well (consider, for example, Malena 2003 or Cronin 2006) – we can recognize in the study of language and education an opportunity open before us. Precisely because the translational project recognizable in schooling is so very multifaceted, precisely because it so clearly entails both linguistic and non-linguistic elements, it provides us with a rich area in which to explore not just the implications of language and education on the formation of identity at both the individual and collective levels, but also the potential productivity of such broader comparisons in responding to the ever more frequent call for the development of a more systematic translational paradigm to help us further engage with the politics of identity in the age of globalization.

**1.4 Of Language, Education and Identity in Canada**

Clearly, then, the intersection of language, education, identity and translation is an area which opens up numerous potential pathways for exploration and examination, and it would be far beyond the scope of the current project to attempt to engage with all of them fully. It will be necessary, then, for us to limit our focus somewhat. We will return to the question of 'translated identities' and the potential benefits of considering non-textual transformative processes in light of a translational paradigm in the final part of our discussion. More immediately before us, however, lies the direct question of how the treatment of languages in education policy and the necessary translation of speech and thought on the part of many students within the schooling system impacts the formation of identity. Even here, though, further precision of our focus is undoubtedly required. Education, as we noted in our very introduction, begins to exert its influence at the level of individual identity formation, but it is never content to end there; instead, its influence then continues to flow outward, impacting in turn the families, communities and societies of which the individually affected students are a part. It is on the level of this collective effect and impact that we wish to train our attention.

Traditionally, education was always closely tied to life experience – the basic strategies needed for survival, the social skills needed to appropriately interact with others, and so on. It often took place informally and was closely governed by family, as well as other known and trusted members of the community. In this way, young people came to learn their own roles and responsibilities within the group to which they belonged. So too, in this way, the social life and structure of the group was perpetuated from one generation to the next. "Education, in its broadest sense," wrote John Dewey, a prominent American philosopher of education,

> is the means of this social continuity of life. Every one of the constituent elements of
> a social group, in a modern city as in a savage tribe, is born immature, helpless,

without language, beliefs, ideas, or social standards. Each individual, each unit who is the carrier of the life-experience of his group, in time passes away. Yet the life of the group goes on. (1916/2009: 6)

It goes on – it has always gone one – thanks to education in its many and various forms.

As successive waves of social change have swept through much of our world over the past few centuries, revolutionizing both political structures and common modes of production and consumption, education too has been significantly transformed. Many of the previously immediate ties to life experience were ruptured (or at least greatly loosened) and the degree of familial control dramatically decreased as formal school systems began to be established. Although of course the maturation and growth of individual students remained a primary concern, with the formation and official sanctioning of given systems of schooling, the societal stake in education was sharply underlined. As Dewey explains,

> Roughly speaking, [schools] come into existence when social traditions are so complex that a considerable part of the social store is committed to writing and transmitted through written symbols. Written symbols are even more artificial or conventional than spoken; they cannot be picked up in accidental intercourse with others. In addition, the written form tends to select and record matters which are comparatively foreign to everyday life. […] Consequently as soon as a community depends to any considerable extent upon what lies beyond its own territory and its own immediate generation, it must rely upon the set agency of schools to insure adequate transmission of all its resources. […] Our daily associations cannot be trusted to make clear to the young the part played in our activities by remote physical energies, and by invisible structures. Hence, a special mode of intercourse is instituted, the school, to care for such matters. (1916/2009: 19)

Yet if such a claim *may* be sufficient to explain the original evolution of systems of schooling, still it falls far short of reflecting the essential role this key social institution has over time come to play in modern society. The idea that education "is a matter not of what some

pedagogues think is best for their pupils but of what society wants for all its citizens if they are to

participate intelligently and actively in their common interests" is a noble, if utopian, notion

(Pring 2007: 122), but one that has for decades been soundly rejected by education theorists

around the globe. More than simply a place for the teaching of objective facts and figures, more

than "a neutral environment […] where teachers respectful of the 'conscience' and 'freedom' of

the children […] open up for them the path to the freedom, morality and responsibility of adults"

(Althusser 1971: 156-157), schools have instead long been designed as mechanisms for

imparting to students norms, values and behaviours that will befit the particular rank and role

they are meant to occupy within an existing social hierarchy. Louis Althusser, the French

philosopher who argued that schooling has come to constitute *the* dominant Ideological State

Apparatus in any mature social formation since the end of feudalism and the decline of the

Roman Catholic Church, expressed it as follows:

> What do children learn at school? They go varying distances in their studies, but at
> any rate they learn to read, to write and to add – i.e. a number of techniques, and a
> number of other things as well (which might be rudimentary or on the contrary
> thoroughgoing) of 'scientific' or 'literary culture' […] Thus they learn the know-how.
>
> But besides these techniques and knowledges, and in learning them, children at
> school also learn the 'rules' of good behaviour, i.e. the attitude that should be
> observed by every agent in the division of labour, according to the job he is 'destined'
> for: rules of morality, civic and professional conscience, which actually means rules
> of respect for the socio-technical division of labour and ultimately the rules of the
> order established by class domination. (1971: 132)

Schooling, then, is understood to be not just a mode of producing educated individuals,

but of reproducing the ways of thinking, reasoning and establishing relationships that support

and maintain a social order. And lest the reader be put off by Althusser's decidedly Marxist

rhetoric, it is important to note that similar observations have been and continue to be made in all

sorts of societies, Marxist or not, and at many different points in history. Canada, for instance, could certainly not be counted any exception in this regard. "The 1831 'Rules for the Establishment of Schools in Lower Canada' required students to love God, to defer to the master, be silent throughout class, clean the classroom [and] avoid idleness" (Axelrod 1997: 21). Moreover, teachers were instructed that

> schools should cultivate the students' sense of citizenship, loyalty, respect for property, and deference to authority. […] Education should prepare youth for their 'appropriate duties and employments of life as Christians, as persons of business, and also as members of the civil community in which they live'. (ibid.: 25)

Clearly, since very early in Canada's history, schools were intended to be not just institutions of instruction but instruments of transformation, taking the students who entered through their doors and turning them into 'good citizens', as defined by the ruling body, the public authority.

Perhaps few, though, have addressed the question of schools as facilitators of social hierarchy more clearly or passionately than renowned sociologist of education Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu (1970/1990) argued that schools, through a series of factors touching curriculum, pedagogy and evaluative methods, favoured from the start students of a certain social class and cultural background; as a result, these favoured students almost invariably excelled more than those who found themselves starting from further behind and without the benefit of social advantage, the natural consequence being the reproduction, year after year, generation after generation, of the same social hierarchy. Such favouritism, Bourdieu explained, is at once legitimized and made invisible by the use of tools such as the entrance exam, which appears to place all students on an equal footing, but only does so by ignoring the social and academic inequalities already in place. "The organization and functioning of the school system continuously and through multiple codes retranslates inequalities in social level into inequalities

in academic level," he insisted. "Blindness to social inequalities, so frequent among both students and teachers, condemns and allows the explanation that all inequalities of academic success are natural inequalities and inequalities of talent" (1970/1990: 158). Michael J. Grenfell, in his insightful analysis of Bourdieu's work, succinctly summarizes the crux of the argument this way:

> In schools, there was a claim to meritocracy: education was available to all. Yet, one function of the education process was social selection: to legitimate and replicate the dominant factions within the social hierarchy. Since this selection function went largely unacknowledged, and therefore unrecognized, it was all the more powerful and pervasive. (2007: 87)

The question of social hierarchy in Canada is certainly not an easy one to address. A nation comprised from the start of provinces and peoples vastly different from one another, bringing together not only multiple languages, religions and cultural traditions, but also diverse industries, economies and political convictions, Canada has never for a day been able to take for granted a common nationalist sentiment. Not even sweeping attempts to instill the pride of the British Empire into its colonized subjects were ever enough to counter the vast range of life experience among Canadians. Consequently, Canadian national identity has from the beginning been a hotly contested terrain, leaning heavily on the notions of tolerance toward difference and cultural compromise. "Canada is often described as a 'cultural mosaic' in order to differentiate it from the American cultural 'melting pot'. In the Canadian 'mosaic', it is said, all the hyphenated cultures – French-Canadian, Native-Canadian, and 'multicultural-Canadian' – are celebrated" (Mackey 2002: 2). This notion of tolerant multiculturalism, however, attractive as it may be on the surface, is not without its darker side, and over the last decade or two, scholarship has worked steadily to more appropriately problematize the very idea of tolerance itself.

Richard Day, in his book *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity* (2000), writes, "It is only when one is in the presence of what appears to be intolerable difference that tolerance becomes necessary and, in many cases, manifests itself as a gloss on hidden resentments" (104). Thus from its first appearance, he reminds us, we must recognize tolerance as being already rooted in prejudice and judgment. Not only that, but also inherent in the notion of tolerance is the very reality of power: someone has the power to tolerate, while another can only ask to be tolerated. "Tolerance actually reproduces dominance," Mackey (2002) argues, "because asking for 'tolerance' always implies the possibility of intolerance. The power and the choice to accept or not accept difference, to tolerate it or not, still lies in the hands of the tolerators" (16). It is a "limited gift" which may or may not be "bestowed" upon Others by the Selves in power, Day (2000) goes on in his turn, noting that throughout most of Canadian history – almost right up until the official adoption of multicultural policy in 1971 – tolerance was not considered an end in itself, a status quo to be maintained, but rather "the necessary counterbalance while waiting for assimilation to have its effects" (104). This was true in the management of the 'Indian problem' by way of the 1869 *Indian Enfranchisement Act*, just as it had been in the treatment of francophones by the *Royal Proclamation* of 1763, with its stated goal of bringing about "the absorption of the French nation by the English, which in matters of language, patriotism, law and religion is evidently what is most desirable and could perhaps be realized in one or two generations" (Maseres, as cited in Day 2000: 106).

A further level of complication is added when we consider that it is not simply a question of *if* tolerance will be bestowed or not, but moreover one of *how far* tolerance once bestowed will be extended. Which forms of difference are to be tolerated and which will be deemed intolerable? Even in a country like Canada, where multicultural tolerance is relatively generously

bestowed, there are clear limits to its extension. Although the policy Pierre Trudeau introduced in 1971 identified more than 80 distinct ethnic and cultural groups potentially eligible for government funding to support the development and maintenance of their unique identities, it simultaneously, though perhaps more subtly, limited the forms of difference that were to be accepted and tolerated. "The support provided by the state is limited to that which will help cultural groups to participate in and contribute to Canadian society and Canadian unity," Mackey (2000) observes. "Therefore, acceptable cultural diversity must buttress the project of nation-building," as it is envisioned, undertaken and directed by those in positions of power (66). Tolerable forms of difference, supported forms of multiculturalism, extended only as far as ethnic and cultural displays – particularly those of the sort which would further highlight Canada's tolerant and inclusive national character – but did not leave room for the assertion of any linguistic or political claim which might in time disrupt the status quo or shake the already established hierarchy of dominance.

Thobani (2007) notes that the same approach can be observed in the government's dealings with First Nations groups, wherein "ethnic and cultural identity" is always carefully dissociated from "civic and political identity". "The former can be accommodated, even celebrated," she explains, "without significant political and economic transformation, while the latter, which demands fundamental transformation of nationality, can yet be ignored" (98-99). In his book *The Imaginary Indian* (1992), Daniel Francis points out that this distinction was recognized even by Pierre Trudeau himself, who drew a line between the multicultural policy he was to champion and the situation he referred to as *realpolitik*. "In terms of *realpolitik*," Francis quotes, "French and English are equal in Canada because each of these linguistic groups has the

power to break the country. And this power cannot yet be claimed by the Iroquois, the Eskimos, or the Ukrainians" (219).

Tolerance, then, we must remember, does not amount to, nor necessarily even lead to, the realization of equality, despite what the predominant rhetoric of official multiculturalism might lead one to believe. And the cultural 'right' to maintain ethnic identity is, as a result, hardly a political right at all, insofar as it in no way significantly touches the structures of power already in place.

> Only the two 'founding nations' have linguistic and political rights as members of their groups. Members of ethnic minorities only have rights as individual citizens. As legally constituted cultural minorities, with rights as individuals only, they cannot authorize political changes to the dominant culture; they can only request them. They can request permanent tolerance of their cultural difference, but only as an exception to the rule. They cannot be accorded equality as members of minority groups. (Mackey 2002: 66)

Despite everything, then – despite our carefully maintained image of multilingual, multicultural respect and compromise, despite the rhetoric of equality that dominates our public sphere, and despite how very loathe we may be to admit it – as long as tolerance, with all its many problematic implications, remains the foundation on which we stand, social and political hierarchy also remain a persistent reality in Canada.

This is the first confession, and a second must follow closely behind it: there can be no doubt that the hierarchy of power which governs Canadian society is as carefully managed today as it was when it was first established.

On October 7, 1763, King George III of England issued a Royal Proclamation intending to establish order and good government in British North America following the end of the Seven Years' War. Among its many provisions, the *Royal Proclamation* granted rather extensive land

rights to First Nations peoples in the area west of the Appalachian Mountains, rendering it illegal for anyone of European descent to settle on the far side of what became known as the 'proclamation line'. Colonial governors were barred from granting this land to colonists and even from surveying reserve areas; all negotiations were to take place directly between the governing power in London and the First Nations themselves, treated as autonomous, self-governing peoples (Francis, Jones & Smith 2002: 168). According to historian Ramsay Cook (1963), however, the motivation for this was less respect for Aboriginal peoples, who were not considered to be in any way a serious threat to British sovereignty, than it was a desire to facilitate quick assimilation of the French settlers in the new colonies who, by contrast, were (4ff). By limiting geographical spread, as well as the powers of the Roman Catholic Church, it was imagined that the conquered *Canadiens* would fairly quickly and easily be assimilated into the ruling British majority. One group was thus granted rights in a direct effort to limit those made available to another. The strategic management of difference in Canada was officially under way.

By 1774, the situation had changed considerably, threatening a shift in the balance of power and so requiring an alternate approach to the management of difference. Under the shadow of the prospect of American invasion and therefore desirous of securing the loyalty of her francophone subjects, England made use of the *Quebec Act* passage that year to restore rights formerly withdrawn from the Catholic Church and to put back in place certain elements of the old civil law that had previously been dismantled (Morton 2001: 26). Though the details of this arrangement were quite drastically different from – even entirely opposite to – those of the 1763 *Proclamation*, in both instances, "colonial policy was flexible, recognizing and enabling certain

populations in the interest of controlling others" (Mackey 2002: 27-28), and in this way, they were exactly the same.

Were we to fast-forward through the next two centuries, we would find the same game still being played around the adoption of the *Official Languages Act* in 1969. In the face of growing nationalist sentiment and the rise of the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, the *Official Languages Act* was the federal response. Its goals were not simply to improve the state of French language education across the country and balance the proportion of francophones to anglophones employed in government service, though certainly it did aim in part at those things. But beyond that and behind that,

> in Trudeau's mind, bilingualism also had the advantage of negating any exclusive link between French-speaking Canadians and the government of Quebec. Putting the emphasis on French-speaking minorities outside Quebec would make the federal government the legitimate representative of all French Canadians and therefore undercut Quebec nationalism. (Grammond 2009: 161)

By opening up opportunity to linguistic minorities across the country, the more concentrated and therefore threatening difference of a single province was thereby strategically mitigated. Similar arguments also surrounded the passing of the *Multiculturalism Act* (cf. Thobani 2007: 144ff), among other strategic pieces of legislation, as we will see.

What emerges from all of this in effect, and particularly from the ability of politicians to successfully carry out such machinations and manipulations, is a clear picture of a hierarchy of power at work throughout Canadian history, one with anglophones immutably at the top and various other groups of cultural 'others' positioned at intervals beneath them. "In Canada," writes Mackey (2002),

> cultural 'others' – and Canada's supposed tolerance – become central pillars of the ideology of nationhood, necessary for managing relations between Quebec and

Canada and in articulating a national identity which differentiates Canada from the USA. While cultural difference and pluralism may be highlighted to distinguish from *external* 'others', they are also managed *internally* so as to reproduce the structuring of differences around a dominant culture. (16)

Sunera Thobani (2007) also discusses Canada's social hierarchy in her book *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. To the tripartite hierarchy described above – involving anglophone Canadians, francophone Canadians and Aboriginal Canadians – Thobani adds a fourth group – immigrants and refugees – who fight for position in a place somewhat lower than francophone Canadians and yet considerably above Aboriginal groups in social standing. Through a detailed consideration of several social institutions, ranging from the granting of formal citizenship to the provision of family services and the administration of the welfare system, Thobani draws attention time and again to the way in which government policies – the laws and regulations that structure our society as a whole – have undeniably contributed to the establishment of a hierarchy which produces "certain subjects as exalted (nationals), others as marked for physical and cultural extinction or utter marginalization (Indians), and yet others for perpetual estrangement or conditional inclusion as supplicants (immigrants, migrants, and refugees)" (6). Here Thobani echoes the work of Constance Backhouse (1999) who argued in *Colour-Coded: A Legal History of Racism in Canada* that "the legal system has been profoundly implicated in Canada's racist past. Legislative and juridical sources provide substantial evidence to document the central role of the Canadian legal system in the establishment and enforcement of racial inequality" (15). Yet as Thobani eloquently demonstrates, such legislated discrimination is clearly not confined to the past and its impact, in fact, extends much further than the bureaucratic treatment of these groups by government to

affect the very manner in which they are constituted as human beings in society, that is, to affect the formation of their identities both collectively and individually:

> Racial difference, as a system of hierarchy within the Canadian socio-legal system constitutes the national, the Indian, and the immigrant as different kinds of *legal* beings. In the process, it also constitutes them as different kinds of *human* beings at a symbolic level, ascribing to them different characteristics and values as intrinsic aspects of their (quasi)humanity. These fundamental categories of Canadian nationhood, born in the violence of the colonial encounter, have been institutionalized and sustained by the relations of force still invested in them. It is the relationality among them, sedimented in state practices, that gives these categories their concrete – sometimes explosive, but always political – meanings. (2007: 28)

Taking into consideration the social import of education as outlined above, it is not difficult to argue that education is yet one more Canadian institution which deserves to be considered in light of its similar role in sustaining the social status quo. Here, too, the motions of tolerance are played out, displaying both its benefits and its severe limitations. Here, too, difference is managed through the strategic granting or withholding of rights and resources. Here, too, all is accomplished and lent legitimation through the enactment of laws and regulations. The discussion of language and education in Canada, then, has a contribution to make not only to theoretical and academic debates surrounding translation and the formation of identity, but also to the practical challenges and realities of living in a multicultural, multilingual context, to the imperative practice of interrogating and examining our social structures, and to the necessary reshaping of Canadian national identity in an age of globalization.

## Ch. 2 – Language and Education in Canada:
### Hierarchy Established and Ensconced

Over the course of the previous chapter, a number of fundamental assertions were made, assertions which will serve as a frame for understanding the significance of the legislation considered as we move forward in our discussion:

- First, that language and education are two key factors influencing the formation of identity;

- Second, that the education system within which both linguistic awareness and understanding of identity grow is not a natural, neutral system, necessarily benevolent to all, but rather an important tool to be strategically wielded by those in positions of power as they seek to maintain the status quo by continually reproducing existing social hierarchies;

- Third, that the legislation and policies put in place by government can sometimes be used to mask and legitimize discriminatory practices, thereby officially undergirding and reinforcing the reproduction of social differentiation; and

- Fourth, that careful and critical examination of not just surface appearances and rhetoric, but of the deeper attitudes and realities that continue to shape our national identity and institutions is a necessary step in preparing our country to meet the emerging challenges of the 21st century.

It is to that end that in this chapter we turn our attention to an examination of the range of legislation that has come to govern language and education in Canada, most significantly at their point of intersection. It is to that end that we take time to consider the following questions:

- How are the various linguistic groups that comprise the population of Canada treated within the documented policies and legislation of the government? What rights are granted to each group or, alternatively, denied? What guarantees are made them or, by contrast, withheld? And how do these rights, guarantees, or lack thereof interact with the notions of equality and justice as fostered in the Canadian conscience?

- How are the diverse groups thus identified represented in the discourse created by Canadian legislation and the policy documents that surround it? What images are created of them? What capabilities or incapabilities are imagined or assumed and therefore acted upon? To what extent is the value of various contributions to Canadian culture and Canadian identity recognized and attributed worth?

- What is the overall picture that emerges of the relative position of languages, cultures and peoples within Canadian society? And does this emergent picture correspond with the social hierarchy proposed by Thobani in *Exalted Subjects* (2007) or, on the contrary, fly in the face of it?

## 2.1 <u>Considering the Corpus</u>

The task of establishing which texts from among the myriad documents that narrate our country's history would best comprise an appropriate corpus for pursuing these lines of inquiry presented, not surprisingly, a number of challenges. The first of these was rooted precisely in the central importance of language debates and language rights throughout Canadian history. Because bilingualism is such an essential part of Canada's self-definition, regulations concerning language have become a touch point for nearly every piece of legislation passed in this country, from stipulations in the *Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act* (R.S.C. 1985, c. C-38) to amendments to the *Criminal Code* (R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46) to provisions for health care, and more.

A basic search through the holdings of Library and Archives Canada using terms such as 'language policy' or 'politique linguistique' generates a list of literally thousands of documents.

The explanation for this sheer volume is twofold. On the one hand lies the reality that responsibility for legislation concerned with language in Canada is not restricted to any one level or any one branch of government. Language was never named among those areas of jurisdiction explicitly assigned to the provinces, and so the federal government has been well within its rights to address linguistic issues in federally-enacted legislative pieces, as in the *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54) or in designated sections of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (S.C. 1988, c. 31). At the same time, however, provincial governments retain the right to introduce laws of their own touching on language, whether directly or indirectly, and so the number of such documents in existence is multiplied.

The situation is complicated further by the fact that, most often, language is not itself an independent matter to be addressed in legislation. On the contrary, in the vast majority of cases, the linguistic content of any law or policy, as well as the level of government empowered to enact it, is determined by reference to the context or sphere of activity in which the language or languages are being spoken, rather than by sole attention to the linguistic question itself. "On this basis, a law prescribing that a particular language or languages must or may be used in certain situations will be classified for constitutional purposes not as a law in relation to language, but as a law in relation to the institutions or activities that the provision covers" (Official Languages Law Group 2000: 5). And so the search becomes still more complex and the number of documents to be potentially included in a corpus again grows exponentially.

Naturally, the linguistic element in each of these laws and regulations does in some way reflect on the treatment of various language groups, whether they be addressed or ignored, and so

consideration of each could in some way be applicable to the discussion at hand, if considered in the broadest sense. However, it is clearly far beyond the scope of this project to deal with such a vast volume of material. Consequently, the strategy adopted was to focus attention only on those policies which hold language issues as relatively central to their theme, those which evidence a development, change or reaffirmation of the Canadian attitude toward what constitutes fair and equal language rights. In compiling the list of documents to be included in this section of the corpus, then, a painstaking search through the legislation archived online was aided by consulting both *Language Rights* – a journal published every two years by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL) summarizing the policies and court decisions that pass, both federally and provincially, impacting the interpretation of language laws in Canada – and *New Canadian Perspectives: Annotated Language Laws of Canada* (Official Languages Law Group 2000) – a volume first published to mark the tenth anniversary of the Official Languages Act, comprised of 398 pieces of legislation related to language rights in Canada.

The majority of these laws and regulations, however, deal explicitly with only French and English, the country's two official languages. Legislation dealing with the rights of those who speak what have variously been termed 'immigrant', 'heritage' or 'international' languages is considerably more rare. In fact, until multiculturalism came to represent a stance formally adopted by the Canadian government in 1971, these languages were, by and large, dealt with only incidentally if at all, and the linguistic and cultural rights of these communities were rarely, if ever, considered, despite their constituting a significant portion of the country's population. Thus it is less within the framework of language policy than within that of the various Multiculturalism Acts in time passed at both federal and provincial levels that we find the most

detailed treatment of heritage language and culture rights, and the outlines of programs designed to promote and support them.

Where First Nations languages are concerned, though, no real federal legislation exists at all, despite the fact that all First Nations affairs fall clearly within federal jurisdiction. It is only within the context of certain provincial or territorial policies that some Aboriginal languages are seriously considered, and steps taken to protect and promote them, two of the most significant examples being the Yukon's 1998 *Languages Act* (S.Y. 1998, c. 13) and Nunavut's *Inuit Language Protection Act* (S. Nu. 2008, c. 17), passed in only a few years ago.

Consideration of education policy in Canada is in many ways no less challenging. Though the struggle for control of schools and curricula was clearly one close to the heart of many Canadians even long before Confederation, debates over the issue were for many years carried out within a religious frame rather than a linguistic one. The realities of life in the second half of the 19th century were simply such that, with only very rare exceptions, to be francophone was to be Catholic and to be Catholic, francophone; while by the same token, to be anglophone was to be Protestant and to be Protestant, anglophone. Thus in the former provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, French-speaking Catholics faced off against English-speaking Protestants in the fight over governance of schools and the content of religious instruction in their newly-formed country, while anglophone Catholics and francophone Protestants struggled for survival as the minority groups of the day. [3] In fact, although the *British North America Act, 1867* (30 Victoria,

---

[3] It is important to note here that the use of the term 'minority' can at times be problematic since there is no necessary consensus regarding how a 'minority' group is to be consistently distinguished or defined. One of the most commonly cited definitions is that one put forward by Franscesco Capotorti: "a group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, in a non-dominant position, whose members – being nationals of the state – possess ethnic, religious, or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language" (1977, para. 568). Throughout this discussion, the focus on numerical inferiority will be maintained, even as positions of relative 'dominance' are debated. Consequently, despite the official recognition and status given to the French language in Canada and the other gestures made toward establishing 'equal partnership' between

c. 3) made no specific reference to the language or languages to be used in education, it constitutionally guaranteed the protection of denominational schools within the nascent country; conditions being what they were, language was simply expected to follow accordingly thereafter. It was only as the country expanded westward into areas where the correlation of language and denomination was less certain, and then as it grew increasingly secularized over the course of the 20th century, that the debate shifted and began to be framed in linguistic rather than religious terms.

Unlike language, however, from the very moment of Confederation, education was clearly legislated as a provincial concern rather than a federal one. While this does remove one level of complication when compared to the above, the fact remains that Canada comprises ten provinces and three territories each with their own systems of governance; and although the movement away from a religious and towards a linguistic debate can indeed be seen refracted across the country, this shift came at various times to various provinces and was enacted with varying degrees of force. It is necessary, then, to consider documentation from all provinces and territories and to focus on developments in different regions at different points in time. The potential complexity of this situation, however, is at least somewhat lessened by the tendency of one province to model aspects of its legislation after what has been passed in another, allowing for the emergence of trends that transcend provincial boundaries. In some regions of the country, provinces have even been known to actively work together in dealing with question of language and education, as was the case, for example, in establishing the Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education (1993), a program in which Alberta, Saskatchewan and

---

anglophones and francophones in the governance of the country, French will at times continue to be referred to as a 'minority' language.

Manitoba joined forces "to 're-energize' curriculum development in heritage language education and to do so in a more cost effective manner" (Tavares 2001: 205).

The issue of education for First Nations is, of course, an exception. For while schooling has always been a provincial concern, any and all dealings with Aboriginal peoples have by contrast been exclusively the responsibility of the federal government. The result is that the question of First Nations education has always been treated as a question apart, with management of schools and programs for Aboriginal children being left in the hands of whatever federal department was currently in charge of Indian Affairs[4] – this despite the fact that the federal government has no Ministry of Education, no teachers, no superintendents or established standards, and no consistent framework through which to provide this education, a reality which none could deny has seriously impacted the quality and the nature of education received by Aboriginal students throughout Canadian history.

As a result of this, government policy on Aboriginal education, as was the case for Aboriginal languages, is rarely found in documents dealing specifically with this topic, but rather must be sought out in the relevant sections and sub-sections of documents with a much broader scope, such as the *Indian Act, 1876* (S.C. 1876, c. 18) or the *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (Indian Affairs and Northern Development 1969). Of special interest, however, are the few rare cases where an Act has been passed at the federal level giving rights to a particular First Nation – as with the *Cree-Naskapi (of Quebec) Act* (S.C. 1984, c. 18) or the *Mi'kmaq Education Act* (S.C. 1998, c. 24) – or where a province, independent of the technically

---

[4] Over the course of Canadian history, nine different government departments have in turn been held responsible for the administration of Indian Affairs. They are as follows: The Department of the Secretary of State of Canada (to 1869), The Department of the Secretary of State for the Provinces (1869-1873), The Department of the Interior (1873-1880), the Department of Indian Affairs (1880-1936), The Department of Mines and Resources (1936-1950), The Department of Citizenship and Immigration (1950-1965), The Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources (1966), The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (1966-2011), and Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (2011 to the present).

responsible federal government, has passed legislation in an attempt to better the educational experience of Aboriginal students within its own borders – as with British Columbia's *First Nations Education Act* (S.B.C. 2007, c. 40).

The outcome of all these considerations is a corpus comprised of three main types of documents. The first of these three, constituting the bulk of the corpus, are the aforementioned Acts. These are the laws of Canada written and passed by elected officials, whether in the federal parliament or the provincial legislatures. Included in the consideration of any Act named in the corpus will be that of any relevant amendments made to it subsequent to its initial passing, as well as that of the pertinent regulations attached to it.

The second type of document to be considered in the corpus are policy statements issued on topics such as Indian affairs, multiculturalism and immigration. Commonly referred to as 'white papers', these statements can provide broader contextualization for actions taken or bills introduced by a government, offering a fuller explanation of the thinking about, attitude toward or objectives held in governance of a particular arena of political life. Unlike their 'green paper' counterparts, which are distributed by a government "to invite public comment and discussion on an issue prior to policy formation" (Library of Parliament 2009: para. 4), white papers lay out already determined viewpoints and guiding principles, and are often precursors to the introduction of a new or amended bill to be voted on in Parliament.

The third set of documents which rounds out the corpus are reports made by various commissions, departments or parliamentary committees. While not imbued with any legally binding power, these are the reports that are meant to inform the opinions and attitudes of those government officials responsible for making the laws. They are the result of studies normally conducted by what are meant to be non-partisan bodies, who conduct research, consult with

citizens, gather evidence and report to government on the actual state of things 'on the ground', as it were. In this way, they represent an important link between social reality and the discourse of politics and policy. What must be remembered, of course, is that since these reports are in no way binding, not all are received in the same manner. Some present recommendations that are well received and swiftly transformed into action; consider, for example, Nicholas Davin's 1879 *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half Breeds*, which so successfully urged the government to pour public funds into the setting up of a residential school system for Aboriginal children. The evaluations and recommendations put forward by other reports, however, never seem to find the light of day; such was the case, by stark contrast, with P.H. Bryce's *Report on Indian Schools of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories* (1907) which, only three decades later, presented a damning assessment of that same residential school system, calling for the institutions' immediate closure.[5] Thus the manner in which these reports were received and the degree to which their recommendations were followed can also reveal much about the way the Canadian government has historically recognized (or misrecognized?) and dealt with perceived problems of language, culture and education in minority group situations.

Taken together, these three sets of documents together comprise a corpus which spans much of the country's history. The passing of the *British North America Act, 1867* (30 Victoria, c. 3) is taken as a natural starting place, albeit without ignoring the fact that due consideration need be given to the state of affairs that existed in the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada prior to the actual birth of Confederation. The closing of the period to be considered is marked by Stephen Harper's official apology to First Nations peoples for the tragedies resulting from the

---

[5] Note that following the failure of government to accept and act on his recommendations, not to mention his subsequent prompt dismissal from the position of Chief Medical Officer for Indian Affairs, Bryce went on to re-publish his report, this time circulating it among the public under the title *The Story of a National Crime, Being an Appeal for Justice to the Indians of Canada* (1922).

residential school experiment, read aloud in the House of Commons on June 11, 2008, on behalf of the Government of Canada. While this was of course not the first time the government had acknowledged the long-held goals of this form of education policy nor the attitude it clearly evidenced towards Aboriginal peoples, societies and cultures, the apology did represent the first significant official reflection on the extent of hurt and damage that had been caused by the system and acceptance of responsibility for many of the problematic issues that continue to plague First Nations communities across the country. As Prime Minister Harper made clear in his speech that day, the apology offered and the subsequent responses spoken by Aboriginal leaders were intended to mark a turning point in "forging a new relationship between Aboriginal peoples and other Canadians" (Canada 2008: para. 9) and in "moving towards healing, reconciliation and resolution of the sad legacy of Indian Residential Schools" (ibid.: para. 8). Only time will tell, of course, if in the end this gesture will fulfill its own promise, whether we have started down a truly new path in this regard or not, but it was clearly intended to be the start of something new, and so for the moment – and for the purpose of setting some boundary for our discussion – we will take it as such.

The distribution of documents over the course of these 142 years, however, is far from even, particularly at the federal level. Following the initial set of Acts put in place as the Constitution was being established, there was very little federal regulation passed dealing with either language or culture for a number of years. During this period, debates over language rights were almost invariably closely tied to those over schooling and so, with the singular exception of the *Laurier-Greenway Accord* (1896) – an agreement reached following the only federal election in Canadian history in which education was a central issue (Lupul 1970: 277) – policies regarding both language and education were left to the provinces. Focus does not really shift

again to federal legislation until after the tabling of the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* (1967-70), bringing in its wake significant changes in Canada's approach to all cultural issues, changes that continue to effect policy-making into the present. Consequently, the majority of documents dealing directly with minority cultural rights bear dates later than that of the commission.

Though every effort has been made to be careful and consistent in the collection of texts and aggregation of the corpus, the ultimate goal of this discussion will be not just a detailed examination of individual legislative and policy pieces, but rather their strategic contextualization within the social and political reality of the country. It is to situate these pieces within the broader scope of the Canadian narrative, in order to observe the cumulative effect and impact of repeated representations and rhetoric in serial legislation that, even in instances of repealing, is more often reformulated than replaced.

It is for this reason that four moments in Canadian history have been chosen to serve as the foci around which we will orient our discussion. Each can be considered a key moment of shift – or potential shift – within the Canadian sphere, and from each can be seen resulting a ripple effect, and so the word 'moment' as used here should be broadly understood; it begins with a single document or event, whether touching on language, culture or immigration, but is then traced outward, both geographically and temporally, to see its effect realized in resulting shifts in education policy and directives, then consequently on the schooling experience of Canadian students. Given the varying rates at which the provinces respond to federal directives or legislation, any one of these moments, then, may in realization be drawn out over decades. Others are separated by only a few years. But all come together to shape and weave the fabric of Canadian culture and the understanding of Canadian identity. Although undoubtedly there are

any number of moments in Canadian history, any number of significant events or interactions, that could be viewed as of central importance and having long-term repercussions, for the purposes of the current discussion, only four have been chosen to be addressed in turn. The first will be the founding of the nation in 1867; the second, the tabling of the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* (1967-70); the third, the adoption of multiculturalism as official government policy; and the fourth, the controversy surrounding the Meech Lake Accord and Elijah Harper's historic filibuster in the Manitoba legislature.

## 2.2 <u>Moment One – A Country is Born</u>

> Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom;
>
> And whereas such a union would conduce to the welfare of the provinces and promote the interests of the British Empire; […]
>
> Be it therefore enacted and declared by the Queen's most excellent Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present parliament assembled and by the authority of the same as follows: […]
>
> The provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one Dominion under the name of Canada; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one Dominion under that name accordingly. (*B.N.A. Act, 1867*, 30 Victoria, c. 3)

With these words, the country of Canada was born. All the countless intricacies and complexities that in time would come to characterize it were yet to be discovered, of course, but on March 29, 1867, with the passing of *An Act for the Union of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the Government thereof; and for Purposes connected therewith* – more

commonly known *The British North America Act, 1867* (or simply the *B.N.A. Act*) – the broad outlines of a nation were drawn. Among the 147 sections of the Act were provisions to cover all necessary domains: the establishment of geographical boundaries for provinces, counties and electoral districts; rules of order and conduct for the House of Commons and Senate; processes for introducing and passing legislation; the division of power between the federal and provincial levels; regulations regarding the admission of additional provinces, and more. And in the midst of all of this, written from the earliest moment into the Constitution of Canada, were the first official laws and assertions about language and education within the Canadian context.

### 2.2.1 About Language

In the years before Confederation, the upper half of the North American continent was a linguistically diverse domain. More than 80 aboriginal languages were spoken by the many and varied First Nations groups that populated the country, and the first wave of European immigrants had arrived – the French, the English, the Scots, the Irish, along with a small, but steady stream of Mennonites from various parts – each group bringing with them languages of their own. From 1867, however, the linguistic landscape of Canada would be marked by only two clear points: English and French.

Naturally, the bringing together of the four founding provinces into a unified whole necessitated a range of political compromises and concessions; few, though, would have been so crucial and pivotal to the success or failure of the entire undertaking as those negotiations touching most closely on language and on culture. Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia already shared significant commonalities in this, having been settled primarily as British and anglophone colonies. Quebec, by contrast, had been colonized by the French and had only relatively recently been ceded to British rule; its population remained primarily francophone and

culturally distinct. The importance of Quebec to the newly-forming union and the need to attend to its distinctiveness was, Grammond (2009) explains, one of the primary motivations for the selection of a federal, rather than unitary, system of governance. "Under a federal system," he writes,

> French Canadians would control the government of the province of Quebec (the new name for Lower Canada), where they formed a large majority. As that government was to have jurisdiction over education and civil law, among other matters, it could ensure the long-term survival of the French-Canadian society, with its linguistic, legal and religious specificity. Hence, federalism was a tool of minority protection. […] In fact, for many French and Canadian writers and politicians, the federal constitution was the legal expression of a moral compact between English and French Canadians, considered as the 'two founding peoples'. (152-153)

Whether the motivation for this decision did involve a 'moral' element or whether it was simply a strategy of political management is perhaps a matter of some debate; but in either case, concern for the preservation of Quebec's cultural distinctiveness was indeed evidenced in the structuring of Canadian governance. This concern was primarily addressed in the clear divisions of power that were set up between the federal and provincial levels of government. Section 92 of the *B.N.A. Act* (30 Victoria, c. 3) makes clear that, in addition to control of all provincial and municipal institutions, each of the four provinces was to have exclusive jurisdiction over areas including "property and civil rights in the province," "the solemnization of marriage," "hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions," "public and reformatory prisons," "the administration of justice, including […] courts both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction," as well as "generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province" (s. 92.). These provisions, along with the swift addition of exclusive jurisdiction over education in section 93,

were intended to provide a significantly stable structure and a degree of autonomy sufficient to facilitate the preservation of Quebec's uniqueness within Confederation.

Despite this evident cultural concern, however, and despite the obvious importance of language as a fundamental expression and element of culture, the *British North America Act, 1867* really had very little to say about language in its own right. Language was not assigned as an independent matter of legislation to either the provincial or the federal government. Only one section of the Act addressed the issue at all:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.
>
> The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages. (30 Victoria, c. 3, s. 133.)

By this section, the English and French languages were set up as equals at the federal level. Either could be used in any parliamentary debate or in the proceedings of any court, and written materials – whether records, journals, or laws printed and published – were to be produced in both. At the federal level, then, French and English were to be afforded equal status.

At the provincial level, however, this was not necessarily so. For while English was mandated for use in Quebec side by side with the language of the francophone majority, no similar mandate extended into the other provinces to govern the use of French; this, despite the fact that the French language was by no means confined to within the borders of Quebec. On the contrary, a large Acadian population lived in French in New Brunswick, and, thanks to the adventurousness and industriousness of early French missionaries who had travelled west, the

language was also spoken by a significant portion of the population well into Rupert's Land and the North-western Territory. The linguistic legislation of the *B.N.A. Act*, however, reached only as far as Quebec.

From the beginning, then, it was clear that in terms of governance in the language of the majority, an effort was made to set all provinces on equal footing. It was equally clear, however, that when it came to linguistic groups that found themselves in the minority, the provisions included in the Constitution were designed to protect only speakers of English inside Quebec. Speakers of French who lived outside Quebec would be free to use their language if ever they had reason to interact directly with the federal government, of course, but in their doubtless much more regular interactions with local and provincial authorities, no guarantees were made.

### 2.2.2 About Education

It was in section 93 of the *B.N.A. Act* that the question of education was addressed, and it read simply enough as follows: "In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education" (30 Victoria, c. 3). This initial statement was followed by four additional provisions, all aimed at a single purpose: the absolute protection of denominational schools, for both Protestants and Roman Catholics, be they in the majority or the minority, and regardless of which province they lived in. "Nothing," the subsection asserted, "in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union" (ibid.). Any decision made or bill passed by a provincial government which did threaten this guarantee was subject to appeal at the federal level, this being the only clear instance in which federal officials were allowed to intervene in what was otherwise exclusively jurisdiction of the province.

### *i. Provincial Systems Frozen in Time*

It was, in theory and in presentation, a simple statement and a simple regulation: each province would have control of its own system of education, with the minority rights in place at the moment of union enshrined quite permanently in the standing Constitution. Simple as it seemed, however, this single statement opened a door toward seemingly endless complexity. For what exactly was the situation being preserved? What exactly were the rights being forever guaranteed? The answer, of course, was different for each and every province.

The development of education in the former provinces of Upper and Lower Canada had up to that point followed dramatically different paths. In fact, the *Common School Act* passed in 1841, intended for the governance of both colonies, was repealed less than two years later in light of the vastly differing realities, needs and trajectories of schooling in the two very disparate areas (Putman 1912: 101). In Upper Canada, soon to become Ontario, the great reformer Egerton Ryerson was just coming into his sphere of influence, taking up the role of Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada in 1844. In contrast to the prevailing notions of the day, Ryerson believed that education should not be restricted to the privileged classes, but rather should be made available to all. "On the importance of education generally," he wrote,

> we may remark, it is as necessary as the light; it should be as common as water, and as free as air. Among the people it is the best security of good government and constitutional liberty; it yields a steady, unbending support to the former, and effectually protects the latter. (as cited in Putman 1912: 71)

This abiding conviction he paired with a second – that "religious differences and divisions should rather be healed than inflamed" (Ryerson 1847: 51) – and, on the basis of this pairing, went on to establish in Ontario a dual system of public education. It is important to note that in the late nineteenth century, the term 'public' as applied to schooling carried with it no

assumption of non-sectarianism; on the contrary, the dual nature of the system meant that every school would be designated as either Protestant or Catholic. The label 'public' communicated only that all schools would be funded publicly and open to all who desired to attend. In any region with a school already established by one denomination or the other, provision was made for members of the minority religious group to petition for a separate school which, once instituted, would be governed and maintained by the same mechanisms as all other schools.

In Quebec, then Lower Canada, however, the advent of public education would be delayed by almost another century, schooling remaining firmly under church control until a much later date. Nearly thirty years after the hasty repealing of the failed 1841 *Common School Act*, a second attempt was made to advance the education system with the setting up of Quebec's first Ministry of Public Instruction in 1868; this too was abolished after only a few short years under pressure from Catholic clergy who believed that it was the role of the Church, and not that of the State, to faithfully educate the next generation and who exercised a remarkable degree of influence over the members of their parishes (Pigeon 2009: para. 1). At the moment of Confederation, then, separate Protestant and Roman Catholic school committees administered parallel and yet completely divided systems of education for their adherents, subject to minimal, if any, government oversight; this dual confessional system would persist, with very little adjustment, well into the 1960s.

The other two provinces present from the first moment of Confederation were, of course, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Nova Scotia had just passed its *Free School Act* in 1864, firmly believing that "the state owes to its children such an education as may enable them to read, if nothing else, the laws which they are to obey" and therefore guaranteeing that "all common schools shall be free to all children residing in the section in which they are

established" (Landry 2011: c.12, para. 8). By this Act, Nova Scotia replaced church-run schools with a system of free education for all, funded by general assessment and taxation rather than by individual fees. Though the original Act did not address the issue, an 1865 amendment clarified that public funding would also be provided to separate schools (which, in predominantly anglophone Nova Scotia, were almost without exception Catholic) provided that they followed prescribed guidelines for curriculum and restricted religious instruction to times outside regular school hours (ibid.: c.12, para. 13). And so Nova Scotia entered Confederation with a system not dissimilar to Ontario's.

Although it would not in the end take them nearly the same length of time to make the move to public education, in 1867, New Brunswick had in place a system much more reminiscent of Quebec's. While the 1858 *Parish Schools Act* did provide for some public aid to go toward the construction of school buildings and the initial hiring of teachers, the government of that province still took no ownership of schools and played no active role in their founding, organization or ongoing management (Toner 1970: 88). All of this was left entirely in the hands of the churches or other religious agencies.

Thus at the moment of Confederation, Canada comprised two provinces with well-established, state-run, state-funded systems of education, with provision made for separate confessional schools, and two provinces in which schooling was left largely, if not entirely, in the hands of churches, with deep religious divides, minimal government oversight and little standardization of any sort.

In the years that followed, six more provinces would join Confederation, each guaranteed jurisdiction over their own system of schooling and each bringing their own nuances and considerations to bear, even where the systems established evidenced many similarities.

Manitoba came first, separated out from Rupert's Land and constituted as a province in 1870, with a population almost equally divided between anglophones and francophones; consequently, the *Manitoba Act* (1870) mirrored the Constitution in its language provisions, the only province other than Quebec in which both French and English would be used in parliament, courts and legislation. Manitoba's *Act to Establish a System of Education* (1871), passed the following year, set up a single publically-funded Board of Education for the province, but made provision for two separate sections to oversee Protestant and Catholic denominational schools.

When Alberta and Saskatchewan were similarly carved out of Rupert's Land and established as provinces in 1905, they each adopted a system modeled on the one which had by that time been operating in Ontario for more than fifty years: a dual confessional public system, with the religious minority in any given region guaranteed the right to petition for a publically-funded separate school.

Both British Columbia and Prince Edward Island joined Confederation – in 1871 and 1873, respectively – with common (i.e. non-confessional) school systems already in place. The 1865 *Act respecting Common Schools* passed on Vancouver Island, taken together with the *Common School Ordinance* of 1869, which replaced the previous Act and extended its application to the entire consolidated territory of British Columbia, laid the groundwork for a single, non-sectarian and non-denominational common school system in BC. Under this arrangement, every school was open to students of all denominations. "The highest morality

shall be inculcated," teachers were instructed, "but no religious dogmas or creed shall be taught" (*An Act respecting Public Schools*, S.B.C. 1872, c. 16).

Prince Edward Island had a similarly non-confessional system in operation, a system which had been in place since the passing of the their own *Free Education Act* (1852). Not only did the royal assent given this Act on April 3, 1852, firmly entrench the non-sectarian principle in the Island's legislation, but it also made PEI the first place in the British dominion to establish a complete system of free education that was open to all.

The tenth and final province to join Confederation was, of course, Newfoundland, and although they did not join with Canada until 1949, thereby setting themselves somewhat apart from this 'moment' in history in terms of chronology, they still received the same constitutional guarantees. In drastic contrast to either PEI or BC, however, notable for their completely non-sectarian systems, Newfoundland brought with it to the union the most complexly nuanced denominational system of any province. In place of the standard binary division between Protestants and Catholics seen elsewhere in the country, Newfoundland's constitutional guarantees were in time extended to Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and Wesleyan Methodists, as well as the United Church, the Salvation Army and the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada. In accordance with the province's 1874 *School Act*, all were public schools, restricted only by a 'conscience clause' regarding their religious beliefs, and provincial funding was therefore provided to all.

### ii. A Complex Intertwining of Language and Religion

Such was the landscape in early years solidified through that single, simple statement. Though similar principles sometimes seemed to transcend provincial boundaries, each of the ten provinces was unique in its precise rules, regulations and procedures, which in turn influenced

the degree and conditions of denominational protection. For as is evident, the whole was first framed in religious terms, and it would take a long, slow, somewhat stilted transition to move the discussion into a linguistic frame. This is not to say, however, that language was not a contentious issue from the very start; indeed, where the language question did take centre stage, dramatic conflict inevitably followed. The clearest example of this is the heated conflict which arose in Manitoba in 1890 and which has since come to be referred to simply as 'The School Question'. Though clearly a clash rooted in a conflict over language, it was argued in the legislature and in the courts on the basis of religious rights and expectations; and yet running beneath all the discussion of language, religion and education was the clear current of identity, the question of what it meant to be a Canadian and a Manitoban of the day.

As noted above, at the time it was established as a province and a member of Confederation in 1870, Manitoba was home to nearly an equal proportion of anglophones and francophones. Section 23 of the *Manitoba Act* (1870, 33 Victoria, c. 3) consequently adopted the same standards of bilingualism for the provincial government as had been laid out in the constitution for the federal government and the province of Quebec, and a year later a dual system of public education was set up, one side being French and Catholic, the other English and Protestant. The two decades which followed, however, brought a drastic change to the demographics of the province thanks to a steady stream of immigration. Many were English Protestants continuing west from Ontario; many more were new arrivals from Europe and beyond who spoke neither English nor French.

By the time Thomas Greenway came to power as premier in 1888, it was clear that French Catholics were now a rather dramatic minority – approximately 13%, rather than 50% of the population as previously – and that a growing number of children spoke neither of the

sanctioned languages of the province and so were receiving their education in another tongue, if at all. Systems and policies originally put in place as a mechanism for protecting and preserving the two languages and cultures of Manitoba no longer seemed to reflect provincial realities, and the influential and burgeoning English Protestant portion of the population was becoming increasingly vocal about their discontent at having to fund a school system which served only a few. After all, they argued, was not Canada first and foremost a British colony? Schools then, already recognized as a powerful tool of assimilation, should be run in such as way that they would "'elevate' the foreign born to the level of Canadian [read 'British'] life, engender Canadian national sentiments, and encourage Canadian standards of living and traditions" (Siamandas n.d.: para. 1).

In an effort to redress this problem both linguistic and cultural, the government passed the 1890 *Manitoba Public Schools Act* which, disregarding guarantees formerly laid out in both the 1870 and 1871 Acts, abolished denominational schools and set up in their place a single, non-sectarian public school system in which the language of instruction was officially to be English. Greenway went on to abolish the use of French in the legislature, the civil service and the courts, but it was the issue of schooling which raised the greatest protest and for which, fortunately from the perspective of many, there were grounds for an active appeal. In time, a number of appeals were made to the federal parliament in Ottawa, from where the question was redirected to the courts and began to move through various levels and branches of the legal system, eventually making it all the way to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London, England.

The debate was still raging six years later when the time came for a federal election – the only one in Canadian history in which education was a central issue (Lupul 1970: 277); notably, this was also the election in which the country gained its first French-Canadian Prime Minister,

Sir Wilfred Laurier. It was Laurier, in fact, who finally brought an end to the controversy with

the signing of a document officially titled *Terms of Agreement between the Government of*

*Canada and the Government of Manitoba for the Settlement of the School Question*, but better

known as simply the *Laurier-Greenway Accord*. Though the common school system would

remain in place, the Accord made provision for religious teaching to be conducted in schools

wherever it was authorized by the majority of the school's trustees or if a designated number of

parents signed a petition to that effect; for this purpose, and this purpose only, students would be

separated out on the basis of religious denomination. Several other similar concessions were also

made for the benefit of the Catholic minority.

The greatest legacy of the *Laurier-Greenway Accord*, however, was neither the settling of

a six-year controversy, nor the restoration of religious rights and privileges, though ostensibly –

constitutionally – this was the issue the Accord was designed to address. The greatest legacy of

the *Laurier-Greenway Accord* was instead the door it opened for bilingual education across the

province, with the possibility of combining not only English and French, but also English and

any other language spoken by a sufficient portion of the community. "Where ten of the pupils in

any school," the second section read, "speak the French language (or any language other than

English) as their native tongue, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French (or such

other language) and English upon the bilingual system" (1897, n. 35, s.2). The result was that by

1907, there were no fewer than 13 languages being used to provide instruction in Manitoba's

public schools, without yet accounting for those languages used in private schools which

continued nonetheless to be operated in numerous ethnic communities.

The case of the Manitoba School Question clearly demonstrates the intricate intertwining

of a number of varied threads: language, religion, education, and identity. So tightly were they

woven together from the very beginning in Canada that a challenge to one almost invariably involved a challenge to the others.[6] In considering the resolution that was at last achieved, the imbalance of power foreshadowed and yet masked in the *B.N.A. Act* (1867, 30 Victoria, c. 3) itself is brought fully into the light. Manitoba was, then as now, one of the most bilingual provinces in the country and yet, unlike the anglophone minority residing in Quebec, there was no constitutional guarantee of language rights for the francophone minority of the province. The battle of French Catholics to maintain their right to educate their children in their language, their religion and their culture was long, hard fought and, in the end, only partially successful. Religious teaching was allowed, but not denominational schooling as before; bilingual teaching was sanctioned, but not education entirely in French as had previously been permitted. The priority of the English language was asserted strongly, being required in every school, while the French language was placed on the same level as languages which as yet had received no official acknowledgment whatsoever. As a result, the very gesture intended to underline the generous permissions granted toward bilingualism, at the very same time served to further entrench the undisputed hierarchical dominance of English language and, with it, culture. For although it was perhaps not explicitly stated, the message that to be truly and correctly Canadian was to embrace the language and culture of Britain was nonetheless heard loud and clear. Of anyone of different provenance, a very personal translation of language, thought, behavior and perception was to be required.

---

[6] A similar situation arose in New Brunswick when the *Common Schools Act* was passed in 1871, which, among other changes and developments, prohibited any religious teaching in schools and required members of religious orders to go through the same courses and certification exams as any other teachers in the province. It included no provisions for teaching French, even in Acadian schools. The controversy came to a head after four long years of protest (involving boycotts by some and the jailing of others) when, on January 27, 1875, in the small town of Caraquet, two people were shot and killed in a riot. As in Manitoba, the confessional school system was never restored; significant concessions were made, however, in response to the demands of the French-speaking Catholics. (See Toner 1970; Snyder 2006).

Considering the linguistic and educational landscape as a whole throughout this period, then, we can summarize as follows: From the start, Canada was set up according to a federal system in which two languages, two cultures, and two peoples were given equal pride of place, at least at the national level. The linguistic rights laid out at the federal level, however, were matched in only two provinces, and even there they stood on shaky ground. Where school systems were concerned, all considerations were ostensibly governed by religious denomination, with the language of instruction simply assumed to follow the then-obvious division; wherever non-sectarian systems were implemented, though, English was unmistakably predominant, whether this were officially legislated (as in Manitoba or New Brunswick) or implicitly assumed (as in British Columbia or Prince Edward Island). Though bilingualism and equality were terms taken up very early on, there remained nonetheless a clear disparity in realization even from the very beginning.

### iii. Educating the Aboriginals

But what of the many indigenous languages once spoken in the vast territory now known as Canada? According to the *Ethnologue* (an index of statistics and information about the world's approximately 7000 languages), there were at one time more than 80 distinct languages spoken by the various indigenous peoples who lived spread across the expanse of the country (Paul, Simons & Fennig 2013). Many of these languages were not confined within contemporary political borders, but rather extended southward into what is now the United States, spreading out according to the movement and migrations of their respective aboriginal communities and nations. The larger language groupings, which often included several related dialects, were found across the prairie provinces and the Arctic, as well as in the Eastern woodlands, where nomadic groups, largely dependent on hunting for their survival, moved about freely over great distances.

More numerous languages were found along the coasts, where, especially in the west, the obstacles of geography and terrain often resulted in more isolated communities with more varied and unique languages and cultures.

As was the case with the provinces, education initiatives were already underway among various First Nations well before the formal date of Confederation came. The earliest educational efforts among indigenous groups began with the arrival of French missionaries as far back as the 1600s. Some of these early endeavours were particularly notable for their desire to work in and with the indigenous languages; the Englishman James Evans, for example, learned to speak both Ojibwa and Cree, and was responsible for the development of the syllabary writing system which, with only relatively minimal adjustments, is still the basis for the written script used by some Cree communities today (Young 1899; Harvey 2003). For most, however, the task of 'educating the aboriginals' was a matter of "undermining the traditional culture and belief system of the aboriginal people by educating the young boys and girls in the Catholic religion and in French customs" (Gaffield 2013: para. 5); though preceding Confederation by as much as 200 years, such undertakings evidenced the very same mindset that would later come to govern state-run attempts at schooling as well.

At the moment of Confederation, the Dominion of Canada assumed responsibility for the care and protection of indigenous people across the country by way of a single line in the *B.N.A. Act*; item 24 of section 91, which listed the areas of exclusive legislative authority of the federal parliament, read simply as follows: "24. Indians and lands reserved for the Indians" (1867, 30 Victoria, c. 3, s. 91).[7] No further elaboration was provided, no further details given. It would soon become clear to officials, of course, that developing a system of education for the

---

[7] Note that the use of the term 'Indian' here, as in the legislative documents to follow, excludes the Inuit and the Métis. Once the guidelines of 'Indian status' were established, the term would also exclude any 'non-status' individuals.

indigenous peoples of Canada was an important, if complicated and challenging, part of this jurisdiction; it would be considered the key to assimilating Aboriginal peoples into European culture and preparing them to take up their appropriate place in Canadian society. At the beginning, however, none of this was yet elaborated. There was nothing more than this single line.

During the first decade of Confederation, the Canadian government displayed no real concern for the issue of indigenous education. The first substantial Act passed with regard to control and management of the Indian population, *An Act for the Gradual Enfranchisement of Indians* (S.C. 1869, c. 6), did not, in fact, make a single mention of education. The *Indian Act, 1876* (S.C. 1876, c. 18), which followed seven years later, did touch on the issue, if in an indirect and passing manner; section 59, which assigned the Governor in Council control over all Indian funds, notes that he should direct, as he saw fit and deemed appropriate, some portion of the Indian moneys "by way of contribution to schools frequented by such Indians" (s.59). The extent of government engagement with the problem of educating Aboriginal peoples was thus restricted during this period to occasional financial support granted to churches so that they could continue with their own ongoing efforts. It was not until 1879, following the submission and review of Nicholas Flood Davin's now infamous report, that any steps toward more extensive government involvement would begin.

The *Davin Report*, as it is commonly known, officially bore the title *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds*. It was submitted to the Canadian Minister of the Interior on March 14, 1879, bearing the heading 'Confidential'. Having spent two months travelling through the United States and visiting schools they had established under a policy they referred to as

"aggressive civilization" (1879: 1), Davin now wrote to recommend the institution of a residential school system in Canada. He urged immediate action, warning,

> There is now barely time to inaugurate a system of education by means of which the native populations of the North-West shall be gradually prepared to meet the necessities of the not distant future; to welcome and facilitate, it may be hoped, the settlement of the country; and to render its government easy and not expensive. […] We have warlike and excited refugees within our territory. A large statesmanlike policy, with bearings on immediate and remote issues, cannot be entered on too earnestly or too soon. (ibid.: 10)

While commending the "zeal and heroic self-sacrifice" of the missionaries who had gone before, Davin argued that their efforts lacked the extent and systematicity needed to really bring civilization and change to the indigenous population. "If anything is to be done with the Indian," he insisted, "we must catch him very young. The children must be kept constantly within the circle of civilized conditions" (ibid.: 12). Establishing day schools in and for Aboriginal communities, which had of course been tried, was judged to be ineffective, because

> the influence of the wigwam was stronger than the influence of the school. […] The child, again, who goes to a day school learns little, and what little he learns is soon forgotten, while his tastes are fashioned at home, and his inherited aversion to toil is in no way combated. (ibid.: 1-2)

Drawing on what he had seen in the US, with additions and modifications to suit the Canadian context, Davin made a number of recommendations:

- That contracts be made with religious bodies to continue and increase training in existing schools;

- That four additional residential schools be established in recommended locations;

- That inducements for attendance initially be offered to both children and parents, but that schooling be made compulsory in time;

- That careful processes be put in place for the selection of teachers and for regular reviews;

- That the curriculum impart practical knowledge of useful industries; and

- That the schools be run entirely "apart from the disturbing, and sometimes designing, predilections of a Chief" (ibid.: 11).

Though Davin did not make any direct comment about language (simply assuming, of course, the use of either English or French), his thinking about religion could hardly have been more clearly stated. Protestantism and Catholicism were legitimate options; indigenous religions were not. "The importance of denominational schools at the outset for the Indians must be obvious," he wrote.

> One of the earliest things an attempt to civilize them does, is to take away their simple Indian mythology, the central idea of which, to wit, a perfect spirit, can hardly be improved on. […] A civilized sceptic, breathing, though he does, an atmosphere charged with Christian ideas, and getting strength unconsciously therefrom, is nevertheless, unless in instances of rare intellectual vigour, apt to be a man without ethical backbone. (ibid.: 14)

The recommendations contained in the Davin Report were accepted almost unquestioningly by the Canadian government, and a growing number of residential schools began to appear across the country. The model used for funding the schools went through several shifts and changes, but was finally settled by an 1892 Order-in-Council which fixed a per capita allocation for students. By 1900, 64 residential schools were operating in Canada, and the system was gaining momentum. Early reports that the schools were "places of disease, hunger, overcrowding and despair" and the accompanying calls for reform – which would naturally necessitate higher government spending – were silenced or ignored (Erasmus 2004: 4), and by 1920, attendance until age 15 had been made compulsory. The idea of 'aggressive civilization'

had been adopted whole hog and the unquestioned reigning assumption was that absorption into the general population was the only real option for facilitating the advancement of Aboriginal peoples. "Our objective," proclaimed D.C. Scott, then deputy superintendent of the Department of Indian Affairs, "is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed in the body politic and there is no Indian Question and no Indian Department" (as cited in Erasmus 2004: 3).

In this early period of Canadian history, there is hardly sufficient grounds on which to make any sort of comparison between the educational situation of speakers of English and French and that of speakers of indigenous languages; and yet, if any comparison over time and trajectory is to be made as we move forward in our discussion, it is important to grasp the extent of this disparity. The myriad documents found on one side, representing widespread debate and echoing countless voices from across the country, are matched on the other by just a handful of authoritative rulings, proscribed by only a few and leaving no room at all for debate, discussion or counter. A political system selected and built with the express purpose of making room for the languages, cultures and relative autonomy of two distinct groups demonstrated little concern for the fate of societies and nations which had preceded them by unnumbered years. And the remarkable complexity of educational policies tailored according to the demographics and desires of each individual province stands out in spectacular contrast to the remarkable limitedness of rulings to be applied across the board to every Aboriginal nation without distinction. The dynamics of power here operating are unmistakable, and even a brief review of the legal documents penned during this early phase of Canadian history is sufficient to determine how cultural stratifications established almost from first contact were strategically undergirded

and socially normalized by yet one more dramatic contrast that emerges to match the rest – that is, the marked contrast between the discursive representation of the Indians that was formed and that of their European counterparts (if such a term may even be used).

Item 12 under section 3 of the *Indian Act, 1876* succinctly expresses that which is at the core of such disparity: "The term 'person' means an individual *other than* an Indian" (S.C. 1876, c. 18, s. 3, emphasis mine). Indians were neither considered to be nor treated as people, in even the most basic sense of the term. Where those of European descent were considered – whether English, French, or something else altogether – there was a natural assumption of capable, responsible personhood; the Indian, on the other hand, was perhaps "a noble type of man", but was yet "in a very early stage of development", incapable of governing his own or even taking care of himself (Davin 1879: 16). All else followed from this initial perspective.

As the institutions of government spread across Canadian territory, for instance, folding additional provinces into the Dominion, one of primary stated motivations was

> that the welfare of a sparse and widely-scattered population of British subjects of European origin, already inhabiting these remote and unorganized territories, would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which exist in the several provinces of this Dominion. (*Rupert's Land and North-Western Territory Order*, 1870, Sch. A)

No such thought, of course, went toward the 'material enhancement' of the indigenous population of those same territories, nor even, truth be told, to the maintenance of their already-established standard of living, this being very poorly understood; on the contrary, the responsibility of the government in this respect was understood to extend only as far as making "adequate provision" for the "Indian tribes whose interests and well-being are involved in the transfer" (ibid.: Sch. B).

Persons of European descent, though not yet 'citizens' of Canada per se – a distinction that would not come into effect until January 1947[8] – nonetheless held the right to active engagement in the ruling of their own society through the voting election of a representative parliament; this was, in fact, considered not just a right, but also a responsibility, as much for the English and the French as for those continually arriving from other European ports of departure. No such responsible capacity was attributed to or expected of the Indian, of course – neither those of "less civilized or wholly barbarous tribes" or "even some of the half-breeds of high intelligence" (Davin 1879: 7, 11). These were, by contrast, beings "incapable of embracing the idea of a nation – of a national type of man – in which it should be their ambition to be merged and lost" (ibid.: 11).

This very same contrast was played out in miniature at the level of school governance. Those of European descent had a role to play in the election of school boards and trustees, bodies which at the time were given extensive control over the system of education, not least in respect of both language and religion. In any province where a confessional system was in place, parents belonging to the minority denomination had the right to petition for a separate or dissentient school; it was to the school board that they submitted their petition. In any province where a non-sectarian system was in place, provisions were normally made for the teaching of religious education outside of regular school hours if and when it was requested by the parents; it was to the school board that they sent their request. In Manitoba, under the terms of the *Laurier-Greenway Accord* (1897, n. 35), petitions for the establishment of bilingual schools were also directed to the school board. Through the election and management of school boards, parents and

---

[8] Note that the provisions of the 1947 *Canadian Citizenship Act* were laid out in such a manner that most Aboriginal peoples did not qualify for citizenship. The problem was address in a 1956 amendment, which extended citizenship to both Indians and Inuit and was made retroactive to January 1, 1947.

residents in any given region could exercise considerable influence over the type of education received by their children.

Aboriginal peoples, on the other hand, exercised no control or influence at all over their educational system: not in respect of language, not in respect of religion, not in respect of the hiring of teachers or the determination of curriculum, not in the election of school trustees or the running of representative school boards. The *Indian Advancement Act* (S.C. 1884, c. 28) did provide for the following very limited engagement of the band: *If* a band was declared 'fit' by the Governor in Council (s. 3), and *if* the proper procedures were followed to elect a band council (s. 5), and *if* the Council met "on a day, and at a place, and between hours to be designated by the Superintendent General or his deputy" (s. 6), *then* the Council could determine the religious denomination of the teacher(s) to be employed at the band school – Protestant or Roman Catholic only, of course – with rights to a separate school for the denominational minority on the reserve. This was the extent of the autonomy awarded should an Indian band first meet all of the conditions imposed by their European 'superiors': the autonomy to choose their colonizing religion.

The idea that indigenous peoples were not, in fact, persons or that they were still, as Davin said, "in a very early stage of development" has often been expressed in the assertion that they were like children (1879: 16). And yet, Davin argued, this was not an altogether accurate comparison.

> The Indian character, about which some persons fling such a mystery, is not difficult to understand. The Indian is sometimes spoken of as a child, but he is very far from being a child. […] There is, it is true, in the adult, the helplessness of mind of the child, as well as the practical helplessness; there is, too, the child's want of perspective; but there is little of the child's receptivity; nor is the child's tractableness always found. […] He has the suspicion, distrust, fault-finding

tendency, the insincerity and flattery, produced in all subject races. He is crafty, but conscious how weak his craft is when opposed to the superior cunning of the white man. (ibid.: 10-11)

It was, in Davin's opinion, not the childlikeness of the Indian, but rather the helplessness, the necessary dependence, that left him subject to the white man and most fundamentally marked the relationship between the two. And in this opinion, Davin was not alone.

The interpretation section of the *Indian Act, 1876* is particularly instructive in this regard. Having been excluded from the category 'person', the categories in which Aboriginal peoples are included are now defined in the very terms of dependence. 'Band' is understood to refer to

any tribe, band or body of Indians who own or are interested in a reserve or in Indian lands in common, of which the *legal title is vested in the Crown*, or who share alike in the distribution of any annuities or interest moneys for which *the Government of Canada is responsible*. (S.C. 1876, c. 18, s. 3.1, emphasis mine)

No band held responsibility for its land, its finances, or any of the responsibilities which come along with them; for this, they were forcibly dependent on the Crown and on the Government. The term 'Indian' followed close behind, defined as "any male person of Indian blood reputed to belong to a particular band" (ibid.: s. 3.3), and through that connection with the collective, the centrality of dependence followed through to the individual. 'Reserves' were defined in their turn as tracts of land designated "*for the use or benefit of or granted to* a particular band of Indians, of which the legal title is in the Crown, but which is unsurrendered" (ibid.: s. 3.6, emphasis mine). 'Special reserves', the titles of which were held by societies or corporations rather than the Crown, were lands "*held in trust for, or benevolently allowed to be used by*" the bands who lived upon them (ibid.: s. 3.7). In every definition, the theme of Indian dependence on the white man can clearly be seen.

Neither was this line of thinking confined to just the *Indian Act* itself. The *Indian Advancement Act* (S.C. 1884, c. 28), even while being specifically intended to "confer certain privileges" on only "the more advanced Bands of the Indians of Canada", was still rife with verbs like 'overseen', 'presided over', and 'approved'. In fact, every decision made by a band council under the provisions of this Act was still subject to confirmation by the Superintendent in charge of Indian Affairs, who was given "charge of the Indians" across the country, as one might be given charge of a child, as well as "trusteeship and management" of their lands and resources (*BC Terms of Union*, 1871, s. 13).

So tightly were the notions of 'Indian' and 'dependence' woven together, in fact, that a lack of the latter automatically cancelled application of the former. Any band not dependent on the white man – that is, who have "no interest in any reserve or lands of which the legal title is vested in the Crown, [and] who possess no common fund managed by the Government of Canada" was automatically considered an 'irregular band' (*Indian Act, 1876*, S.C. 1876, c. 18, s. 3.2). Any individual who did not remain dependent – that is, who attained a sufficient "degree of civilization" and a "character for integrity and sobriety" such that he "appears to be a safe and suitable person for becoming a proprietor of land", and was therefore no longer dependent on the holdings of the Crown (*Gradual Enfranchisement Act*, S.C. 1869, c. 42, s. 13) – was automatically deemed 'enfranchised' and was no longer considered by the law to be an Indian at all, except in the continued receipt of tribal annuities (ibid.: s. 16).

In both lexical choices and assertions made, then, the discursive representations emerging from the legislative and related documents of the day presented vastly contrasting images of the nature, character and capabilities of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada and those of Canadians of European descent. And as these representations took form, in something of a circular movement,

the institutions set up for the governance of each group, along with their accompanying policies and patterns, seemed to both follow from and further confirm the public narratives being told. The authority to write the public narrative is, as we have seen, "the authority to decide what history means […] and what obligations it lays on us all" (White 1987: 183-184). For the British settlers who now held the position of power in Canada, this meant the circulation of a public narration of history that really began not long before Confederation. The principle of narrative relationality meant that the thousands of years lived by prior inhabitants could be essentially ignored, or at most relegated to the role of background staging, in preparation for the inciting event of European arrival and discovery – a tale well in line with the reigning metanarrative of progress and the glory of Empire. And from this narrative flowed the first conceptions of the new country's collective identity: a Canadian identity marked on the one hand by tolerance toward difference and openness to dialogue – as demonstrated by the federal structure adopted and dealings with the francophone minority – and on the other by a benevolence toward those less fortunate (or perhaps better said, just less) – as evidenced in dutiful attention paid to making 'adequate provision' for the Aboriginal peoples all around.

### iv. Of New Immigrants and the Languages They Brought with Them

There is relatively little to be said about immigrant languages and education during this period. In a way, to even speak of a particular class of 'immigrants' this early in Canadian history has a ring of falsehood to it given that, with very few exceptions, the vast majority of those of European background then living in the country could have been classed as recent arrivals relative to Canada's original inhabitants. However, it is perhaps this very fact that makes it all the more important that we do give consideration to this question.

Section 95 of the *British North America Act* reads:

In each province the Legislature may make laws in relation […] to immigration into the province and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time make laws in relation […] to immigration into all or any of the provinces; and any law of the Legislature of a province relative […] to immigration shall have effect in and for the province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada. (1867, 30 Victoria, c. 3, s. 95)

It would be nearly 40 years before the first *Act respecting Immigration and Immigrants* (S.C. 1906, c. 19) would be passed at the federal level in 1906, and yet this section of the *B.N.A. Act* clearly confirms that a certain upheaval of the social order had already taken place and was by now already well established.[9] The Aboriginal peoples of Canada had been thoroughly displaced – in terms of politics, geography and culture – and the French and English segments of the population naturalized in their place. Date of arrival or longevity in the land really had little to do with it. In only a short span of time, the strategic combination of practice and policy had "transformed insiders (Aboriginal peoples) into aliens in their own territories, while simultaneously transforming outsiders (colonizers, settlers, migrants) into exalted insiders" (Thobani 2007: 74), thereby laying the groundwork for figuring a new class of beings as 'immigrants'.

Throughout this period, no particular legislation or documentation attended to immigrant languages or their place in the schools of the country. The daily realities of life simply had to be negotiated in English or French whenever an individual departed from the sphere of family or close-knit ethnic community. And except where a community had established a school of their own, children who attended school did so in English or French. From time to time some controversy did arise; many Germans, Ukrainians and Mennonites, for example, had arrived on

---

[9] Note that the passing of this first general *Act respecting Immigrants and Immigration* (1906) was in fact preceded by two acts concerned with the arrival of Chinese immigrants in particular, these being the *Act to Restrict and Regulate Chinese Immigration into Canada* (1885) and the subsequent *Chinese Immigration Act* (1900).

the prairies with assurances that they would retain the autonomy to educate their children as they wished, and they were consequently as much bothered by the Manitoba School Question as the francophones of that province (Siamandas n.d.). In such situations, however, concerns were only ever heard when voiced in terms of francophonie versus anglophonie – or more accurately Catholicism versus Protestantism.

In time, the many languages and cultures then only beginning to take root in Canada would become a critical topic of discussion and debate. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, however, they were rarely more than a footnote.

### 2.2.3 Canada at the Turn of the Century

Canada approached the turning of the century still a nascent country, but one brimming with the promise and potential that would in the end be needed to meet the sweeping social and economic challenges brought to Canada by the next few decades, along with two World Wars and all that came in their wake. Yet throughout this period, even in the midst of all this upheaval, the core narratives told about languages and cultures in Canada – the narratives on which the country had been founded and its structures of governance built – remained fundamentally unchanged, as did the basic organization of the accompanying social hierarchy.

The English carried on essentially unchallenged in their assumed position of highest social standing, sustained by memories of the mighty British empire and continued wide-spread subscription to the doctrine of discovery. The naturalization of the English – followed at a measured distance by the French – had been officially written into the narrative of Canada by the *British North America Act, 1867* (30 Victoria, c. 3), thereby setting the stage for a certain construction of Canadian identity. And the established position of these two groups relative to any others possessing different languages or cultures was only further bolstered by the institution

of Canadian citizenship, introduced in the *Immigration Act* (S.C., c. 27) of 1910. Although the designation 'Canadian citizen' was at this point little more than a simple subset of the broader domain 'British subject', the inauguration of citizenship nevertheless served as a forceful repetition and reassertion of a particular group's status within the newly-formed nation, of their holding of certain rights and privileges within the Dominion of Canada, included therein the power to grant or withhold from others, on whatever grounds they deemed fit, permission to immigrate or to acquire citizenship for themselves.

Though little legislative attention had been paid to them up to the turn of the century, the passing of the 1906 *Act respecting Immigration and Immigrants* (S.C., c. 19), followed as it was by several sets of amendments made in relatively rapid succession – in 1910, 1919, and then again in 1952 – clearly evidenced that, in the first half of the twentieth century, that class collectively known as 'immigrants' became a significant political concern for Canada's young parliamentary body, led by men obviously and unapologetically oriented "toward the replication of a British type of society in Canada" (Dewing 2009: 2). The many who arrived in Canada throughout this period were, in truth, very diverse, ranging from German and Russian Mennonites, to families of various Eastern European and Scandinavian provenance, to those of Japanese and Chinese descent, who continued to arrive in the west despite the introduction of a severe head tax intended to deter them. Notwithstanding this diversity, all these new arrivals were yet united by two characteristics which bound them together as the class of 'immigrants' and immediately determined their initial place on the Canadian social scene: the exigence of supplication for permission to enter and establish a place for themselves, and the expectation of assimilation toward the English norm. For while some years more would have to pass before the ability to speak English or French would be made a formal requirement for citizenship, the

centrality of cultural considerations in decisions regarding immigration was made clear very early on. The 1919 *Act to amend the Immigration Act* (S.C., c. 25) expanded the description of 'prohibited and undesirable classes' to include not only those who were criminals, physically or mentally ill, or over the age of 15 and still illiterate, but also those whose cultures seemed to vary too dramatically from the standard, that is,

> immigrants belonging to any nationality or race […] deemed unsuitable having regard to the climatic, industrial, social, educational, labour or other conditions or requirements of Canada or because such immigrants are deemed undesirable owing to their peculiar customs, habits, modes of life and methods of holding property, and because of their probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their entry. (s. 13)

With English language and culture already taken as the norm, and French admitted as an acceptable variation, this 1919 amendment to the *Immigration Act* thus relegated all other languages and cultures arriving on Canadian soil to a lower level marked by supplication and conditionality, granted place and space in Canada only at the discretion or benevolence of those holding the position of political power.

Though varying degrees of cultural and political assimilation were naturally assumed necessary for anyone coming to reside in the Dominion, status granted or denied was never, for those falling within the class of 'immigrants', a question of capable personhood. Unlike the designation 'Indian', the classification 'immigrant' did not carry any automatic assumption of dependence or incapacity, its legal definition instead resting only on factors such as terms of arrival in Canada (S.C. 1906, c. 19, s. 2) or declared intention to remain (S.C. 1910, c. 27, s. 2). As a result, even the lowliest of immigrants held a higher status in Canada's emerging social hierarchy than the most prominent Aboriginal chief who, though respected and honoured by his

own people, could not gain even the barest entry into this society that had displaced his own

unless he were willing to essentially renounce his language and culture, his very identity as a

member of an Aboriginal nation – that is, unless he were willing to accept the terms of

enfranchisement. In all these ways, the narratives begun even before the moment of

Confederation were continued unbroken into the twentieth century, shifting in subtle nuance

perhaps, but fundamentally unchanged.

As we have seen, that same period which saw the formation of social and linguistic

hierarchy in Canada also witnessed the configuration of the country's varied educational systems

which likewise, once past the initial period of organization and establishment, settled into

something of a routine, with few real challenges to the status quo where languages of education

were concerned. The 50 years between 1915 and 1965 saw various surveys and commissions of

inquiry staged across the country, in all ten provinces as well as in the Yukon Territory. Some

had broad mandates, seeking to overview whole regions or systems and to assess their collective

results, as did Nova Scotia's *Report on Education in the Maritime Provinces* (Learned &Sills

1921-22), for instance. Others, by contrast, held more modest goals, aiming to explore a

particular well-defined question or concern, like Manitoba's *Commission on the Status and

Salaries of Teachers* (Hill 1919). While many of these led to shifts and amendments to specific

regulations having to do with the hiring and contracting of teachers, the organization of school

districts, the budget allotted for textbooks, or so on, none brought any substantial change to the

systems of education – English or French, Protestant or Catholic, sectarian or non-sectarian –

that had been instituted in each of the provinces. The overall linguistic hierarchy established by

the state and repeatedly bolstered by the structuring of schooling systems across the country

carried on unchanged. The first major challenge would not come until well into the 1960s.

**2.3 <u>Moment Two – The Advent of Official Bilingualism</u>**

Between 1963 and 1964, the federal government of Canada commissioned two rather remarkable studies. The first was a report by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, established by Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson in July 1963

> to inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution. (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism [RCBB] 1967, v.1: xxi)

The second, *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*, was begun less than a year later at the request of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, who asked that "a study be undertaken of the contemporary situation of the Indians of Canada with a view to understanding the difficulties they faced in overcoming some pressing problems and their many ramifications" (Hawthorn 1966, v.1: 5).

Though these two reports are not often discussed in relation to one another, there is strong justification for considering them side by side. The concerns which led to the commissioning of each emerged against the same social backdrop. With the events of the Second World War still fresh in the annals of history and the unrest of the civil rights movement growing continually stronger south of the border, issues of racism, discrimination and social inequality were at the forefront of many Canadians' minds, leading to an increasing number of questions about the treatment of minority groups within Canada as well. And each of these reports in its own way aimed to address some aspect of these questions and concerns.

Social climate of production, however, was not the only common factor shared by these two projects. Both were given a mandate that centred on questions of language and culture, not just in and of themselves, but in specific relation to the political and economic structures of Canada. Both reports subsequently made use of very similar language and rhetoric, evidencing deep concern for equality (however defined or understood), for the status of Canada's charter members within the growing nation, for the established rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and for the general strength and well-being of the country. Both reports emphasized time and again the importance of language and culture to the formation and preservation of identity, not only for the particular minority groups who claimed them as their own, but also for the identity of Canada as a whole. And finally – last, but certainly not least – both reports clearly underlined the central importance of schooling and education to all of the above.

When looked at in this light, then, as individual documents simply considered side by side, there are many correspondences that can be identified between the two. When placed within a broader context, however, and in dialogue with other pieces of the Canadian narrative, a somewhat different picture emerges. For in addition to these significant similarities, there are also rather remarkable dissimilarities and contrasts, not least in terms of the response and reaction that greeted their release; and in considering the question of Canadian social hierarchy, it is these differences that are perhaps most telling of all.

### 2.3.1 The Reports

#### i. Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

In the 1960s, nearly 30% of the Canadian population was francophone (Commissioner of Official Languages, 2009: 3), and yet despite the relative strength of their numbers, the francophone community lagged behind the rest of the country in several significant ways. As has

already been noted, due to the dominance of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec and the resulting struggle between religious and secular leaders to maintain social control in the province, Quebec was literally decades behind all other nine provinces in developing a consistent system of public education. After the initial attempt at a Ministry of Public Instruction capitulated in 1875, having been in operation for only six years, schooling in Quebec remained firmly under the governance of denominational church leadership until well after the Second World War. With more than 1500 school boards in the province and many one-room schoolhouses still catering to all grades together, education in Quebec was, for all intents and purposes, "a complete hodgepodge: each school took care of its own programs, textbooks, and the recognition of diplomas according to its own criteria" (Pigeon 2009: para. 2). As a result of this disorganization, literacy rates in Quebec lagged considerably behind standards in all other parts of the country, as did general levels of educational achievement more broadly. The ripple effects of this reality stretched all the way to federal institutions where, despite representing 30% of the population, only 21% of the workforce was French-speaking. Still more revealing, however, is the fact that in truth only 9% of positions in the federal public service were officially designated bilingual, the result being that the majority of government services were offered in English only (Commissioner of Official Languages, 2009: 3).

Then in 1963 the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec (better known now as simply the Parent Commission) released the first part of what would turn out to be a five-volume final report. Calling for swift and dramatic change, the report challenged the provincial government to take control of the education system, to standardize it, to secularize it, and to at long last make it compulsory (Pigeon 2009: para. 10-11). Quebec's leadership was not slow to respond, establishing a new Ministry of Education under Paul Gérin-Lajoie before

the final volume of the Commission's report was even tabled. This overhaul of the school system would be at the heart of the wider social movement known as the Quiet Revolution in Quebec: a concerted effort to raise the popular level of education, produce a better-qualified workforce, increase the economic competitiveness of the province, and modernize society as a whole, while at the same time insisting upon the continued maintenance and prominence of French language and Québécois culture within Canada. The Quiet Revolution aimed, in short, to reposition Quebec within the Canadian nation so that it could finally reassert its own power as one of the 'two founding races' or, if the separatists had their way, even as a nation unto itself.

It was within this context and in light of these social tensions that Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson first established the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, co-chaired by André Laurendeau and A. Davidson Dunton (hence also referred to as the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission). Over the course of the next seven years, Laurendeau and Dunton, along with the other Commissioners appointed to work with them, crisscrossed the country holding regional meetings, both public and private, with citizens in every province. They met with each Premier and received more than 400 written briefs from various groups and individuals wanting to express their particular point of view on the various questions at hand (RCBB 1967, v.1: xv-xvi). Their task, as laid out in the Terms of Reference handed to them on July 19, 1963, was "to inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races" (ibid.: 173), and this was to be accomplished by focusing primarily on three areas of inquiry: first, the state of bilingualism within the federal government; second, the role of public and private organizations

in promoting bilingualism and good cultural relations; and third, the opportunities provided by each provincial education system for the learning of both French and English (ibid.: 174).

Throughout the discussion of English and French contained in the Commission's final report, language and culture were clearly understood to be "inseparably linked" (ibid.: xxx). Though never going so far as to conflate the two, of course, the Commission did not hesitate to emphasize the one as a necessary condition of the other's continued health and vitality. "Even a great cultural language," the report read,

> even an international language like French, under certain sociological conditions, can wither away to the point where, for certain groups, it no longer expresses the essentials of contemporary civilization. In such a case the culture itself is in mortal danger; for nobody will maintain that a group still has a living culture, in the full sense of the term, when it is forced to use another language in order to express to itself the realities which make up a large part of its daily life. (ibid.: xxxv)

"Language is the key to cultural development," the report notes time and again. "Language and culture are not synonymous, but the vitality of the language is a necessary condition for the complete preservation of a culture" (1968, v.2: 8). As a direct result of this understanding, the bilingualism and biculturalism of Canada were spoken of in a single breath, the "two dominant languages" ever matched by the "two principal cultures," both of which needed to be preserved and developed in parallel if there was to be established "an equal partnership between the two founding races" (1967, v.1: xxxi, xxxix).

Given the complicated dynamics of such a partnership, the Commission distinguished between two levels of bilingualism and biculturalism: individual and institutional. The individual level naturally referred to the ability of particular Canadian citizens to speak both French and English and to participate in both cultures. Desirable as this was, however, individual bilingualism was of concern to the Commission only to the extent that it was necessary to

facilitate institutional bilingualism, that is, the ability of public and private offices and enterprises to provide service to citizens in either language, whether the citizen be bilingual or unilingual. "The point at issue," they explained,

> is essentially equality of opportunity, but *a real equality of opportunity* – an equality ensuring that the fact of speaking English or French would be neither a help nor a handicap to a person seeking entry into the institutions affecting our individual and collective life. (ibid.: xlii)

In order to assess accordingly the life and vitality of these two languages and cultures, the Commission explored the extent of English and French usage in both the public and private sectors of the business world, as well as in the organization and running of volunteer associations of all sorts. They considered ways to make both languages and cultures more evident in the national capital region, and they delved into the relevant constitutional questions and debates. More prominent than any of these discussions, however, more pervasive throughout the report than any of these considerations, was the matter of education. While only one of the six volumes of the Commission's final report was actually given the title *Education* (1968, v.2), each book without exception touched on schooling to one extent or another, and every section contained at least one recommendation having to do with the provision of educational opportunities. "Education is vitally concerned with both language and culture," the report read,

> Educational institutions exist to transmit them to a younger generation and to foster their development. The future of language and culture, both French and English, thus depends upon an educational régime which makes it possible for them to remain 'present and creative.' […] Other institutions impose a structure on our economic and social life and their importance cannot be underestimated. Changes in education, however, will facilitate reforms elsewhere and are a prerequisite for some of the other changes which must be made. (1968, v.2: 3)

More than any other public institution, then, the various provincial systems of public education were to figure centrally in the process of reforming Canadian society to be truly bilingual and bicultural. The schooling system was understood to be "the front line of defence" for protecting language and culture, "the basic agency" for propagating them, and an "essential resource" for every community that desired to remain healthy and strong (1967, v.1: 67, 122).

A crucial mechanism for determining the status of English and French in various parts of the country, then, was an examination of the degree of protection afforded by the school system to whichever language was spoken by the minority in that particular province. In Quebec, of course, this meant considering opportunities for English instruction; in all other provinces, it was a consideration of French. Not surprisingly, the general conclusion which followed the initial survey of the provinces was that the situation of francophone Canadians across the country was very disadvantageous indeed, and could "scarcely be compared" with the situation of the English-speaking minority within Quebec (ibid.: 67). Much of the report, as a result, was essentially an argument for the provision of bilingual education across the country, the case being made not only in terms of political and social considerations (see, for example, 1967, v.1: 130 or 1968, v.2: 7), but also in those of pedagogical reasoning (1968, v.2: 9-10), economic advancement (1969a, v.3: 25-26), and even the "*moral right* of Canadian parents to have their children educated in the official language of their choice" (1968, v.2: 142, emphasis mine).

In the end, the primary legislative recommendation of the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* (1967-70) was that English and French be formally recognized as the two official languages of Canada, a move that would pave the way for laying out linguistic and cultural rights and guarantees in areas not directly addressed by section 133 of the *B.N.A. Act* (1867). "We believe," the Commission concluded, "that henceforth formal

rights must replace simple tolerance and makeshifts. In place of the present *de facto* bilingualism, more or less precarious, constantly debated, and unequally accepted from one region to another, there must be official bilingualism" (1967, v.1: 73-74). A number of other legislative requirements accompanied this central one, among them that both Ontario and New Brunswick be made officially bilingual, with all that that entailed for services, courts and legislatures (ibid.: 97); that bilingual districts be established in the other provinces, mirroring the same but on a smaller scale (ibid.: 110); and that Ottawa, as federal capital, be declared an officially bilingual city (ibid.: 119).

At the same time, however, the Commission was unwavering in its assertion that effective realization of any of the goals envisioned depended heavily on a model of education that would provide opportunities to learn both languages, not only for those individuals who would need to be bilingual to carry out their work in public and service offices, but also for any Canadian who simply wanted to learn the two official languages of their country. Consequently, alongside the legislative recommendations came an equally primary educational one: "We recommend that the right of Canadian parents to have their children educated in the official language of their choice be recognized in the educational systems, the degree of implementation to depend on the concentration of the minority population" (ibid.: 123). Though stated simply enough to begin with in the first volume of the report, the lengthy discussion which followed made clear for any who might doubt it that implementation of this recommendation would be far from simple. The further suggestion that

> every province should establish and maintain elementary and secondary schools in which English is the sole or main language of instruction, and elementary and secondary schools in which French is the sole or main language of instruction, in bilingual districts and other appropriate areas under conditions to be determined by

provincial law, [while not] prohibiting schools in which English and French have equal importance as languages of instruction, (ibid.: 134)

was followed by dozens of more focused recommendations addressing the specific curricular needs of official-language minorities (1968, v.2: 149-150), determining enrollment for minority language schools (ibid.: 158-159), the dissociation of linguistic and religious considerations in school governance (ibid.: 163), the structuring of school boards (ibid.: 170-171), the training and hiring of teachers (ibid.: 174-176), the strategies for inter-governmental cooperation in providing funds and grants (ibid.: 186-187), and more. Despite the extent and complexity of the changes required, however, the Commission was clear: the realization of a Canada where two official languages and two dominant cultures lived and flourished in equal measure, a Canada in which there truly was "an equal partnership between the two founding races" (1967, v.1: xxxix), depended first and foremost on equal and balanced bilingual educational opportunities straight across the country.

In addition to this primary investigation into the relative status of English and French, the mandate of the Commission was extended to include what they referred to as "the ethnic question" (1969b, v.4: xxv), that is, a taking into account of "the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution" (1967, v.1: xxi). In many ways, the views expressed by the Commission on this topic were quite positive. In addition to the role played by many immigrant families in carrying culture and civilization "in the broadest sense" to previously unsettled and uncultivated parts of the country, they observed,

in a narrower sense Canadian culture has been the richer for the knowledge, skills and traditions which all the immigrant groups brought with them. Their many

distinctive styles of life have gradually increased the range of experience, outlook, ideas, and talents which characterize the country. Cultural diversity has widened our horizons; it has also given opportunities – not always seized upon – for varied approaches to the solution of our problems. (ibid.: xxv)

Moreover, the artistic talents of many had contributed to the development of "literature, music and the plastic arts in Canada" and the range of languages spoken meant that Canada should be "well equipped to communicate with the world and to assert its presence. […] With its wealth of human, linguistic, and cultural resources, Canada reflects the world in microcosm" (ibid.: xxvi, li).

Accordingly, a number of recommendations were made with regard to maintaining and preserving these languages and cultures. While none called for extensive legislative changes or constitutional review, as had been the case for English and French, many were yet concerned with education, recommending their development and incorporation as curricular subjects at both the elementary and secondary levels (1969b, v.4: 141, 145), with expanded opportunities made available in university social science and humanities faculties as well (ibid.: 167). Other recommendations addressed the presence of immigrant languages and cultures in the public sphere, suggesting policy changes which would increase the visibility of other languages and cultures in CBC and CRTC broadcasting (ibid.: 190, 191), as well as at the National Film Board (ibid.: 196) and the National Museum of Man (ibid.: 222). "The presence in Canada of many people whose language and culture are distinctive by reason of their birth or ancestry represents an inestimable enrichment that Canadians can not afford to lose," the Commission concluded.

The dominant cultures can only profit from the influence of these other cultures. Linguistic variety is unquestionably an advantage, and its beneficial effects on the country are priceless. […] In our opinion, these values are far more than ethnic differences; we consider them an integral part of the national wealth. (ibid.: 14)

In all these ways, then, the recognition afforded languages other than English and French, along with the cultures to which they gave expression, was very positive. At the same time, however, it was made almost painfully clear that any freedom of expression allowed these languages and cultures in Canada was *given* to them, and that, within strict limits and boundaries. "It will be noted immediately," the Commission insisted at the opening to *Book IV: The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups*,

> that while the terms of reference deal with questions of those of ethnic origin other than British or French, they do so in relation to the basic problem of bilingualism and biculturalism, from which they are inseparable, and in the context of the coexistence of the Francophone and Anglophone communities. (ibid.: 3)

Even the common term 'bilingualism' was restricted in its usage to refer only to the ability to speak both English and French, with fluency in any other language dismissed, their speakers "considered unilingual in terms of the two official languages" (1967, v.1: xxvii). The idea of multiculturalism was also rejected out of hand, admitting only "the basically bicultural nature of our country" (1969b, v.4: 12). "It is clear that we must not overlook Canada's cultural diversity," the Commission conceded, "though keeping in mind that there are two dominant cultures, the French and the British" (ibid.: 12-13).

To some extent, the limitations imposed by this perspective are entirely understandable, for although in 1961 members of these 'other ethnic groups' in fact comprised 26% of the Canadian population, the reality of their diversity and spread across the country meant that nowhere was any group sufficiently concentrated or numerous "to contemplate the institution of other official languages, or the expansion of the concept of two societies to include four or five" (ibid.: 10). The activities of daily life in Canada and the movements of its ongoing governance happened in French or in English, and consequently this was where focus was naturally and

necessarily maintained. Even the recommendations that differentiated English and French as languages of instruction and other tongues as simply curricular subjects are justifiable in light of the practicalities of maintaining a public school system open to all and the need for young people to be prepared for entry into the workforce upon graduation. After all, "lack of fluency in at least one of the official languages of Canada is obviously a barrier to participation in Canadian life, […] to young people in conjunction with their education and to adults in conjunction with their work" (ibid.: 65). This much can hardly be criticized.

Nonetheless, upon closer examination, inconsistencies in the argumentation and reasoning laid out by the Commission raise questions as to whether practicality and pure logic were the only motivating factors behind the drastic differentiations proposed. In speaking of the concept of culture, for example, the following definition is offered:

> Culture is a way of being, thinking, and feeling. It is a driving force animating a significant group of individuals united by a common tongue, and sharing the same customs, habits, and experiences. It is a style of living made up of many elements that colour thought, feeling and creativity, like the light that illuminates the design of a stained glass window. (1969b, v.4: 11)

It is, perhaps, a rather broad definition, but thus far in no way especially objectionable. The definition is followed swiftly, however, by a rather odd caveat: "This definition is applied essentially to the two dominant cultures of Canada, those of the Francophone and Anglophone societies; to *a certain degree* it also fits the other cultures in this country" (ibid.: 11, emphasis mine). It is never made clear exactly which aspects of the preceding definition could not be applied directly to cultures belonging to communities other than the British and the French, and yet the distinction is unmistakably there. Just as the "great cultural languages" of English and French stand in contrast to other "spoken languages and dialects" (1967, v.1: xxxv), so too are

the "two principal cultures" clearly set apart from other "styles of life" and "folk traditions" (ibid.: xxv).

The implications of such a distinction are revealed in several different ways over the course of the full report. We have already seen how, in the discussion of English and French, the complexities of language and culture were repeatedly presented as being inseparably linked phenomena; when attention is turned to consideration of 'other ethnic groups', however, separation of the two, in light of this lesser status, unexpectedly becomes possible. "Many seem to believe that the members of a group who have adopted another language have completely lost their original culture," we read.

> This is yet another illusion which has given rise to many misunderstandings. In Canada we can observe the indisputable survival of some cultural traits among native groups and among a number of groups of other ethnic origins. In fact, some of these groups attach the greatest importance to these elements of their ancestral culture. Such is the case, for example, among Canadian Jewish people, for whom the question of language hardly arises in everyday life. (ibid.: xxxvii)

The urgency of fighting for the "complete preservation of a culture," included therein the vitality and life of the language (1968, v.2: 8), is replaced with simple satisfaction at having preserved some 'traits' or 'elements' of ancestral traditions to which the term 'culture' may apply 'to a certain degree'.

When it came to the discussion of educational opportunity, the distinction was even more marked. Whereas for speakers of English or French, mother tongue education was considered a "top priority" – the mother tongue being "the essential and inestimable foundation of thought and communication" and its mastery the only way to avoid "the handicap of confused thinking and limited means of expression" (1967, v.1: 130) – and whereas anglophone and francophone parents were thought to have a "moral right" to educate their children in the language of their

choice (ibid.: 123), any speaker of another language who desired that their children be educated in their mother tongue was presented as wanting something extra, something more, something that was, in the end, a luxury. "Everett Hughes has said that most parents want to give their own children 'the chance that everyone has, plus a little bit more,'" the report reads,

> Parents of non-British, non-French origin have frequently wanted that little bit more to be a knowledge of the language, culture, and religion of their forefathers. In a few cases, they have supported private all-day schools at which their children could receive all their elementary or high school education. More often they have sent their children to part-time schools, meeting after school hours or on Saturday or Sunday. […] The role of these ethnic schools in the lives of the groups that sponsor them, and in Canadian society as a whole, has been little studied. It is probable that they contribute to a feeling of cultural identity on the part of those who attend by teaching them the language and culture of their parents, as well as by setting them apart from other children. However, this may be resented and may lead some individuals to drift away from their cultural group later on. (1969b, v.4: 106-107)

Rather than being that which allows the individual "to find, at all levels of human activity, a setting which will permit him to develop, to express himself, and to create in accordance with his own culture" (1967, v.1: xli), mother tongue education in languages other than English or French is represented instead as something additional and superfluous which may, in the end, have detrimental rather than beneficial effect. Self-fulfillment for members of these 'other ethnic groups' is instead to be found "in adopting fully the Canadian way of life, sharing its advantages and disadvantages" (1969b, v.4: 6), and "being more or less integrated with the Francophone and Anglophone communities, where they should find opportunities for self-fulfillment and equality of status" (ibid.: 10).

It cannot be denied that the Commission undoubtedly had practical reason on its side when it came to many of the distinctions its recommendations drew between the legislated

treatment of English and French in Canada and that of all other languages. However, inconsistencies such as these in the arguments and representations put forward suggest strongly that it was not only practicality, but also prejudice, which contributed to certain differentiations. Eve Haque, in her 2012 book, *Multilingualism Within a Bilingual Framework*, goes so far as to argue that by such machinations, the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission intentionally transformed language and culture into the new discursive terrain on which racial discrimination could be played out, "an acceptable site for the articulation of exclusion when race and ethnicity could no longer comfortably do so" (238). Certainly, the report's discussion of English and French made clear that the Commissioners were well aware of the high stakes involved in the interplay of language and education, affecting as it did the formation of identity for both individual students and linguistic communities, as well as their sense of full and equal participation in Canadian life. "Language itself is fundamental to activities which are distinctively human," they wrote, quoting from R.J Watts.

> It is through language that the individual fulfills his capacity for expression. It is through language that man not only communicates but achieves communion with others. It is language which, by its structure, shapes the very way in which men order their thoughts coherently. It is language which makes possible social organization. Thus a common language is the expression of a community of interests among a group of people. It is not surprising, then, that any community which is governed through the medium of a language other than its own has usually felt itself to some extent disenfranchised. (1967, v.1: xxix)

Having said all this, then, there is now no logic to support the assertion that members of other cultural communities would unproblematically find "self-fulfillment and equality of status" through integration into anglophone or francophone society (1969b, v.4: 10). Certainly there were no easy answers to the challenging questions faced by the Commission, and yet assertions

such as this one – which applied the same rhetoric of equality in status and opportunity to the situation of all language minority groups as it did to official-language minority groups – all but denied that there was a challenge, thereby doing little more than simply dismissing those questions. In this, the Commissioners joined in the already established tradition of strategically managing difference, submitting differential recommendations that would soon be reflected in Canadian law.

### ii. A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada

Within only a few months of establishing the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission, the Government of Canada set the wheels in motion for a second separate and apparently unrelated research study. It could not be denied that Aboriginal peoples in Canada were suffering from poverty far more extensively than any other segment of the population, and census data revealed that this was matched by lower life expectancy and higher rates of infant mortality (First Nations Studies Group, UBC 2009: para. 5). A major review of Aboriginal education carried out in the 1940s had prompted the federal government to revisit the question of residential schools, the lack of certified teachers and appropriate curriculum, and the possibility of cooperating with provincial public systems. However, despite the changes attempted as a result, levels of educational achievement among Aboriginal students remained woefully below every provincial standard, with relatively few graduating elementary school and moving on to high school, and even fewer proceeding on to university. In fact, in 1967, across the length of the entire country, only 200 First Nations students were enrolled in any Canadian university (McCue 2001: para. 6).

So it was within this context that in 1964, René Tremblay, in his role as Minister of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, approached Dr. Harry Hawthorn, a researcher at the University of British Columbia, to request that

a study be undertaken of the contemporary situation of the Indians of Canada with a view to understanding the difficulties they faced in overcoming some pressing problems and their many ramifications. […] The problems that called for detailed and objective study were concerned with the inadequate fulfillment of the proper and just aspirations of the Indians of Canada to material well-being, to health, and to the knowledge that they live in equality and in dignity within the greater Canadian society. (Hawthorn 1966, v.1: 5)

Over the course of the next two and a half years, Hawthorn, with the help of his Associate Director Marc Adélard-Tremblay, pored over the documents and files made available by the Indian Affairs Branch, scrutinized the responses to a comprehensive Resources Questionnaire sent out to Indian Agencies across the country, and recruited more than forty scholars to contribute to the collection of data in various provinces and regions, as well as to its subsequent analysis (ibid.: 9).

*A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, more commonly known as the Hawthorn Report, was published in two volumes, the first of which was tabled in October 1966 and the second in the same month of the following year. In terms of its staging, its duration and its funding, not to mention its profile in the Canadian public eye, this inquiry appeared in every way more humble than the counterpart it found in the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission. The task suggested by its mandate, however, and the scope of the questions it was intended to address were equally enormous, if not more so. "The scope of this enterprise has been so wide as to be barely manageable," Hawthorn lamented.

Some of the topics listed in the first proposals for this project have not been touched upon by us and are not at present being studied by anyone known to the authors. […] There are some other topics on which work has been started without yet yielding enough to report. (ibid.: 8)

Yet even with these caveats, the range of issues addressed by Hawthorn and his colleagues was impressive to say the least, particularly for having been accomplished in such a short span of time, ranging from a comparative analysis of the socio-economic factors impacting the development of bands and lands in different regions of the country; to a discussion of the legal status of Aboriginal peoples in their relationship to various levels of government and the difficulties this posed in accessing social services; to an assessment of the political arguments at the centre of calls for self-determination and local band governance. And once again, running like a golden thread through the full length of the report was the ever-present theme of education. "The prime assumption of the Report has been that it is imperative that Indians be enabled to make meaningful choices between desirable alternatives," Hawthorn summarized at one point,

> and that this should not happen at some time in the future as wisdom grows or the situation improves, but operate now and continue with increasing range. But many of the desirable alternatives potentially open to Indians, and even more that will be open in the future, are open only to those educated for them. Consequently Indian children, and those adults who have the drive to attend classes, must find schools and proper programs ready to receive them. (1967, v.2: 5)

At first glance, many of the arguments made by the Hawthorn Report bear a remarkable resemblance to those put forward by the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission. Both reports were agreed in their insistence that the members of a minority group should never be subjected to forced assimilation, understood to imply "almost total absorption into another linguistic and cultural group" and a giving up of "cultural identity" (RCBB 1969b, v.4: 5). "Man is a thinking and sensitive being," the Royal Commission reminded us. "Severing him from his roots could destroy an aspect of his personality and deprive society of some of the values he can bring to it" (ibid.). Taking up the very same refrain, Hawthorn likewise insisted,

Ordinary respect for what values and institutes, languages, religions and modes of thought persist in their own small societies, which were once fully viable and to varying extents are so today, calls for maintenance of this principle. […] It is worth reiterating clearly and simply that the research group do not think that the Indian should be required to assimilate, neither in order to receive what he now needs nor at any future time. (1966, v.1: 6)

The reports were also unanimous about the fundamental importance of schooling in the advancement of any minority group, not only in terms of cultural identity and social status, but also in those of economic standing. "Education plays a key role in economic development," Laurendeau and Dunton explained.

In an economy as advanced as Canada's, simple literacy is no longer enough. Rather, the minimum requirement for any person in the labour force is a good, all-round education; he must have the general knowledge and flexibility of mind to cope with the increasingly rapid changes produced by modern technology in both types and methods of work. […] Any group which is cut off from attaining these qualifications will share only marginally in the social advantages stemming from industrial progress. (1969a, v.3: 25-26)

"The main emphasis on economic development should be on education and vocational training," wrote Hawthorn in his turn (1966, v.1: 13), underlining the fact that a sole focus on the development of lands and resources, though valuable, would never be sufficient to ensure the advancement and well-being of Aboriginal bands, since without adequate education, Aboriginal peoples would be left unprepared to make the meaningful choices that would determine their futures. "The advances in professionalization of educational services, in numbers of children in school and in the duration of their stay have indeed brought results," he recognized.

However, the numbers in high school and in post-secondary institutions are not yet near the size that will be needed to reach educational equality with the rest of the nation, and perhaps it could be said that most of the Indian's problems have even

moved ahead of their educational solutions in the past few decades. The recipe almost certainly calls for more education. (1967, v.2: 6)

A third point of agreement between the two reports was the assertion that it was only within the context of collective cultural freedom that individual equality could be truly realized. "Individual equality can fully exist only if each community has, throughout the country, the means to progress within its culture and to express that culture," the Royal Commission argued, explaining that this collective equality must include "the power of decision of each group and its freedom to act, not only in its cultural life but in all aspects of its collective life" (1967, v.1: xliv, xlv). This was, in fact, the very same claim made by Hawthorn and his associates, who contended that the individual equality of Aboriginal persons as provincial citizens should be recognized "in the fullest sense compatible with those aspects of Indian status found in treaties, the special nature of Indian communities, the particular characteristics of Indian land holdings, and certain historic privileges they have long enjoyed under the Indian Act" (1966, v.1: 16).

That particular attention should be paid to the rights of Canada's charter communities was one further point of accord between the two reports, and yet it is here that the great division between these two studies is seen. For while the Commission stood firm in its insistence that this implied attention to only the 'two founding races' of Canada, that is, the English and the French, the authors of the Hawthorn Report were equally insistent that the members of Canada's First Nations should not be so easily dismissed. "In addition to the normal rights and duties of citizenship," they maintained, "Indians possess certain additional rights as charter members of the Canadian community" (ibid.: 13).

This call for recognition of the true place of Aboriginal peoples in Canadian history, of their status as charter members of the nation, and of the rights that go along with it was at the heart of the Hawthorn Report. After so many years of being treated as less than full and capable

human beings, less than respected members of society, less than citizens of European descent, Hawthorn and his associates argued that the time had come to recognize and treat the Aboriginal population of Canada as 'citizens plus'. Historically, Hawthorn reminded his readers, a series of agreements were reached between the Aboriginal residents of Canada and the white settlers who arrived, agreements designed to ensure that the latter could settle and establish themselves peacefully, while the former retained their languages, cultures and particular relationship to the land. "In retrospect," he however observed,

> it is clear that the privileged position to which Indians are entitled was historically used as a justification for depriving them of services of a quality and quantity equal to those received by non-Indians. By any standard of measurement a privilege was turned into a millstone. (ibid.: 396)

This was the situation which demanded to be redressed if First Nations were ever to live "in equality and in dignity within the greater Canadian society", as the study's mandate directed (ibid.: 5). Not only did renewed attention need to be paid to restoring and respecting those "charter rights which derive from history and long respect" (ibid.: 396), but also contemporary services needed to be reviewed and reformed to make sure that the justification for "any continuing differential in the services provided for the Indian must be that they are better, not worse, and that they make greater contributions to his well-being than could be made by the services available to other citizens." (ibid.: 7)

Hawthorn was not unaware, of course, of the fact that the same concerns for social equality, the same fears of discrimination and racism that had first prompted such studies in the 1960s might lead to objections to the proposed status of Aboriginals as 'citizens plus'. "Differentiation on ethnic grounds has become synonymous with discrimination, apartheid, second-class citizenship," he readily admitted, noting that a "pragmatic, ahistorical society"

would "undoubtedly find the argument for charter rights and charter status difficult to seriously consider" (1966, v.1: 208, 397). Nonetheless, Hawthorn and his researchers held fast to their position, repeating time and again that we do not, in fact, live in an ahistorical society and that we must, as a result, be prepared to confront and redress the long legacy of a discriminatory past. After all, we are reminded, "the reverse status Indians have held, as citizens minus, which is equally repugnant to a strongly egalitarian society has been tolerated for a long time, perhaps because it was out of sight, and so out of mind of most people" (ibid.: 6).

The matter of education was certainly not least among those issues identified by the Hawthorn Report as needing to undergo movement from 'minus' to 'plus'. Despite the accepted statements regarding equality of opportunity for all in Canada, the report observed, equality of educational opportunity had never been a given, with systems and standards differing from province to province, and city schools routinely better than those in rural areas. In some ways, then, the state of Aboriginal schooling was comparable to that of other under-privileged areas, where lack of funding led to a lack of qualified teachers, where children were often pulled out when needed to help on the family farm or in another job, and where one commonly found "a high incidence of illiteracy and of people whose schooling stopped below the level of grade seven" (1967, v.2: 167). However, in the case of Aboriginal schooling, these problems were further compounded by linguistic and cultural barriers which resulted in an experience of education that was "unpleasant, frightening and painful; […] not so much adaptive as maladaptive" (ibid.: 6). "Schooling should be integrated with the values and the totality of a culture," Hawthorn explained.

> Obviously neither the contemporary provincial school nor the schools that operate specially for Indians are at all closely integrated with the values and the other aspects of the Indian child's culture. The child on entry and the teacher do not implicitly

share as many values and expectations as do the teacher and the typical middle-class White child. […] With the many barriers of language, age, preoccupation and timidity along with others, the entering child and the busy teacher can embark on no dialogue to explore their differences in outlook. Undoubtedly both suffer. (ibid.: 7)

Not surprisingly, in light of the egalitarian ethos of the day, many of the attempts to reform Aboriginal education following the governmental review carried out in the 1940s had focused on integrating Aboriginal children into provincial systems, thereby seeking to afford them the same opportunities as other Canadian children. This, however, was a project doomed to failure, in Hawthorn's view, if this was as far as it extended. "Low educational attainments, a high drop out rate, and the occasional antipathy of teachers and White parents […] will not be overcome by simply ensuring the physical presence of Indian children in the classrooms of joint schools," the report stated clearly. "Over and above this, a series of supplementary policies will be required to provide Indians with the capacities and effective opportunities to enable them to attain meaningful social and economic equality." (1966, v.1: 399, 400) These were to include, among other things, the development of materials on Aboriginal languages and cultures to be added to the curriculum, additional language classes specifically adapted to help Aboriginal students reach levels necessary for engagement in an anglophone or francophone school, revision or replacement of textbooks which included inaccurate or insulting remarks about indigenous people and cultures, as well as an intentional program of education directed at the broader Canadian public to address the problematic stereotypes and inadequate historical knowledge that led toward discrimination against Aboriginal peoples.

Retracing this line in the opposite direction, we find the crux of Hawthorn's argument: The greatest challenges faced by Aboriginal children in the current education system flowed directly from these issues of disconnection from language and culture, and the barriers that

resulted. Without adequate attention being given to the restoration of language and cultural

considerations in curriculum and schooling, there would be no chance of Aboriginal students

ever attaining real educational parity with their non-Aboriginal counterparts, even if they spent

every day in the same classroom together. And without educational parity, there would be no

chance of Aboriginal communities ever more broadly achieving social, economic or political

parity with other segments of the Canadian population. All of these concerns were in reality

intertwined together, meaning that the connections between them needed to be recognized and

the whole addressed in a systematic way if any real change were to be achieved. And the key to

it all was education.

### 2.3.2 Responses and Results

The *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* (1967-70) and *A

Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada* (1966-67) thus present an interesting case study

in contrast when placed side by side. In many ways, as we have seen, the two resonate with

similarity; proceeding from the same social climate and prompted by the same social queries,

both were centrally concerned with issues of language and of culture, drawing on the same

discourses of equality, citizenship and identity to shape and strengthen their recommendations.

And yet despite these apparent parallels in argumentation, the arguments finally made were

crucially different at their core, being shaped and informed by conflicting narratives of Canadian

history – one subscribing to the doctrine of discovery, centralizing European settlers as

protagonists in story, and consequently placing unwavering emphasis on preserving and

protecting the languages and cultures of Canada's 'two founding races' above all else;[10] the other

---

[10] One commissioner – Jaroslav Bodhan Rudnyckyj, a Ukrainian Canadian from Winnipeg, MB – officially voiced his objection to the limitations of Commission's bilingual, bicultural focus in a separate, dissenting statement, included at the end of *Book I* of the final report. However, Haque (2014) notes that even in his voiced resistance to

rooted in a narrative that began long before, remembering those who had lived and died on the land for generations before agreements reached and treaties signed between nations that stood equally tall, hence calling insistently for the recognition and restoration of a third group of the country's 'charter members'.

To fully grasp the extent of the contrast between these two contemporaneous reports, however, it is necessary to first remember that they were precisely that – reports. As such (and as was noted above), these documents were not of themselves imbued with any legally binding power, but rather were designed to strategically inform the opinions and attitudes of the government officials who would in turn go on to draw up and enact the relevant laws. The real contrast, then, is revealed not simply through a comparison of their rhetoric and recommendations, but moreover through consideration of how each report was received and subsequently acted upon by government bodies, in this way actively influencing the ongoing unfolding of the authoritative public narrative to be circulated in Canada.

The *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* was tabled in a series of six volumes between October 8, 1967 and February 14, 1970, and soon went on to become one of the most significant Royal Commissions in Canadian history, impacting not only federal policy, but also provincial legislation across the country, while at the same time reshaping the relationship between the Government of Canada and what was at the time its most troublesome child, la belle province de Québec. The response to this report at the federal level

---

the marginalization of 'other ethnic groups', Rudnyckyj still bases his argument on the same underlying narrative and, as a result, reinforces the same hierarchical arrangement even in his counter-proposal: "Rudnyckyj drew on demographic, historical, and linguistic rationales to develop a taxonomy of Canadian languages and set out his model for the constitutional recognition of regional languages. However, his strategy was to push for the inclusion of other ethnic groups into the white-settler template of the two founding peoples, thereby reinscribing some of the fundamental exclusions that were built into the final report. Specifically, he rested his linguistically based claims on the erasure of Indigenous languages, proposing a linguistic taxonomy that entrenched the recognition of European languages only. Such a strategy for inclusion assured that it would offer recognition only to those who could 'pass' as part of the white-settler population, reinforcing the exclusion of all who could not be 'white'." (185)

was almost immediate, with Prime Minister Trudeau making the implementation of its recommendations a top priority. In fact, the 1969 *Official Languages Act* was first passed through Parliament before the final volume of the report had even been formally submitted, declaring to all that

> the English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the Parliament and government of Canada. (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54, s. 2)

In addition to the guarantees made with regard to the use of both languages in federal courts, in the houses of Parliament, and in all published laws and documents – guarantees which reaffirmed but did not fundamentally alter what had previously been laid out in the *B.N.A. Act* (1867) – the *Official Languages Act* extended requirements for the provision of government services in French as well as in English wherever warranted by the population (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54, s. 9-10), laid out the guidelines for establishing Bilingual Districts in provinces across the country (ibid.: s. 12-13) and established a Commissioner of Official Languages to oversee the implementation of the new protocols and ensure "compliance with the spirit and intent of this Act" beyond the simple fulfillment of its obligations (ibid.: s. 19, 25).

Responses to the Commission's report at the provincial level would take longer to be realized, yet over the course of the next ten to fifteen years, language-related changes were to varying degrees implemented in all nine anglophone provinces. New Brunswick came first, its swift and definitive reaction taking the shape of a provincial *Official Languages Act* passed that very same year, in 1969. Largely echoing the federal legislation, the Act provided that

> the English and French languages are the official languages of New Brunswick for all the purposes to which the authority of the Legislature of New Brunswick extends;

and possess and enjoy have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use for such purposes, (S.N.B. 1969, c. 14, s. 3)

as well as in all courts, laws, and public services and communications. As a matter of provincial jurisdiction, this was understood to include access to schooling in which either English or French was used as a principal language of instruction, depending on the mother tongue of the students, with the other being taught as a second language. Wherever low numbers made such a division of students unfeasible, the Minister was charged with "making alternate arrangements to carry out the spirit of this Act" (ibid.: s. 13).

Although Ontario did not opt to follow the same path and declare itself at once officially bilingual, as early as 1968, it began to adopt and implement the recommendations of its own advisory committee on the subject, the Bériault Committee, moving to ensure access to French-language education for all francophones in the province, whether in designated classes within an anglophone school or, where numbers warranted, in separate schools altogether. Despite the fact that the implementation of these changes did not go entirely smoothly, with extended conflicts arising in several key districts (see Gidney 1999: 144ff), by the time the *French Language Services Act* was finally passed in 1986, affirming French as "an historic and honoured language in Ontario, recognized by the Constitution as an official language in Canada", as well as "an official language in the courts and in education" in Ontario (R.S.O. 1990, c. F-32, pre.), great advances had been made for the benefit of the Franco-Ontarian community. These included not only easier access to French-language education, but also the provision of provincial services in French (ibid.: s. 2), use of both languages in courts and by government institutions (ibid.: s. 3), and the appointing of a French Language Services Commissioner to monitor linguistic issues and oversee the progress of bilingualism within the province (ibid.: s. 12).

By 1979, the use of French in the legislature and courts of Manitoba had been reinstated, along with many of the previously-made allowances for the francophone minority which had been eroded or withdrawn in the years since Thomas Greenway was Premier. Each of the other provinces in their turn also moved to enact new legislation or introduce additional regulations in order to provide more and better opportunities for education in French, whether as a first or second language, within their own individual schooling systems.[11]

Even as these developments increased the visibility and usage of French across the country, so within Quebec steps were also being taken to ensure the ongoing strength and dominance of the French language within provincial borders. Within ten years of the release of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission's findings, three key pieces of legislation were passed in Quebec: the 1969 *Act to Promote the French Language in Quebec* (S.Q., c.9), the 1974 *Official Language Act* (S.Q., c.6) and the 1977 *Charter of the French Language* (R.S.Q., c. C-11). Together, these three documents sought to increase by progressive degrees the extent of French's continued and even required use in all aspects of daily Quebecois life, leading toward the eventual assertion that "every person has the right to have the civil administration, the health services and social services, the public utility enterprises, the professional orders, the associations of employees and all enterprises doing business in Québec communicate with him in French" (R.S.Q., 1977, c. C-11, s. 2). Where education was concerned, French was quickly declared to be the official language of instruction within the newly standardized educational regime, with all newly arriving immigrants to be integrated into the French-language system, rather than being given a choice between the English or the French. Only at the request of eligible anglophone parents and upon approval by the Minister would an exception be made for

---

[11] Alberta – *School Act* (R.S.A. 1970, c. 329); British Columbia – *School Act* (R.S.B.C. 1979, c. 375); Nova Scotia – *Education Act* (S.N.S. 1981, c. 65); Saskatchewan – *Education Act* (S.S. 1983, c.11); Yukon – *Education Act* (S.Y. 1989-90, c.25); Prince Edward Island – *School Act* (R.S.P.E.I. 1993, c. 35)

designated children to be educated in English, though even these would be required to demonstrate a working knowledge of French before they would be allowed to graduate from secondary school. "No person," the Charter unequivocally declared, "may permit or tolerate a child receiving instruction in English if he is ineligible therefor" (ibid.: s. 78.1).

Inasmuch as this promotion of French fell well in line with the declared intentions of the federal *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54) and the development of francophone education and services programs across the country, Quebecois legislation departed markedly from the spirit of the bilingualism and biculturalism movement by unapologetically seeking to establish French as the *sole* language of the province, even to the detriment of English. In 1979, the Supreme Court of Canada took the step of declaring Chapter III of the 1977 Charter – which pronounced French the only official language of the courts and legislature of Quebec – to be unconstitutional, requiring amendments to reinstate the status of English alongside French. Even with these amendments made, however, this set of three documents, considered together in sequence, still bears witness to a growing nationalist sentiment within the province, revealed by an increasingly explicit emphasis on the social and cultural place of the French language in Quebec, beyond its role as a simple medium of communication. Whereas the 1969 Act sought only to promote French as the language of the majority without much additional comment, the Act of 1974 boldly claimed the language as "a national heritage which the body politic is in duty bound to preserve," going on to insist that it was "incumbent upon the government of the province of Québec to employ every means in its power to ensure the preeminence of that language and to promote its vigour and quality" (S.Q. 1974, c.6, pre.). Three years later, the Charter went still one step further, asserting that "the French language, the distinctive language of a people that is in the majority French-speaking, is the instrument by which that people has

articulated its identity" (R.S.Q., 1977, c. C-11, pre.) and thus implying that it was not just the French language, but the unique cultural and linguistic identity of the Quebecois within Canada that the Charter was designed to protect. The potential volatility of such a sentiment, however, was mitigated by the new situation brought into effect by the federal government's *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54). No longer was Quebec the only advocate for Canadian francophones. Having set itself up as protector of official language minority communities across the nation, the Government of Canada established a new relationship with francophones in every province, including the province of Quebec, being now "the legitimate representative of all French Canadians and [undercutting] Quebec nationalism" (Grammond 2009: 161).

Standing in stark contrast to the above, *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada* (1966-67) was met with a rather different reception. Tabled in only two volumes – the first in October 1966 and the second exactly one year later – the Hawthorn Report prompted no legislative reaction whatsoever, neither at the federal nor at the provincial level. Instead, after two years of relatively silent reflection on the part of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the government issued its response in the form of a white paper entitled *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (1969).[12]

As was true of both reports under consideration, this Statement was marked in its writing by the same discursive structures and rhetorical lines characteristic of the day, that is, by a voiced concern for social equality, the cessation of discrimination, the free expression of cultural identity, and the shared rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. "The Government

---

[12] As noted above, the term 'white paper' is used to refer to a policy statement issued by the government, offering a broader contextualization for actions taken or bills introduced, a fuller explanation of the thinking about or objectives held in governance of a particular arena of political life. The 1969 *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* is arguably the most (in)famous white paper ever issued in Canada. In this instance, the term took on dual significance, since "for many First Nations people, the term ironically implies a reference to racial politics and the white majority" (First Nations Studies Group 2009: para. 2).

believes that its policies must lead to the full, free and non-discriminatory participation of the Indian people in Canadian society," it read. "Such a goal requires a break with the past. It requires that the Indian people's role of dependence be replaced by a role of equal status, opportunity and responsibility, a role they can share with all other Canadians" (Indian Affairs and Northern Development [IAND] 1969: 5). Desiring to eschew any and all discrimination, particularly when based on race or ethnicity, the Statement lamented the reality that to be an Aboriginal person in Canada meant "to be someone apart – apart in law, apart in the provision of government services and, too often, apart in social contacts. […] Indian relations with other Canadians began with special treatment by government and society," the paper observed, "and special treatment has been the rule since Europeans first settled in Canada. Special treatment has made of the Indians a community disadvantaged and apart" (ibid.: 3). Ignoring by such summary pronouncements the specificities of history which first prompted the differential treatment of Aboriginal nations and which later transformed intended privileges into millstones (to borrow a figure from Hawthorn himself), the government's response paper easily equated every form of difference with negative discrimination and proceeded to lay out its plan for what was deemed to be "a new opportunity to expand and develop [Indian] identity within the framework of a Canadian society which offers them the rewards and responsibilities of participation, the benefits of involvement and the pride of belonging" (ibid.: 7).

Despite such observable similarities in the strategies of argumentation, however, two significant shifts in the perspective from which this discourse was taken up guaranteed that the conclusions reached in the government's White Paper could not in the end line up well with the recommendations of the Hawthorn report. The first was a shift from a focus on the collective to a focus on the individual. Through their report, Hawthorn and his colleagues repeatedly underlined

the collective characteristics of Aboriginal life and tradition and emphasized the need to consider this carefully when charting out any future course of action. Treaty rights, after all, had been negotiated with collective communities, not with individuals (Hawthorn 1966, v.1: 240). Land was understood to be held in common, with fish, game and farming produce often seen as collective income (ibid.: 117, 271). Language, culture and religious life were also given expression in the context of community (ibid.: xliv). It is at the communal level, Hawthorn noted,

> that the administrative and political consequences of Indian status have had their greatest impact. It is only at this level that Indians can acquire any collective freedom. They are obviously prevented from acquiring nationhood, and their political impact at the provincial and federal level, while growing, will never be more than marginal. At the local level, however, they could acquire the small degree of autonomy possible. (ibid.: 293)

Any steps toward economic or community development, then, needed to be imagined and undertaken as collective projects, rather than solely at the discretion of individuals.

The government's policy statement, however, seemed to move in exactly the opposite direction. Claiming as observed that any difference was by its very essence discriminatory, it recommended that the *Indian Act* (S.C. 1876, c. 18) – which obviously applied only to Aboriginal peoples and not to the Canadian population as a whole – be repealed, effectively negating the ability of Aboriginal nations to interact with the government directly. Instead, individual Aboriginal citizens were to access provincial and local services via the same mechanisms as everyone else (IAND 1969: 2). Arguing that "Canada has changed greatly since the first Indian Act was passed, [being now] made up of many people with many cultures" (ibid.: 8), the White Paper went so far as to suggest the very removal of any reference to Aboriginal peoples from the Constitution, leaving therein the mention of only the two official linguistic

communities, the English and the French. This, it was argued, was a step "necessary to end the legal distinction between Indians and other Canadians" (ibid.). "The significance of treaties in meeting the economic, educational, health and welfare needs of the Indian people," the paper moreover suggested, "has always been limited and will continue to decline" (ibid.: 11). Control of reserve lands would first be turned over to collective bands or communities, but would inevitably be converted to private property holdings "when the Indian people see that the only way they can own and fully control land is to accept taxation the way other Canadians do" (ibid.: 12).

This first fundamental shift from concern for the collective to that of the individual was matched by a second: the shift from a substantive concept of equality to a more formal one. "A formal conception of equality," Grammond explains, "focuses on how people are treated. […] The principle of formal equality guarantees that the state does not treat one category of persons more favourably than others; it upholds, in that sense, the ideal of state neutrality and impartiality" (2009: 16-17). Substantive equality, on the other hand, focuses not on the decisions or rules disinterestedly applied, but rather on the results of such application, that is, on the actual situations of particular individuals or groups. "As the primary goal of substantive equality is to equalize certain results, it follows that in certain cases this might require unequal treatment, contrary to the principle of formal equality" (ibid.: 19).

Repeatedly in his writing, Hawthorn had warned against the hazards of too formal a conception of equality applied to the situation of Aboriginal peoples in Canada, cautioning:

> Governments and the Canadian people must beware of seeking a formal solution to the problems facing Indians as members of communities and as individuals. A formal solution would be one in which differences in the public treatment accorded Indians and Whites were completely eliminated, and no further action was taken. An

unrestrained emphasis on simple formal equality, which is not humanized by necessary supplemental treatment and services, could lead to the placing of Indians unaided in competition with Whites with disastrous results. The equal treatment in law and services of a people who at the present time do not have equal competitive capacities will not suffice for the attainment of substantive socio-economic equality. (1966, v.1: 391-392)

In spite of such a clear caution, however, the government policy as presented in 1969 made no real provision for the sort of 'supplemental treatment and services' called for by Hawthorn. Even while acknowledging at one point that "equality before the law and in programs and services does not necessarily result in equality in social and economic conditions" (IAND 1969: 10), the White Paper instead repeatedly insisted that "services should be available on an equitable basis" and that they "ought not to flow from separate agencies established to serve particular groups, especially not to groups that are identified ethnically" (ibid.: 9).

Together, these two shifts in perception created a situation in which the recommendations of the Hawthorn Report were not so much dismissed as strategically misinterpreted, and thereby largely negated. Rather than affirming the special status of Aboriginal groups as charter members of the Canadian community, their status was to be dissolved entirely and their place in the historical record all but erased. Rather than developing additional services to help close the social and economic gap created by years of neglect and maltreatment, even existing obligations demanded by treaty agreements were to be phased out and brought to an end. Rather than developing local governmental structures which, in conjunction with the Indian Affairs Branch, could give greater voice to Aboriginal groups at the level of policy discussion, the Branch was to instead be shut down within five years, leaving no voice but the individual vote.

The most noticeable divergence of all, however, between the Hawthorn Report and the government response to it had once more to do with the question of education. For although

Hawthorn's report had insisted loudly, repeatedly and consistently that increased educational opportunities, attentive to the linguistic and cultural realities of Aboriginal peoples, must be absolutely central to any desired action or reform, the *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (1969) had next to nothing to say about education and schooling in the newly proposed regime. A comment in its opening pages simply read,

> The Government could press on with the policy of fostering further education, could press forward in the directions of recent years, and eventually many of the problems would be solved. But the progress would be too slow. […] We can no longer perpetuate the separation of Canadians. Now is the time to change. (6)

As a result, no plan is laid out for the education of Aboriginal children beyond their integration into existing provincial schools. The barriers of language, culture, communication and experience identified by the Hawthorn Report as impediments to understanding, to learning, and consequently to any development or progress, remain completely unaddressed and entirely ignored.

The 1969 *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* was met by outrage on the part of Aboriginal communities, who descried it as "a thinly disguised programme of extermination through assimilation" (Cardinal 1969: 1). "In spite of all government attempts to convince Indians to accept the white paper," averred Harold Cardinal, then leader of the Indian Association of Alberta, "their efforts will fail, because Indians understand that the path outlined by the Department of Indian Affairs through its mouthpiece, the Honourable Mr. Chrétien, leads directly to cultural genocide. We will not walk this path" (ibid.: 139). The conflict and opposition triggered by the release of the White Paper would not soon be quelled, and its immediate impact was sufficient to block any implementation of the proposed policy. The bottom line, then, remained unchanged; unlike the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission's report

which had prompted legislative change clear across the nation, there was no legislative action or reform resulting from Hawthorn's recommendations; no affirmation of the languages or cultural identities of Canada's Aboriginal peoples; no advancement of their place within Canadian society; and no improvement to the range of educational opportunities open to them.

### 2.3.3 As Narratives Unfold

In considering the role played by language and education policy in shaping the national narrative and informing understandings of Canadian identity, this second 'moment' in Canadian history should be recognized as a particularly significant one given the potential for change found within it and the lasting impact of the choices made. The questions about racism, discrimination, social inequality and the treatment of minority groups which were being raised in the 1960s and which prompted the two studies under consideration are as crucial now as they were then to establishing intercultural relational patterns and standards both within and across national borders.

In the preliminary report which preceded the bulk of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission's research and analysis, Laurendeau and Dunton wrote,

> We believe that there is a crisis, in the sense that Canada has come to a time when decisions must be taken and developments must occur leading either to its break-up, or to a new set of conditions for its future existence. (RCBB 1965: 2)

Likewise, in the introduction to his report, Hawthorn also spoke of impending crisis in relation to Aboriginal communities and governance, warning that, with the possible exception of the soon-to-be-disbanded Indian Affairs Branch, no government body "appears to have the knowledge and readiness to assist" (1966, v.1: 8). Collectively undertaking an examination of the place of English, French, Aboriginal and immigrant languages and cultures in specific relation to social,

economic and political development in the country; apparently agreed on the importance of language and culture to the development and expression of identity; and speaking in unison of the centrality of schooling to the preservation and protection of both, the reports seemed poised to bring both reshaping and renewal to the Canadian social sphere.

In the end, however, the result of these two studies and of the legislative responses which followed was not a fundamental paradigm shift, nor even a significant progression in a new direction, but rather a simple reaffirmation of the established status quo. English and French were entrenched still more firmly at the top of the linguistic hierarchy, English taking precedence by sheer force of numbers, with French following more consistently now at a measured pace; and thanks to the clear pairing of bilingualism and biculturalism throughout the Commission's report, the inseparability of these two official languages from the two 'dominant cultures' they expressed was now largely accepted as fact. Clear across the country, schooling systems had been brought into line with this vision of bilingual, bicultural Canadian identity, ready and waiting to reproduce continually this established social structure.

Consideration of 'other' languages and cultures, neither French nor English, came next, spoken of in the same breath and written about in the same documents, but always with a clear understanding that these did not stand on the same plane as the two official languages, occupying instead a lower stratum and granted what space they had by those in positions of greater authority. Though the possibility of schooling in these languages did exist, whether as curricular subjects or in separate community classes, no doubt remained that parents who desired such education for their children were asking for 'a little bit more', a little bit extra. Education in these languages was no longer a question of right, but rather one of privilege.

Aboriginal languages and cultures, by contrast, continued to find themselves placed dramatically to one side, almost entirely out of sight. As the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission explained, the mandate and terms of reference they had received contained

> no allusion to Canada's native populations. They speak of 'two founding races,' namely Canadians of British and French origin, and 'other ethnic groups,' but mention neither the Indians nor the Eskimos. Since it is obvious that these two groups do not form part of the 'founding races,' as the phrase is used in the terms of reference, it would logically be necessary to include them under the heading of 'other ethnic groups.' Yet it is clear that the term 'other ethnic groups' means those peoples of diverse origins who came to Canada during or after the founding of the Canadian state and that it does not include the first inhabitants of this country. (RCBB 1967, v.1: xxvi)

By such logical arguments and explanations, any consideration of Aboriginal languages and cultures or of their place within the developing nation was rendered unnecessary and summarily dismissed, set aside to be addressed in a separate study and report which, as we have seen, in its turn resulted in no significant legislative reform at all. The question of education in these languages remained unimagined and unaddressed, leaving the Aboriginal peoples of Canada precisely where they had always been in terms of the country's social hierarchy, that is, clinging as they could to the bottom-most rung.

Despite the rhetoric of equality and social justice which markedly characterized the discourse of the 1960s, then, both the linguistic and the social hierarchy of Canada remained unassailably intact, continually perpetuated and bolstered at every turn by systems of education across the country.

# CH. 3 – LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION IN CANADA:
## HIERARCHY CHALLENGED AND CHANGED?

From its very inception, the Dominion of Canada was carved out of a landscape marked by remarkable linguistic and cultural complexity and shaped against a background in which language and identity were intricately woven together. Even so, it did not take long for a consistent public narrative to emerge as dominant – one that, eclipsing all alternatives, would be recounted as the history of the country, undergirded by the discursive representations created, normalized through its repetition in countless government documents, and realized through the enactment of laws which would ensure that the relationships described therein would be acted out again and again in the world. The resulting social and linguistic hierarchy which emerged was one which saw English language and culture assume the highest place, representing both political power and what was thought at the time to be quintessential Canadianness. French followed behind at a measured pace, ever present and rhetorically equal, and yet, as we have seen, never practically speaking so. Those of the 'other ethnic groups' came next, in a role ever marked by supplication and exception, followed only at a great distance by Canada's First Nations, forced to struggle for any degree of recognition at all. As Canada entered its second century of life, however, the social developments of a rapidly changing world would bring new challenges to the well-entrenched hierarchy – new challenges and the possibility of change.

## 3.1 Moment Three – The Move to Multiculturalism

Whereas the first two moments here considered were separated by the span of a century, the next two find themselves much more closely placed together on the timeline of Canadian history, their chronologies in fact flowing into one another. Yet each one is marked by the

potential it held for the opening of a new discursive trajectory, the possibility it presented for social change and progress where questions of language, culture and education were concerned.

It was less than two years after the tabling of the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission report's final volume that Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau stood before the House of Commons to address the question of cultural diversity in Canada. Though the passing of the *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54) and the institutional changes which accompanied it had more or less settled the question of bilingualism and, at least for the moment, eased some of the tension between the federal government and the province of Quebec, the prevailing social climate of the 1960s and persistent concern for equality and social justice continued to raise questions about the status and role of other minority language and culture groups within the country. While these groups had been affirmed in the report as bringing to Canada "an inestimable enrichment that Canadians cannot afford to lose" and as being "an integral part of the national wealth" (RCBB 1969b, v.4: 14), the determined pairing of bilingualism and biculturalism left them still standing on uncertain ground.

Up until this point, the term 'multiculturalism' had generally been used in one of two senses: the first was a descriptive sense, referring simply to the presence in a given region or locale of people from diverse cultural backgrounds; the second was a prescriptive sense, expressing a broad set of ideals – most often including equality and mutual respect – about how people in such a setting ought to relate to one another (see Dewing 2009). Standing before Parliament on October 8, 1971, however, Trudeau introduced the Canadian public to a third sense of the term 'multiculturalism', a political sense which denoted "the management of diversity through formal initiatives in the federal, provincial, territorial and municipal domains"

(ibid.: 1), and as he did so, Trudeau led Canada to become the first country in the world to officially make the move to multiculturalism as state policy.

### 3.1.1 Multiculturalism Within a Bilingual Framework

"Mr. Speaker," Trudeau began, turning the attention of the House to that volume of the report entitled *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups*,

> I am happy this morning to be able to reveal to the House that the government has accepted all those recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism which are contained in Volume IV of its reports directed to federal departments and agencies. (1971: 8545)

This was, it would seem, a rather odd statement with which to begin his speech for several reasons. To start with, such an assertion required what has often been called "a very creative reading" of the recommendations made (Day 2000: 188). In reality, of the sixteen recommendations summarized in the final pages of this volume, "seven were dismissed as superfluous, five were said to be out of federal jurisdiction, three were relegated to a 'research program,' and only one, suggesting increased funding for linguistic assimilation, was to be implemented" (ibid.). But a second reason why this statement made for an odd beginning was because the policy Trudeau was about to announce – Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework – flew directly in the face of the Commission's stated rejection of multiculturalism in favour of recognizing "the basically bicultural nature of our country" and emphasizing the "two dominant cultures, the French and the British" (RCBB 1969b, v.4: 12-13). Notwithstanding this apparent contradiction, however, the Prime Minister forged ahead, presenting the newly adopted policy as a continuation of the previous discussion, rather than a break from it, insistent that "although there are two official languages, there is no official culture, nor does any ethnic group take precedence over any other" (Trudeau 1971: 8545).

The policy document tabled by Trudeau that day clearly laid out the four major objectives toward which it was aimed:

1. The preservation of cultural identities – "The government of Canada will support all of Canada's cultures and will seek to assist, resources permitting, the development of those cultural groups which have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop, a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada, as well as a clear need for assistance." (Canada 1971: 8581)

2. The overcoming of social barriers – "The Government will assist members of all cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society." (ibid.)

3. The fostering of creative intercultural exchange – "The Government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interest of national unity." (ibid.)

4. The continued promotion of Canada's two official languages among all cultural groups – "The Government will continue to assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society." (ibid.)

By way of this policy, Trudeau sought to give validation and affirmation to the cultures and traditions of those many other groups from different backgrounds who comprised a growing proportion of the Canadian population. He also sought to communicate to the country as a whole that diversity was not something necessarily damaging to a nation, something that needed to be feared or quashed through the forced assimilation of all; on the contrary, diversity was an asset to be welcomed, preserved, and even celebrated for the enrichment it could bring.

There can be little doubt that the introduction of this policy was in many ways a boon to the 'other ethnic groups' working to build a place for themselves in Canada, opening a door to

funding opportunities and sometimes, as we will see, even to curricular changes in their schools.

At the same time, however, there can be absolutely no doubt that this was never a question of

actually challenging the established status quo, that is, the clear dominance of the English and

the French. The bilingual framework for this policy was a non-negotiable factor, with other

languages and cultures to be protected and promoted only inasmuch as they demonstrated their

"capacity to grow and contribute to Canada […] in the interest of national unity", while citizens

simultaneously worked to become "full participants in Canadian society" through the acquisition

of at least one of the two official languages (Trudeau 1971: 8546). As Trudeau himself

explained, "In terms of *realpolitik* French and English are equal in Canada because each of these

linguistic groups has the power to break the country. And this power cannot yet be claimed by

the Iroquois, the Eskimos, or the Ukrainians" (as cited in Francis 1992: 219).

A close reading of both the text of Trudeau's speech and the policy document introduced

soon reveals that promoting multiculturalism in this way while simultaneously desiring to

preserve the social structures already in place required two significant modulations in the

argumentation employed, when compared with that used by Laurendeau and Dunton in arguing

for biculturalism. The first was a strategic conceptual separation of language from culture. In

making their case for biculturalism, the Commission had repeatedly asserted that "culture and the

language that serves as its vehicle cannot be dissociated" (RCBB 1969b, v.4: 13) and that

"language is the most evident expression of a culture," insisting that "this means that the

problems of bilingualism and biculturalism are inseparably linked" (RCBB 1967, v.1: xxx).

Trudeau, by contrast, downplayed the role of language in cultural life by arguing that "adherence

to one's ethnic group is influenced not so much by one's origin or mother tongue as by one's

sense of belonging to the group, […] the group's 'collective will to exist'" (1971: 8545). Though

the Commission report did, as we have seen, display certain inconsistences in this regard when referring to languages and cultures other that the French or the English, for Trudeau such a separation did not evidence an inconsistency, but rather a persistent claim; in fact, in his speech he went so far as to assert that an "individual's freedom would be hampered if he were locked for life within a particular cultural compartment by the accident of birth or language" (ibid.).

The second move required by the new policy of multiculturalism was the complete removal of any political element from the resulting discussion of culture. Whereas from the opening pages of the report's first volume it was made plain that the Commission was primarily concerned with "linguistic and cultural aspects of political and socio-economic matters" (RCBB 1967, v.1: xxvii), the new policy document eschewed any discussion of either the political or the economic, focusing instead on the facilitation of "cultural education centres" where "creative encounters and cultural exchanges" could take place, as well as "displays of the performing and visual arts" such as "a bagpipe band or highland dancing group" (Trudeau 1971: 8546). Gone was all discussion of the civil service and the military; the federal agencies referenced were instead the CRTC, the National Film Board and the National Museum of Man (ibid.). Whereas the Commission had explored "the political dimensions of this problem", acknowledging that "any community which is governed through the medium of a language other than its own has usually felt itself to some extent disenfranchised, and that this feeling has always been a potential focus for political agitation" (RCBB 1967, v.1: xxix), Trudeau's approach made possible the effective dissociation of ethnicity and culture from any civil or political engagement. As a result, "the former can be accommodated, even celebrated, without significant political and economic transformation, while the latter, which might demand a fundamental transformation of nationality, can be ignored" (Thobani 2007: 99).

By thus strategically delimiting the notion of 'culture', Trudeau was able to formally introduce his government's policy of 'Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework' in a way that did not conflict with the recently enacted *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54). "The time is overdue for the people of Canada to become more aware of the rich tradition of the many cultures we have in Canada," the policy read.

> Canada's citizens come from almost every country in the world, and bring with them every major world religion and language. This cultural diversity endows all Canadians with a great variety of human experience. […] Ethnic loyalties need not, and usually do not, detract from wider loyalties to community and country. Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed, we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity. Every ethnic group has the right to preserve and develop its own culture and values within the Canadian context. To say we have two official languages is not to say we have two official cultures, and no particular culture is more 'official' than another. A policy of multiculturalism must be a policy for all Canadians. (Canada 1971: 8580-8581)

A number of immediate steps were taken in order to facilitate and oversee the implementation of the policy, with a Multiculturalism Directorate being formed under the Department of the Secretary of State in 1972 and the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (later called the Canadian Ethnocultural Council) established the following year. According to government records, "nearly $200 million was set aside in the first decade of the policy for special initiatives in language and cultural maintenance" (Dewing 2009: 3). Consultations were carried out between the various levels of government, and in 1974 Saskatchewan became the first of the provinces to enact its own multicultural legislation, its stated purpose being

> to recognize that the diversity of Saskatchewan people with respect to race, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry and place of origin is a fundamental

characteristic of Saskatchewan society that enriches the lives of all […]; to
encourage respect for the multicultural heritage of Saskatchewan; to foster a climate
for harmonious relations among people of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds
without sacrificing their distinctive cultural and ethnic identities; and to encourage
the continuation of a multicultural society. (R.S.S. 1978, c. S-31, s. 3)

Throughout the next two decades, the influence of this policy on education and schooling was
significant. Education standards of the day, as we have seen, provided for (or were in the process
of providing for) mother tongue education for both anglophones and francophones in every
province, as well as consistent opportunities for all Canadians, whatever their background, to
learn either English or French as a second language. Education in any other language, by
contrast, remained relatively rare and, where it did exist, was often hotly contested and almost
always hard won. The introduction of 'Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework' as
official policy, however, cleared the way for what became known as Heritage Language
Education, that is, for new programs which soon began to appear across the country, teaching
various non-official minority languages to students in Canadian schools. For as much as Trudeau
may have desired to separate language and culture from one another by his careful wording and
presentation, in developing programs to support multiculturalism, especially at the provincial
level, it was above all language education which proved to be in greatest demand.

### i. The Emergence of Heritage Language Education

In 1973, the Edmonton Public School Board became the first school board in Canada to
introduce a program of bilingual education, beginning at the primary level and involving a non-
official minority language, under the auspices of the new multiculturalism policy (Cummins
1993: 8). But other school boards and other provinces would not be far behind. With the notable
exception of the maritime region (where language education programs remain relatively limited

to this day), the next 15 years would bear witness to the burgeoning growth of Heritage

Language Programs across the country, so dubbed because the label 'heritage'

> tended to reinforce the idea that languages other than English or French were not
> 'foreign' languages, as they were spoken by many Canadians and were part of their
> Canadian heritage. The maintenance of these languages was presented as a rational
> extension of the efforts to recognize and celebrate Canada's multicultural heritage
> and was in keeping with the multicultural policies espoused by various levels of
> government. (Tavares 2001: 203)

Though the details and structures of the various programs would, like the rest of the

school system, vary according to provincial policies and priorities, the reasons cited for the

development of Heritage Language Programs bore a remarkable resemblance across the board.

While parents almost without exception talked about the desire to see their children maintain and

develop linguistic skills in the language spoken at home, thereby improving communication with

grandparents and other relations, policy documents more formally referenced the need to

enhance identity and self-understanding through a greater pride in one's heritage and cultural

roots, as well as increasing opportunity and ability to move with ease in the multicultural context

of Canada (Cummins 1993: 2-3). Moreover, arguments regarding improved intellectual

development were also added to the list as a growing number of studies began to demonstrate the

benefits of first language retention for a student's overall academic performance, even when

classes were conducted in one official language or the other.[13]

Canada's western provinces led the way in enacting legislation that permitted non-official

languages to be used as a medium of instruction in schools. As a result, these provinces offered

the widest range of 'dual track' programs, in which instruction time was split according to a

designated ratio between an official language and the heritage language of the community.

---

[13] See, for example, Cummins and Mulcahy 1978, Bhatnagar 1980, Wells 1981, or Dolson 1985.

Ukrainian-English bilingual programs came first, initially appearing in Edmonton but quickly spreading and consequently well established in not only Alberta, but also Saskatchewan and Manitoba by 1979. In time, other dual track programs instituted in Manitoba provided Hebrew and German options; Alberta additionally developed programs in Spanish, Mandarin, Arabic, and American Sign Language, while the Kootenay district in British Columbia added Russian teaching in certain schools (Babaee 2012: 7). In addition, other languages offered in these provinces as individual subjects of study ranged from Portuguese to Filipino to, in at least one instance, Icelandic (Tavares 2001: 203). By the mid-1980s, Alberta, for example, boasted that it had students enrolled in approved and accredited programs or courses in 14 distinct languages, including not one, but two Aboriginal options: Arabic, Blackfoot, Cree, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, Polish, Spanish, Swedish and Ukrainian. Moreover, in cooperation with federal initiatives and funding, the Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism department also supported some 143 community schools which gathered in the afternoons or on weekends to provide classes in at least 40 languages[14] (Government of Alberta 1988: 22-24).

In contrast to the western provinces, the governments of Ontario and Quebec chose to maintain existing legislation which dictated that, with very few exceptions, English and French were still to be used as the primary languages of school instruction. As a result, both Ontario's Heritage Language Program, initiated in 1977, and Quebec's Programme d'enseignement des langues d'origine, introduced the following year, were focused less on the elaboration of dual track programs than on extending options for heritage languages as subjects of instruction. While a few fully bilingual programs did develop, most notably among the Italian and Jewish

---

[14] Amharic, Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Cree, Chipewyan, Croatian, Czech, Farsi, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Malayalam, Mandarin, Norwegian, Oromo, Pashto, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Saulteaux, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tagalog, Tamil, Tigray, Tigrinya, Turkish, Ukrainian, Urdu and Vietnamese.

communities of major cities like Toronto and Montreal, most courses centred on limited but concentrated periods of language instruction, most often ranging in length from 30-90 minutes daily (Cummins 1993: 10-14). By 1984, Quebec was offering such courses in Italian, Portuguese, Greek and Spanish, while the Ontarian initiative involved "more than 90,000 children, 4,000 classes and 62 heritage languages" (Edwards 1993: 131).

In light of the new policy of official multiculturalism and taking seriously government claims that it desired to promote "the development and expression of heritage cultures and languages as an integral part of Canadian artistic, cultural and academic life" (Tavares 2001: 202), these programs emerged as a

> direct response to pressures from various cultural groups […] for inclusion and recognition. Government support for maintaining their languages and cultures through 'bilingual' and other forms of heritage language programs was equated with equality and the right to full participation in a multicultural Canadian society, (ibid.: 200)

and so, provided that the framework of official language bilingualism be strictly maintained, the Government of Canada was pleased to support these programs which aligned so well with their policy, thus promoting this feeling of civic pride and participation.

### 3.1.2 Shifting Legislation: From Cultural to Civil Rights

As noted above, it was Saskatchewan that, in 1974, became the first of the Canadian provinces to enact its own multicultural legislation. While Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island would all follow suit before long, adopting various Acts connected to multiculturalism over the course of the 1980s,[15] at the federal level,

---

[15] Ontario – *Ministry of Citizenship and Culture Act* (S.O. 1982, c. 6); Alberta – *Alberta Multiculturalism Act* (S.A. 1984, c.A-32.8); Manitoba – *Manitoba Intercultural Council Act* (R.S.M. 1987, c. 155); New Brunswick – *New*

multiculturalism initiatives and program plans remained on the stratum of policy. That is to say that while 'Multiculturalism Within a Bilingual Framework' effectively outlined the intentions of Trudeau's government and the direction in which they desired to see Canada evolve, it was not yet written into the laws of the country nor made compulsory in any way, as the *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54) had done for bilingualism. Despite this lack of official legislation, however, the policy was rendered rather more official than not when, in 1982, it was written into the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and so made part of the newly patriated *Constitution Act, 1982*. "This Charter," read section 27, "shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians" (R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 44). Not surprisingly, this step, which entrenched multiculturalism as a specifically Canadian value and a part of the Canadian identity, prompted federal officials to begin to devote more deliberate thought to the pragmatics of how such a policy might be realized, and in 1985 a House of Commons Standing Committee on Multiculturalism was created, eventually leading to the introduction of a bill formally entitled *An Act for the Preservation and Enhancement of Multiculturalism in Canada*, but better known as simply the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (S.C. 1988, c. 31).

Between the first introduction of Trudeau's policy in 1971 and the receiving of assent by this bill in 1988, the better part of two decades had passed, during which time a significant shift in the prevailing perspective on multiculturalism had occurred. Throughout this period, the steady flow of immigrants into Canada had never ebbed, though developments in immigration

---

*Brunswick Policy on Multiculturalism* (1986); PEI – *Provincial Multicultural Policy* (1988); Nova Scotia – *Act to Promote and Preserve Multiculturalism* (R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 294).
British Columbia followed with the 1993 passing of its *Multiculturalism Act* (S.B.C. 1993, c. 57); Newfoundland would not enact its *Policy on Multiculturalism* until 2008.
Quebec officially rejected the notion of multiculturalism in favour of that of 'interculturalism', as explained in the 1990 policy paper *Let's Build Quebec Together: A Policy Statement on Integration and Immigration*.

policy had resulted in an increase in the number of arrivals from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean,

as well as other previously 'undesirable classes', when compared with those arriving directly

from Britain or from other European countries.[16] By consequence, the number of 'visible

minority' groups present in Canada also increased quite dramatically, prompting new concerns

about racism and discrimination, this time based on factors other than cultural practice or dress.[17]

Though Canada had, in fact, had a *Bill of Rights* (S.C. 1960, c. 44) in force since 1960, detailing

the six inalienable rights and freedoms of every Canadian,[18] and although by 1988 six provinces

and one territory had also enacted their own Human Rights Acts toward the same end,[19]

increasingly "the removal of racially discriminatory barriers became the main focus of

multicultural programs, and race relations policies and programs were put in place to uncover,

isolate and combat racial discrimination at personal and institutional levels" (Dewing 2009: 3).

By the time the 1988 *Multiculturalism Act* was penned, the primary concerns of 1971 – the

preservation of cultural diversity and the promotion of creative cultural exchange – had been

very nearly overshadowed by the need to address outright displays of racial discrimination, and

---

[16] A policy of 'colour-blind' immigration was introduced in 1967. According to this policy, applications were assessed not based on ethnic or regional origin, but according to a point system focused primarily on economic requirements. Harris notes that, under the new system, "immigration from Europe declined to 36 percent by 1981 and to 20 percent by 1991, while Asian immigration increased sharply. If in 1861 Asians comprised only 4 percent of immigrants, by 1991 this figure had grown to 50 percent. The vast majority came from Vietnam (including 60,000 refugees in 1979– 80), Hong Kong, India, and the Philippines. Jamaica, El Salvador, and Guyana also became sources of substantial numbers of immigrants" (1999: 1052).

[17] The use of the term 'visible minorities' can be traced back at least as far as the Terms of Reference given to the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment, established in June 1983 and chaired by Rosalie Abella. "The issue," the report explains, "was to attempt to ascertain the extent to which people who were visibly non-white were excluded thereby from employment opportunities available to whites" (1984: 46).

[18] "The right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law; the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law; freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of assembly and association; and freedom of the press" (S.C. 1960, c. 44, s. 1).

[19] New Brunswick – *Human Rights Code* (S.N.B. 1971, c. 8); Quebec – *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms* (R.S.Q. 1975, c. C-12); PEI – *Human Rights Act* (R.S.P.E.I. 1975, c. H-12); Saskatchewan – *The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code* (S.S. 1979, c. S-24.1); Alberta – *Alberta Human Rights Act* (S.A. 1980, c. A-25.5); Manitoba – *Human Rights Code* (S.M. 1987, c. H175); Yukon – *Human Rights Act* (S.Y. 1986, c. 116)

the demands of multiculturalism became closely linked, if not conflated, with those of human

rights. The opening lines of the Act demonstrate this clearly:

> Whereas the Constitution of Canada provides that every individual is equal before
> and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and benefit of the law
> without discrimination and that everyone has the freedom of conscience, religion,
> thought, belief, opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association and
> guarantees those rights and freedoms equally to male and female persons; […]

> And whereas the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as
> regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental
> characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism
> designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while
> working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural
> and political life of Canada;

> Now, therefore, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate
> and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows." (S.C. 1988, c. 31, pre.)

The close connection thus created between multiculturalism and human rights is not the

only thing to immediately strike the reader upon encountering this Act. Also immediately

noticeable is the reintroduction of the political and socio-economic considerations which had

been so markedly absent from the policy document of twenty years prior. However, the potential

difficulties which could arise from affording recognition to the political and economic import of

cultural and linguistic issues is mitigated by two things. The first is a clear expansion of the Act's

range of application. Whereas the original policy was restricted in its discussion to only the

cultures and social realities of the 'other' ethnic groups – that is, to the general exclusion of the

English, the French, and the Aboriginal peoples of Canada – the new bill included references to

the rights and traditions of Aboriginal peoples, as well as to both official language populations.

The *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* in this way harkened first back to Trudeau's observation that

"each of us is born into a particular family with a distinct heritage: that is, everyone – French, English, Italian and Slav included – has an 'ethnic' background" (Canada 1971: 8580); and then even further back to Watson Kirkconnell's one time claim that "we are all minorities, but all Canadians, entering, each with his own capacities, into the richness of the national amalgam" (1941: 7). By such an expansion, the Act was rendered relevant to "all Canadians, whether by birth or by choice" (S.C. 1988, c. 31, pre.).

The second mitigating factor was once again a marked shift from a focus on the collective aspects of cultural life to one concerned with individual expression and equality before the law. While in light of the circumstances of the day there was certainly no need to justify any and all efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and promote equity in respect, it cannot be entirely ignored that such a determined training of attention on the individual had the effect of weakening any collective voice which might advocate for the needs or desires of a community as a whole, a problem previously highlighted in relation to policies proposed for application to the Aboriginal communities of Canada. Such an approach was in fact well aligned with the reasoning previously offered in the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission report which, even while acknowledging the fact that nearly a third of the Canadian population was of neither British nor French origin, still essentially dismissed the need to give consideration to this assemblage, at least at the level of policy, stating, "It is clear that this 'third force' does not exist in Canada in any political sense, and is simply based on statistical compilations" (RCBB 1969b, v.4: 10). In the very same way, the 1988 *Multiculturalism Act*, by its strategic focus on the individual over the collective, also "skillfully delimited" the common ground allotted to 'other ethnic groups' "so as to allow them all to be *managed* under one policy, while being denied the right to commonly *resist* any policy" (Day 2000: 188).

Thus at the federal level, the focus of multiculturalism was effectively moved from cultural rights to civil rights, the shift being soon evidenced in practice as well as in discourse. Nilsen notes that

> almost as soon as the Act was passed the government began to cut its commitment to the multicultural policy. […] In 1988, the federal government announced that it would spend an additional $62 million over five years on multiculturalism in Canada, but this was cut in 1989 to $54 million including explicit reductions of 15% per year for at least three years to the operational funding of ethnocultural advocacy organizations. (2001: 101)

While the common reality of government budget cuts does go some way toward explaining these financial adjustments, it is not difficult to find specific instances which clearly demonstrate that individual human rights were not just paired with, but were actually overtaking concern for communal cultural life. A clear example can be drawn from the events of 1991.

On February 1st of that year, the federal government gave assent to two distinct yet related Acts: the *Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act* (S.C. 1991, c.7) and the *Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act* (S.C. 1991, c.8). Each Act outlined the creation of a new federal agency, established for distinct purposes, but both falling within the purview of the Minister responsible for the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (S.C. 1988, c. 31). The first was concerned primarily with the cultural rights encompassed in said Act, its declared purpose being "to facilitate throughout Canada the acquisition, retention and use of heritage languages by promoting, through public education and discussion, the learning of heritage languages and their benefit to Canada", as well as by making available information, resources and materials related to heritage language teaching and learning (*Heritage Languages Institute Act*, S.C. 1991, c.7, s. 4). The second agency, by contrast, was directed instead toward the human rights issues addressed in the Act, and held the goal of "facilitat[ing] throughout Canada the development,

sharing and application of knowledge and expertise in order to contribute to the elimination of racism and all forms of racial discrimination in Canadian society" through educational programs, the development of professional standards and the promotion of public awareness (*Race Relations Foundation Act*, S.C. 1991, c.8, s. 4). Thus far the two seemed designed to go hand in hand. At the level of funding, however, even from the very outset, a substantial discrepancy was apparent, for while the Race Relations Foundation was to receive an initial investment of $24 million from the Consolidated Revenue Fund (ibid.: s. 22), the Heritage Languages Institute was to receive only $6.5 million, and this over the first five years (*Heritage Languages Institute Act*, S.C. 1991, c.7, s. 22). The clear primacy of race relations over cultural considerations is only further emphasized when we realize that, while the Canadian Race Relations Foundation was well established and continues in operation to this day, the *Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act* never was brought into force; it was repealed in 2008, no action having ever been taken.

Though some time is always needed for such effects to trickle down, the same tendencies soon began to reveal themselves in provincial legislation as well. Where Multiculturalism Acts passed relatively early on emphasized as their purpose things like "foster[ing] a climate for harmonious relations among people of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds without sacrificing their distinctive cultural and ethnic identities" (*Saskatchewan Multiculturalism Act*, R.S.S. 1978, c. S-31, s. 3) and "encouraging the continuation of a multicultural society as a mosaic of different ethnic groups and cultures" (*Multiculturalism Act*, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 294, s. 3), provinces which enacted their legislation later took on a different tone. The *Manitoba Multiculturalism Act*, for instance, outlined a policy designed to "recognize and promote the right of all Manitobans, regardless of culture, religion or racial background, to equal access to

opportunities [and to] participate in all aspects of society" (S.M. 1992, c. 56, s. 2). The policy

laid out in British Columbia, in addition to affirming the multiculturalism and diversity of its

citizens, also aimed to "reaffirm that violence, hatred and discrimination on the basis of race,

cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, ancestry or place of origin have no place in the society of

British Columbia" and to work towards "building a society […] free from all forms of racism

and from conflict and discrimination" based on the same range of factors (*Multiculturalism Act*,

R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 321, s. 3). The continued conflation of these connected concerns can be seen

even in the eventual title of Alberta's 1996 *Human Rights, Citizenship and Multiculturalism Act*

(R.S.A., c. H14) which repealed and replaced the distinct acts which preceded it.

Neither was the growing sphere of Heritage Language Education immune from this

effect. The growing discourse of concern for human rights and dignity, full participation in

society, and equal responsibilities of citizenship here became paired with concerns about access

to the job market and career preparation, particularly in light of increasing globalization and

international movements. As the 1990s progressed, languages were increasingly selected for

curricular development and program implementation not in reference to local populations and the

cultural composition of the school district, but rather with an eye to emerging global powers and

international treaties. Programs in Japanese, Mandarin and Korean were initiated across the

prairie provinces by school boards mindful of the growing significance of these Asian countries

in the new global economy (Tavares 2001: 206). Spanish language programs also took off as

commerce with Mexico and other countries in Central and South America increased. Tavares

observes that "from 1990 to 1999, the number of senior years (high) schools offering Spanish

grew by over 400 percent" in Manitoba alone, with other provinces roughly keeping pace (ibid.:

207). "The significance of these programs," he further explains, "is that they were not introduced

as 'heritage' programs targeted at Canadian students of [these] origins, but were primarily

directed at students with no heritage connection to either language or culture," but who simply

had an interest in studying another language or culture for personal enrichment (ibid.: 206).

Accordingly, the terminology used to talk about such programs soon shifted away from 'heritage

languages' to take up instead the term 'international languages', easily reflecting "the impact of

globalism on education systems in Canada, as well as significant shifts in multicultural policies

and perspectives" (ibid.: 199).

The impact of this shift in policy and practice can be read in different ways. On the one

hand, even during a time of economic recession and budget cuts, language programs continued to

be supported and even expanded, often in creative ways. Under the auspices of the Western

Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education[20], for instance, Alberta, Saskatchewan

and Manitoba worked jointly to develop curriculum and standards for non-official language

education, eventually producing two documents: *The Common Curriculum Framework for*

*Bilingual Programming in International Languages, Kindergarten to Grade 12* (1999) and "The

Common Curriculum Framework for International Languages, Kindergarten to Grade 12"

(2000). Additional sources of funding not previously available were also recruited to support

these new 'international language programs', such as, for example, the Asia Pacific Foundation

of Canada, which helped actively support and promote courses in Japanese and other Asian

languages (Tavares 2001: 206).

Considered from the perspective of heritage language communities, however, these

developments were not necessarily without a negative side. While opportunities for instruction in

---

[20] Established in 1993, the Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education was an interprovincial association charged with articulating standards and learning outcomes for various curricular areas to be held in common by Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. A similar collaboration, the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation, was established in the Maritime region around the same time, though international languages were not addressed in this context. (Wallner 2013: 143)

various non-official languages did indeed increase, the argument that such language instruction could be "equated with equality and the right to full participation in […] Canadian society" (ibid.: 200) no longer had the ring of truth. On the contrary, the more these programs grew and developed, the further removed they seemed to be from the actual linguistic and cultural communities they were originally designed to serve. Just as changing perceptions of multiculturalism had shifted the focus of multicultural legislation away from collective expressions of cultural life and language as a mark of identity toward equality of individual citizens' standing before the laws of the country, so altered motivations for heritage, or rather international, language education moved from enveloping cultural communities other than the English and the French into Canadian society toward preparing Canada's primarily bilingual and bicultural society for more advantageous economic and political engagement in an increasingly global world.

### 3.1.3 The Social Impact of Multiculturalism as Official Policy

"The time is overdue for the people of Canada to become more aware of the rich tradition of the many cultures we have in Canada," Trudeau declared in 1971.

> The government regards this as a heritage to treasure and believes that Canada would be the poorer if we adopted assimilation programs forcing our citizens to forsake and forget the cultures they have brought to us. […] The government is concerned with preserving human rights, developing Canadian identity, strengthening citizenship participation, reinforcing Canadian unity and encouraging cultural diversification within a bilingual framework. These objectives can best be served through a policy of multiculturalism. (Canada 1971: 8580-8581)

With these words, 'Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework' became the official policy of the Government of Canada. Looking back over the course of the decades which have followed, it seems apparent that in some respects at least, this policy has turned out to be

remarkably successful. Though Canada maintains one of the highest per capita immigration rates in the world and though the percentage of Canadians claiming British or French origin continues to decline (Dolan & Young 2004), the bilingual identity of the country – most evident at the level of federal institutions and of education policies and requirements – is now well recognized and rarely questioned by most. Concurrently, multiculturalism has become a central piece of Canadian national identity, not only as perceived by those without our borders, but also by those within. A recent document published by the Library of Parliament points out that, "the percentage of Canadians who see multiculturalism as a symbol of Canadian identity increased from 37% in 1987 to 56% in 2010. At the same time, the percentage of Canadians who feel that immigration levels are too high dropped from 61% in 1977 to 38% in 2011" (Dewing 2009: 8). And although a growing number of countries have evolved their own programs and systems for heritage language education, Canada continues to be recognized as "a leader in developing pro-active policies and initiatives to support minority and heritage language instruction and maintenance" (Duff and Li 2009: 4).

This is not to say, though, that the multiculturalism policy introduced by Trudeau and evolved in subsequent years has been without its critics. Many Quebecois and other francophone supporters immediately viewed the policy as a threat to the status and position of the French language and culture in Canada, a menacing step toward reducing it to the state of being just one among many rather than honoured as a founding force in Confederation (cf. Moodley 1983; Mackey 2002). Others immediate feared that such a policy would lead to the appearance of ethno-cultural enclaves which would rather impede integration into broader Canadian society than promote it (cf. Zucchi 1988). Such concerns were certainly not without merit, nor without a certain basis in reality. However, the policy's dogged maintenance of the bilingual framework in

the end served to further entrench francophone realities as dominant across the country – admittedly never overtaking English, but ever present at its side – while the strategic prioritizing of civil and human rights concerns rather than continued focus on community-based expressions of culture made it more difficult to tie the emergence of any ethnic neighbourhoods directly to government directives.

More difficult to answer, though, were assertions that this policy of multiculturalism, rather than promoting cultural and linguistic equality as it purported to do, instead served to simply buttress the dominance of those already in positions of power – the English and the French – while equally excluding all 'other ethnic groups' from access to any real power or influence in the political and socio-economic realms. This was, in fact, the precise effect – if not the precise intention – of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (S.C. 1988, c. 31) once passed. While individual citizens were guaranteed equal treatment and protection in respect of the law, as well as equal rights to full participation in all aspects of Canadian society, the pathway for any ethno-cultural group, regardless of size, to enter the arena of the *realpolitik* and exercise significant influence over the country at the level of policy discussions and legislation had been effectively blocked once again, requiring that a significant caveat be attached to the notion of multicultural equality in Canada.

One further outstanding question has to do with the continued lack of attention paid to Aboriginal languages and cultures within these discussions. Although the reasons for this were relatively clear in 1971, the Act passed in 1988 ostensibly aspired to a change in this respect, wrapping into the policy of multiculturalism recognition of the "rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada" (*Multiculturalism Act*, S.C. 1988, c. 31, pre.). Beyond this single mention in the preamble to the Act, however, as well as a few similar mentions in provincial multiculturalism

Acts (cf. *Multiculturalism Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 321), few further strides were taken to equalize the treatment of and respect afforded Aboriginal languages along with the others. Even where Aboriginal languages were named among the program options for a given province, availability of these courses was often extremely limited and access to them restricted, even after the move had been made to open up 'international language' classes to those well beyond a particular cultural community.

As was the case in 1867 when Confederation was first formed, and then again in 1967 at the advent of official bilingualism, the move to multiculturalism was a moment in Canadian history when questions of language, culture and education were brought to the fore and opened up for discussion and debate. And although we should not ignore the many positive effects which have over time resulted from this pioneering policy and later legislation, once again the underlying structures of the Canadian society remained entirely unaffected and unchanged.

The move to multiculturalism was a moment when the public narrative of Canada shifted in a way that would fundamentally mark our collective identity. The discourse of multiculturalism represented Canadians to themselves and to the world as a nation who had flung the doors open wide to welcome others in, and who found in cultural diversity an immeasurable richness that could not but lead to growth. Unfortunately, however, as we have seen, the shift in actual reality was perhaps somewhat less profound; for careful rhetorical management and subtle discursive modulations ensure that the same social hierarchy would continue to be maintained, that languages and cultures would continue to be arrayed in a familiar pattern, ever maintaining the same relative distances from the immutable centrality of the English language and culture norm. For those from the 'other ethnic groups' who had petitioned and worked for recognition of their language and their place in Canadian society in the form of government-supported heritage

language teaching in the schools, initial triumph turned out to be somewhat short lived, as the move toward international language classes instead reversed the step forward they thought had been taken toward. In the end, the distance to be transversed toward the centre and the degree of self-translation required remained very nearly exactly the same as they had been before.

## 3.2 Moment Four – The Fight for Aboriginal Rights and Recognition

John Boyko refers to 1990 as "the year of the Indian" (1998: 186). It was the year of the Oka crisis in Quebec, the year the Meech Lake Accord was defeated in the Manitoba legislature and the year the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in favour of recognizing the fishing rights of a Musqueam man named Sparrow. It is also the year that will serve as a focal point for our fourth 'moment' in Canadian history, a moment relatively recent in time, but rooted long before in a complex chain of interconnected events, any one of which could be the subject of lengthy discussion.

The Aboriginal population of Canada, as we have already seen, has been consistently – and very often cruelly – kept on the lowest level of the country's societal hierarchies, no less in terms of language, culture and education than in those of economy, politics and governance. Despite having been the first inhabitants of the land, Aboriginal peoples were legislatively transformed into outsiders from the moment of Confederation – outsiders relative to the 'two founding races' of Canada, relative to the languages and cultures of 'civilization', relative even to any notion of intelligent or capable personhood. At the moment when changes recommended by the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission were being implemented, ostensibly with the purpose of restructuring and restabilizing the country's linguistic and cultural – and consequently political – spheres, Aboriginal peoples were again left aside, willfully dismissed as part of neither the 'two founding races' nor the 'other ethnic groups' and so outside the very field of

consideration. Even the introduction of multiculturalism as official policy – intended to position those of languages and cultures 'other than the English and the French' on firmer (if still lower) ground in Canadian society, thereby integrating them more fully into the life of the country – had little effect for Aboriginal people who, though paid lip service in federal documents and granted a limited form of inclusion in a few provinces, largely carried on in their exclusion across the better part of the Dominion.

1990, 'the year of the Indian', was certainly a long time coming.

### 3.2.1 A Long Time Coming

When the White Paper was tabled in the House of Commons in 1969, it drew vehement reaction from Aboriginal citizens across the board. In fact, *Citizens Plus* (1970) – a document also known as the Red Paper, which was presented to the government by the Indian Association of Alberta and is still considered "the most important Native response to the White Paper" (Boyko 1998: 208) – went to great lengths to systematically rebut and reject every recommendation made by Chrétien's policy statement, from those concerning treaty rights and the Indian Act to those addressing land claims and bureaucratic governance. It was the issue of education, however, and the protection of their children which would soon become the ground on which Aboriginal communities would firmly take their stand as never before, prepared if need be for a united and extended struggle.

The system of residential schooling had for decades been resisted and resented by those subjected to it. While it cannot be denied that many initially welcomed the idea of providing the children of their communities and bands a Western-style education, hopeful that it would prepare them to better understand and engage with the 'white man's world', the harsh realities of residential schooling – from the range of punishments inflicted upon 'uncooperative' students to

the variety of sanctions imposed upon 'disobliging' parents – soon turned the tide of any good opinion. Enough accounts of these tragic conditions have now been written that we need not rehearse them again here (see Erasmus 2004; Churchill 2004; Malott 2008, etc.). It is enough for us to note that, although these resolutions had not yet been passed at the time, what was considered standard practice in the heyday of residential schooling would today be considered a contravention of UN General Assembly resolutions against both genocide[21] and linguicide.[22]

In 1951, following the release of a report on Aboriginal education prepared by a special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, residential schools slowly began to close their doors as the federal government entered into negotiations with the provinces for the integration of Aboriginal students into public schools run under the provincial systems. While physically this new arrangement was for many a vast improvement over residential schooling,[23] emotionally and educationally the results were not much better. "Under the new system of integration," Boyko explains, "the Native child was forced to enter a racist society during the day, endure a non- or anti-Native curriculum, then return home each evening to a culture he was being taught was inferior and worthy of being relegated to the dustbin of history" (1998: 202).

---

[21] The UN General Assembly Resolution 96 (I) on 'The Crime of Genocide' (1946), which declares genocide to be "a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations, and condemned by the civilized world" (pre.), defines the practice as "acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part, a national, ethic, racial or religious group" (art. 2). Genocidal acts include both "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group" and "forcibly transferring children of the group to another group" (ibid.).

[22] A UN Special Committee on Linguicide, convened in 1968, defined the crime as any act "committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part or to prevent the natural development of a language or dialect", with the list of linguicidal acts including the following: "(b) imposing repressive measures intended to prevent the natural, organic, development of a language or dialect; (c) forcibly inflicting on a bilingual community conditions of cultural development calculated to transform it into a unilingual group; (d) against the will of an ethno-lingual group denying the right of a language to be taught in public schools; […and] (e) against the demand of an ethno-lingual group refusing moral and material support for its language maintenance efforts and cultural endeavours" (art. 2).

[23] Note that the average death rate at many of the residential schools was shockingly high. P.H. Bryce, who was dismissed from his post as Chief Medical Officer of the Indian Department after recommending the immediate closure of the residential schools, laments one report he submitted, the recommendations of which "were never published and the public knows nothing of them. It contained a brief history of the origin of the Indian Schools, of the sanitary condition of the schools and statistics of the health of the pupils, during the 15 years of their existence. Regarding the health of the pupils, the report states that 24 per cent of all the pupils which had been in the schools were known to be dead, while of one school on the File Hills reserve, which gave a complete return to date, 75 per cent were dead at the end of the 16 years since the school opened." (*The Story of a National Crime* 1922: 4)

Though the particular methods employed had been changed, the basic goal of training Aboriginal students to be other than Aboriginal remained. Though no longer so physically distant, through the mechanism of schooling, Aboriginal children continued to be drawn apart from their families, communities and cultures. Given the prevailing attitudes of the day, however, integration into white society remained an impossibility, and so these youths were left in limbo, somewhere in between, with no solid ground to stand on. "The child went to school an Indian," Harold Cardinal has observed. "The young man emerged a nothing" (1969: 87).

By the time 1969 came, then, people were hungry for change. They were also more prepared for a fight in the political arena than they had ever been. It was only in the 1950s that legislation outlawing Aboriginal political organizations had been amended, and less than a decade had passed since Aboriginal Canadians had finally won the right to vote in federal elections. Though the space granted them on the political stage was still very new and still very small, they were determined to make the most of it. So it was that just three years after the White Paper's release, the National Indian Brotherhood (now known as the Assembly of First Nations) presented the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with a policy paper of their own; it was called *Indian Control of Indian Education*.

"In Indian tradition," the paper began,

each adult is personally responsible for each child, to see that he learns all he needs to know in order to live a good life. As our fathers had a clear idea of what made a good man and a good life in their society, so we modern Indians want our children to learn that happiness and satisfaction come from pride in one's self, understanding one's fellowmen, and living in harmony with nature. These are lessons which […] will enable us to meet other Canadians on an equal footing, respecting cultural differences while pooling resources for the common good. (National Indian Brotherhood 1972: 1)

This initial broad explanation of an Aboriginal philosophy of education was quickly followed by the statement of two very specific and fundamental goals for students: "to reinforce their Indian identity [and] to provide the training necessary for making a good living in modern society" (ibid.: 3).

Though clearly neither of these goals had been realized by any form of government-imposed schooling to date, *Indian Control of Indian Education* (1972) did not reject out of hand the notion of integrated schooling. It did, however, condemn the lack of prior consultation with Native parents and leaders, as well as the unidirectional understanding of integration that prevailed without exception. "Integration viewed as a one-way process is not integration, and will fail," the paper read.

> In the past, it has been the Indian student who was asked to integrate: to give up his identity, to adopt new values and a new way of life. This restricted interpretation of integration must be radically altered if future education programs are to benefit Indian children. […] The success of integration is not the responsibility of Indians alone. Non-Indians must be ready to recognize the value of another way of life; to learn about Indian history, customs and language; and to modify, if necessary, some of their own ideas and practices. (ibid.: 25, 26)

The paper criticized the government for attempting to implement a program of integration without taking into account either the desires of Aboriginal communities, or the readiness of white communities; as a result, neither side was "prepared or able to cope with the many problems which were created" (ibid.: 25). Integration, which should ideally productively draw together the best elements of diverse groups and cultures, instead had brought out only the worst.

The bulk of the document was dedicated to the examination of four key factors which were deemed in need of "radical change" (ibid.: 3): responsibility for schooling, curriculum and programs, teachers and teacher training, and facilities. Specific needs and recommendations were

laid out in relation to each. Throughout the whole, however, two themes clearly prevailed. The first, the primary, was the imperative of localized, parental control of education. Though the federal government was certainly not to be released from its treaty-based legal responsibility for funding and enabling education for Aboriginal peoples, this point was clear above all else: "Indian parents must have FULL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONTROL OF EDUCATION" (ibid.: 27), which naturally entailed effective decision-making authority over both funds and programs.

The second predominant theme was the need to incorporate Aboriginal history, language and culture into the school curriculum for all Canadian students, whether Aboriginal or not. "The present school system is culturally alien to native students," the paper explained. "Where the Indian contribution is not entirely ignored, it is often cast in an unfavourable light. […] Courses in Indian history and culture should promote pride in the Indian child, and respect in the non-Indian student" (ibid.: 9). Even while underlining the urgent need for language instruction and cultural centres to strengthen and preserve Aboriginal cultures and identities for the Aboriginal peoples themselves, the National Indian Brotherhood pressed government officials to recognize both the role of Aboriginal peoples in the country's history and their value and place in contemporary Canadian society. "Indian children will continue to be strangers in Canadian classrooms," they cautioned, "until the curriculum recognizes Indian customs and values, Indian languages, and the contributions which the Indian people have made to Canadian history" (ibid.: 26).

The summary statement laid out toward the close of the document was both clear and concise, leaving little room for confusion or doubt about the Brotherhood's demand:

> Those educators who have had authority in all that pertained to Indian education
> have, over the years, tried various ways of providing education for Indian people.

The answer to providing a successful educational experience has not been found. There is one alternative which has not been tried before: in the future, let Indian people control Indian education. (ibid.: 28)

It took the government of Canada less than three months to issue their formal response to *Indian Control of Indian Education* (1972). "I have given the National Indian Brotherhood my assurance that I and my Department are fully committed to realizing the educational goals for the Indian people which are set forth in the Brotherhood's proposal," Chrétien announced. "In consultation and co-operation with the Indian organizations, my Department will begin immediately to effect the educational changes for the Indian people that they have requested" (as cited in Cardinal 1977: 59). As an initial response, it seemed extremely positive. Implementation, however, would not be nearly so straightforward, nor so unproblematic. Two years more would go by before the Department of Indian Affairs at last produced its guidelines for the creation of Band Education Authorities, and when it appeared, it was immediately clear that the scope of authority to be actually given these newly formed bodies would not be nearly that demanded by the National Indian Brotherhood. Every program put in place by an Education Band Authority "must be acceptable to the Department", meeting the criteria laid out for curriculum design, teacher hiring and budgetary expenses (as in Boyko 1998: 212). What Aboriginal communities had hoped would be 'Indian *controlled* schools' "became known to the Department of Indian Affairs as Band *Operated* schools," Kirkness notes.

Controlling and operating are two entirely different concepts. To control is to have power over, to exercise directing influence, whereas to operate means to manage or to keep in operation. It is predictable that the difference in perception would lead to misunderstanding and impede the direction of the policy. (1999: 12-13)

Over the course of the 1970s, some isolated gains were made by the Aboriginal communities of Canada, the most significant being the 1975 signing of the *James Bay and*

*Northern Québec Agreement*, the first major treaty to be negotiated with the Crown since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Price and Craik 2011). Among its many provisions, the agreement – which involved both the Cree and the Inuit of the province – created the Cree School Board, which operated under the provincial *Education Act* (R.S.Q., c. I-13.3) but was controlled by the Cree community. According to the Agreement, the Cree School Board was given jurisdiction within its territory over both hiring and curriculum at all educational levels, including the development of "courses, textbooks and materials designed to preserve and transmit the language and culture of the Native people" (s. 16.0.9). Perhaps most significant of all was the provision which made Cree the official language of instruction in the Board's schools: "The teaching languages shall be Cree and with respect to the other languages in accordance with the present practice in the Cree communities in the Territory" (s. 16.0.10). French was to be taught to the students as well so that any who chose to do so would be prepared to continue their studies in any of the province's post-secondary institutions. However, the timing and rate of French's introduction into the curriculum was to be settled only "after consultation with the parents' committee" (ibid.). The Kativik School Board was smaller, but set up in a similar manner to oversee Inuit education.

This development in Quebec, however, was more the exception than the rule. Across most of the country, the implementation of changes moved forward at a glacial pace, and in a manner very different than originally envisioned by the National Indian Brotherhood. Such was the general rate of progress that in May of 1981, the Aboriginal nations of Canada joined together to voice their demands once more. After recalling in the preamble to their statement that *Indian Control of Indian Education* (1972) had been "endorsed and accepted by both the Indian people and the Department of Indian Affairs", with promises made regarding support and implementation, the resolution continued as follows:

Whereas the Department of Indian Affairs has failed to actively support the full implementation of *Indian Control of Indian Education* as seen by recent moves to cut back on several programs in education; […]

Therefore be it resolved that this Assembly of Chiefs reaffirm the policy and directions as stated in the 1973 *Indian Control of Indian Education* paper; and […]

Further that we demand that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development reinstate, maintain and expand the programs which are required to fulfill Band Educational Training and support need; and […] make available appropriate financial resources to ensure the highest quality of *Indian Control of Indian Education*. (as cited in Kirkness 1999: 10-11)

Frustration and anger over this failure to follow through and the lack of reform which continued to plague Aboriginal education was matched by frustration and anger over a second series of events, less well known perhaps, but certainly no less tragic than the disastrous residential school saga. As residential schools began to close and their tragic legacy grew increasingly apparent, government officials were at a loss for what to do, until spokespersons for the Canadian Association of Social Workers suggested to a joint parliamentary committee that in many cases, removing the children from Aboriginal homes and finding them places with white families would be the best course of action (Boyko 1998: 203). It became known as the "Sixties Scoop".[24] Across the country, social workers began to visit Aboriginal communities en masse. Often well intentioned, but without adequate training or any understanding of Aboriginal culture and family life, they began 'scooping' up children for reasons that would never have been considered sufficient justification for removal where non-Native children were concerned (Johnston 1983: 23). "In 1951," Hanson reports, "twenty-nine Aboriginal children were in provincial care in British Columbia; by 1964, that number was 1,466. Aboriginal children, who

---

[24] This term was coined by Patrick Johnston following a conversation with a remorseful social worker who "told him with tears in her eyes that it was common practice in B.C. in the mid-sixties to scoop from their mothers on reserves almost all newly born children" (Hanson n.d.: 1).

had comprised only 1 percent of all children in care, came to make up just over 34 percent" (n.d.: 1). Statistics from other provinces are even more staggering. By the 1970s, the figure reached 44% in Alberta, 51% in Saskatchewan, and 60% in Manitoba (Sinclair 2007: 66). Most were adopted to white families out of province, sometimes even out of country. Until regulations were amended in 1980, no consent needed to be obtained from, nor even notification given to, a band or community before their children were taken. Adoption policies of the day made it extremely difficult to have birth records opened, meaning that many children were blocked from knowing their heritage or finding out even where they had come from; few ever saw their parents again (Hanson n.d.: 2).

Frustration and anger continued to mount as the 1980s wore on. Initial proposals for the constitutional amendments that that decade would see realized disregarded Aboriginal concerns and treaty rights entirely; months of concerted lobbying were needed to achieve the insertion of section 35's recognition of "the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada", understood to include "the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples", into the *Constitution Act, 1982* (R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 44). And then came the Meech Lake Accord, a negotiation for further constitutional amendments designed to "bring Quebec back into the constitutional fold with honour and enthusiasm" (Mulroney, as cited in Parkinson 2007: para. 5). Primary among the amendments was what is called the 'distinct society clause': formal recognition written into the Constitution "of Quebec's distinctive character, in terms of both its culture and language", affirming again the role of government in preserving and promoting that distinction (ibid.: para. 9). This was supported by a series of provisions designed to increase provincial autonomy relative to the federal government. Meanwhile, representatives of Canada's First Nations were not even at the table, the continual assault on their language, culture and distinct heritage simply

going on as before. The three-year timeline of the Meech Lake Accord required its ratification in all ten provinces by June 1990.

### 3.2.2 From a Royal Commission to an Official Apology

1990 was "the year of the Indian" (Boyko 1998:186). It was the year the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in favour of Ronald Sparrow, a Musqueam band member arrested six years earlier in British Columbia "for fishing with a net longer than was permitted by his food fishing license" (Salomons and Hanson n.d.: para. 3). Making reference to the *Constitution Act, 1982*, the ruling read as follows:

> Section 35(1) does not promise immunity from government regulation in contemporary society but it does hold the Crown to a substantive promise. The government is required to bear the burden of justifying any legislation that has some negative effect on any aboriginal rights protected under s. 35(1). (R.v. Sparrow, [1990] 1 S.C.R. 1075)

Aboriginal treaty rights, it was declared, were still legal and binding.

1990 was the year Mohawk bands in Quebec stood their ground against provincial police and the RCMP, blocking construction workers from starting in on an approved project that would see a golf course and condo development expanded onto still-disputed land that included a sacred burial ground. The 78-day armed stand off, which prompted outcry and expressions of support across the country, was ended only after armed forces were called in and the federal government committed itself to purchasing the disputed land on behalf of the Kanesatake band in order to prevent any further attempts at development (Marshall 2013). Aboriginal land claims, it was made clear, could not be simply disregarded.

1990 was also the year when the clock ran out on the Meech Lake Accord. According to the newly patriated *Constitution Act* (R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 44), any constitutional

amendment required ratification by all 10 provinces according to their specified procedures. In Manitoba, this meant unanimous consent in the provincial legislature. In 1981, Elijah Harper, a chief of the Red Sucker Lake Band, had become the first Aboriginal individual elected to provincial government. Elijah Harper was well familiar with the ongoing strife between First Nations communities and the Canadian government, as well as the glaring contradiction between the Accord's intentional affirmation of one people's language and culture, while those of others were being continually eroded. In June 1990, with an eagle feather in hand, Elijah Harper pronounced his now historic "No." The Meech Lake Accord was effectively dead (Parkinson 2007). Aboriginal voice would no longer be ignored.

The cumulative effect of these events forced the government to begin asking serious questions about something that had rarely been considered truly seriously before: the actual state of relations between the government and the First Nations of Canada. On August 26, 1991, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was established. Its mandate was to "investigate the evolution of the relationship among aboriginal peoples (Indian, Inuit and Métis), the Canadian government, and Canadian society as a whole" (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples [RCAP] 1996, v.1: 664). Though sixteen specific questions – including the question of education – were marked for particular attention, the Commission was more broadly charged with examining "all issues which it deems to be relevant to any or all of the aboriginal peoples of Canada" (ibid.). Of the seven commissioners appointed, four were Aboriginal and three, non-Aboriginal. Georges Erasmus, former head of the Assembly of First Nations, and René Dussault, who held a seat in the Quebec Court of Appeal, were to direct the whole as Commission co-chairs. "By the end of 1993," Erasmus reported, "we had visited 96 communities, held 178 days of hearings, heard briefs from 2067 people and accumulated more than 76,000 pages of

testimony. […] Moreover, we commissioned over 350 research projects" (Dussault & Erasmus 1996: para. 5). The eventual result was a five-volume, 4000-page final report, released in November 1996, making some 440 recommendations for change. The bottom line was a call for "a complete restructuring of the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in Canada" (Doerr 2006: para. 5), including the issuing of a new Royal Proclamation, the creation of an Aboriginal parliament, and the establishment of a Department of Aboriginal Relations to oversee and assist the transition of First Nations to realized self-governance.

The range of issues addressed was almost overwhelming, and yet the place of education in the whole was not lost. "The destiny of a people is intricately bound to the way its children are educated," the report read.

> Education is the transmission of cultural DNA from one generation to the next. It shapes the language and pathways of thinking, the contours of character and values, the social skills and creative potential of the individual. It determines the productive skills of a people. […] Consistent with Aboriginal traditions, education must develop the whole child, intellectually, spiritually, emotionally and physically. Current education policies fail to realize these goals. […] Yet, despite the painful experiences Aboriginal people carry with them from formal education systems, they still see education as the hope for the future, and they are determined to see education fulfill its promise. (RCAP 1996, v.3: 404)

As its pages progressed, the report rehearsed and recognized the progress and small victories that had been made in the years since 1972 and the publication of *Indian Control of Indian Education*, among them the signing of the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement* (1975), the creation of the Mi'kmaq Education Authority (1994) and ongoing attempts to develop culturally-based curriculum among the Dene and Inuuqatigiit populations of the Northwest Territories (RCAP 1996, v.3: 407-408). In the same breath, however, the

Commissioners lamented the rarity and limitations of such successes. "For nearly 30 years," they wrote,

> Aboriginal leaders have made policy recommendations to governments, and governments have conducted internal studies. The Commission examined 22 reports on Aboriginal education written between 1966 and 1992. The recommendations of these reports, many of them excellent, show remarkable consistency. […] What we find most disturbing is that the issues raised at our hearings and in interveners' briefs are the same concerns that Aboriginal people have been bringing forward since the first studies were done. (ibid.: 410-411)

Though reasons for this lack of real progress were in many ways complex, the Commission clearly recognized four factors as primary to its cause: reluctance to decisively hand over control of education to Aboriginal leaders, lack of mechanisms for effective accountability, restrictions impeding the development of linguistically- and culturally-appropriate curriculum, and inadequate financial resources (ibid.).

Not surprising at all, the need for Aboriginal language instruction beginning from the pre-school level, along with courses in Aboriginal history, culture and language at all levels, featured prominently on the list of concerns that had been repeatedly voiced in report after report and study after study. Though no precise methodology was laid out, the *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (1996) once again followed suit, repeating the call for education systems, whether Aboriginally-, provincially- or territorially-controlled, to prioritize the development of Aboriginal language curriculum and the inclusion of fluent elders as language teachers, creating programs in schools that would support and complement community efforts toward language preservation (435-436). Recognizing that "the eradication of Aboriginal languages was one prong of the federal government's overall attempt to erase Aboriginal cultures" (ibid.: 432), the Commission reasoned that measures that contributed to the restoration

of these languages, especially in the education system, must necessarily figure in any recalibration of the standard. Control of their own schooling systems was to be "a core element of jurisdiction in Aboriginal self-government" (ibid.: 412), with the teaching of language and culture to be one of the very first and most fundamental changes made.

In an address given the day their final report was released, Erasmus and Dussault compared the task with which they had been charged to that of the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission. "Since the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism," they reflected, "this Commission is the first to address the relationship between the peoples who make up the country. In that sense, our report goes to the fabric of what Canada is and could be" (1996: para. 6). In many ways, the comparison was a very valid one. Both reports were concerned with the relationship between various segments of the Canadian population. Both centralized the issue of language and culture, emphasizing the key role of schooling in their preservation and ongoing vitality. And both pointed to autonomy in the control of education as evidence and guarantee of their standing in Canadian society. However, whereas for the francophones treated in the first Commission's report the exercise of such autonomy was primarily a question of reinforcing and enhancing realities already in place in order to maintain current social and political standing, for the Aboriginal peoples treated in the second, it was a question of upending the entire social hierarchy. It was not a matter of granting rights similar to those awarded heritage language and culture communities under the policy of multiculturalism; Erasmus and Dussault called on the government to instead grant First Nations something much fuller, much richer, much more fundamental: a recognized and respected place in the confederation of Canada. "The Commission's proposals are not concerned with multicultural policy," they asserted, "but with a vision of a just multinational federation that recognizes its historical foundations and values its

historical nations as an integral part of the Canadian identity and the Canadian political fabric" (RCAP 1996, v.1: 7). In this, then, the two reports differed dramatically, for where one in the end called for a reinforcement of the status quo, the other called for real and remarkable change.

Like any other such report commissioned and tabled in Parliament, this one had no legal power, depending on government response and legislation to realize the recommendations proposed. In this case, government response was not quick in coming. The Prime Minister's announcement that no reaction would be issued prior to a general election was followed by the Minister of Indian Affairs' forewarning that the spending increases proposed by the Commission would no doubt be difficult to achieve. Five months after the report's release, the Assembly of First Nations organized a national day of protest "to express its anger over perceived government inaction and the refusal of the Prime Minister to meet with First Nations leaders to discuss the report" (Hurley and Wherrett 2000: 2). Finally, in January 1998, response came in the form of a policy document entitled *Gathering Strength: Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan*. The document began with a 'Statement of Reconciliation', acknowledging "the mistakes and injustices of the past," and then moved on to its 'Statement of Renewal' which cast a "vision of a shared future," centred on the realization of four key objectives: renewing partnership, strengthening Aboriginal governance, developing a new fiscal relationship, and supporting strong communities, people and economies (IAND 1997: 1).

The plans and policies laid out were good, positive, necessary first steps – from the setting up of a 'healing fund' for residential school survivors (ibid.: 5) to the establishment of greater stability and accountability in the management of funds (ibid.: 13) to the expansion of 'Head Start' preschool programs and increased focus on healthcare (ibid.: 17). At the same time, however, it cannot go unnoticed that any recommendations requiring constitutional action or

parliamentary reform were minimized, if not ignored. No mention was made of a new Royal Proclamation, a new Aboriginal parliament, or a new Department of Aboriginal Relations.

Where language, culture and education were concerned, the government expressed two primary commitments. The first was to begin demonstrating "respect and support for Aboriginal language, heritage and culture" as an important step to 'renewing the partnership' between communities and authorities. "The Government of Canada will work to help preserve Aboriginal languages," it was promised, "both as a link to our collective past and as a promise for the future of Aboriginal people. We will continue to work with Aboriginal people to establish programs to preserve, protect, and teach Aboriginal languages, and to ensure that these languages are kept alive for future generations" (ibid.: 7). The second was a commitment to "support education reform on reserves" as part of working toward 'strong communities, people and economies'.

> The objective will be to improve the quality and cultural relevance of education for First Nations students; improve the classroom effectiveness of teachers; support community and parental involvement in schools; improve the management and support capacity of First Nations systems; and enhance learning by providing greater access to technology for First Nations schools. (ibid.: 17)

Again these commitments comprised good, positive and necessary measures, but again broader issues were ignored. No mention was made of actually transferring control of education systems into Aboriginal hands, nor of increasing the role of Aboriginal parents and leaders on provincial school boards, despite the fact that "68.7 per cent of First Nations students were in provincial school systems" (RCAP 1996, v.3: 408). And no connection was drawn between autonomy in education and autonomy in self-governance.

In April 2000, two and a half years after the release of *Gathering Strength* (1997), Phil Fontaine, then National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, remarked that while "the promises made by the Government of Canada … represented the potential for a major step," the

commitments laid out "have not fully been implemented or honoured in the way in which we had anticipated" (as cited in Hurley and Wherrett 2000: 3). It was a sadly familiar refrain.

The years that followed would be marked by the same sort of slow and incremental progress, with small victories won along the way, but never a chance of sweeping change. Though control of education remained in the hands of the government, with few if any immediate changes made to curriculum or funding models, 2002 did see the establishment of a Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Cultures, given the mandate of proposing "a national strategy to preserve, revitalize and promote First Nations, Inuit and Métis languages" (Task Force 2005: i). Though no Aboriginal parliament was added to the governmental structures of Canada, the lengthy process of negotiating Comprehensive Land Claims between particular First Nations, the federal government and the relevant province or territory pressed forward, even demonstrating an increase in completions and signatures. By 2009, 22 of these 'modern treaties' – which, in addition to land title and usage rights, also address financial compensations and social programs, as well as often now including provisions for self-government – had been signed, more than half of them in the years subsequent to *Gathering Strength* (Canada 2013: c.5, para. 12).[25]

Perhaps the most significant of these was the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* (S.C. 1993, c. 29), the first treaty ever to be signed with the Inuit, which cleared the path for the 1999 creation of the Territory of Nunavut. Since the 1980s, Aboriginal languages had clearly been granted greater protection in the north than in any other region of the country; the Northwest Territories, for example recognizes nine Aboriginal languages as territorial official languages alongside English and French, with government service to be provided in them – in addition to

---

[25] By 2014, this number has increased to 24 concluded claims, 18 of which include provisions for self-government. Additionally, two 'stand alone' self-government agreements have also been reached. (http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/DAM/DAM-INTER-HQ-AI/STAGING/texte-text/mprm_pdf_modrn-treaty_1383144351646_eng.pdf)

the two national official languages, of course – wherever there is deemed to be sufficient demand and active support provided for community initiatives toward their promotion and preservation (*Official Languages Act*, R.S.N.W.T. 1988, c.0-1). The creation of Nunavut, however, opened the door to possibilities never before deemed realistic. The 2008 *Inuit Language Protection Act* (S. Nu., c. 17) was, in fact, more reminiscent of Quebec's *Charter of the French Language* (R.S.Q. 1977, c. C-11) than of any document treating the heritage languages of Canada or even previous territorial Language Acts. Without hesitation, it called out for recognition of

> the importance of the Inuit Language as a cultural inheritance and ongoing expression of Inuit identity both in Nunavut communities and in the wider circumpolar world; as the fundamental medium of personal and cultural expression through which Inuit knowledge, values, history, tradition and identity are transmitted; to the development of the dynamic and strong individuals, communities and institutions in Nunavut that are required to advance the reconciliation contemplated by the *Nunavut Land Claims Agreement*; to support the meaningful engagement of Inuit Language speakers in all levels of governance and in socio-economic development in Nunavut; and as a foundation necessary to a sustainable future for the Inuit of Nunavut as a people of distinct cultural and linguistic identity within Canada. (S. Nu. 2008, c. 17, pre.)

The Act went on to legislate that the Inuit Language (a term understood to encompass both Inuktitut and Inuinnaqtun) be the daily language of work in all territorial institutions, in all services and communications with the public (ibid.: s. 3), in all government contracts and court documents (ibid.: s. 4-5), in all municipal offices (ibid.: s. 6), and even on all signs and posters, in at least equal prominence with English, French or any other language (ibid.: s. 3). The Inuit Language was also established as the official language of education in the territory, beginning at the preschool level and with programs designed to "enable the education system to produce secondary school graduates fully proficient in the Inuit Language, in both its spoken and written

forms" (ibid.: s. 8). Even more remarkable is the fact that Inuit leaders did not contain their

vision within territorial borders, but instead announced themselves determined "to advocate for

and to achieve the national recognition and constitutional entrenchment of the Inuit Language as

a founding and official language of Canada within Nunavut" (ibid.: pre.). Though it cannot be

denied that Nunavut remains a unique case in many ways, neither can it be denied that the royal

assent given such a bill and its very coming into force evidence a significant shift of the ground

on which the First Nations of Canada stand.

On June 11 of that same year, 2008, Prime Minister Stephen Harper stood on the floor of

the House of Commons to offer, "on behalf of the government of Canada and all Canadians", an

apology to the former students of residential schools and to the communities from which they

were taken. "To the approximately 80,000 living former students, and all family members and

communities," he said,

> the government of Canada now recognizes that it was wrong to forcibly remove
> children from their homes and we apologize for having done this. We now
> recognize that it was wrong to separate children from rich and vibrant cultures and
> traditions, that it created a void in many lives and communities, and we apologize
> for having done this. […] The government of Canada sincerely apologizes and asks
> the forgiveness of the aboriginal peoples of this country for failing them so
> profoundly. Nous le regrettons. We are sorry. Nimitataynan. Niminchinowesamin.
> Mamiattugut. (Canada 2008: para. 7)

These official words of apology, spoken before the residential school survivors and

Aboriginal leaders who filled the House that day, not to mention the thousand more who watched

from the lawn outside, moved the country one step further down the path of reconciliation begun

with the creation of the Aboriginal Healing Foundation, announced in *Gathering Strength* (1997)

and established in March 1998. This path was further pursued by the formation of the Legacy of

Hope Foundation in 2001, the negotiation of the Common Experience Compensation Package in 2007, and the inauguration of the Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission the following year. The apology was intended to mark a turning point, a new beginning, a fresh start in "forging a new relationship between aboriginal peoples and other Canadians, a relationship based on the knowledge of our shared history, a respect for each other and a desire to move forward together with a renewed understanding that strong families, strong communities and vibrant cultures and traditions will contribute to a stronger Canada for all of us" (ibid.: para. 6).

Time has yet to tell, of course, whether such a gesture will fulfill its own promise, whether a new time of respect and restoration has really begun. For despite whatever progress has to date been made, it cannot be denied that the need for education – linguistically- and culturally-appropriate education – among the First Nations of Canada remains great. A 2012 fact sheet produced by the Assembly of First Nations notes that "Aboriginal youth are the fastest growing demographic" in Canada, statistics showing growth 3.5 times faster than that of the non-Aboriginal population in 2006 (Chiefs Assembly on Education 2012: 1). More than half still "understand or speak a First Nations language", affirming a continuing belief among these youth "that learning a First Nations language is very important" (ibid.). Notwithstanding increased opportunities for both Indigenous language and cultural programming, however, data from 2004-2009 set "the rate of First Nation graduation at approximately 36% compared to the Canada graduation rate of 72%. […] 61% of First Nation young adults (20-24) have not completed high school, compared with 13% of non-Aboriginal people in Canada" (ibid.: 2). Significant disparities in funding and facilities continue to persist. And once again, even this brief five-page document ended with a call for government officials to "fulfill their Constitutional, Treaty and

international obligations to First Nations peoples by supporting the design and implementation of
First Nations comprehensive learning systems with adequate and sustainable resourcing" (ibid:
5). Though it is important not to minimize the gains which have been made and the strides
forward which have been taken, the realities and results of past policies and choices mean that, in
terms of social and educational attainment, First Nations are still fighting from way behind.
There is still a long way to go before the social, economic, educational and linguistic hierarchies
of Canada see these peoples effectively dislodged from their long-held place at the bottom.

## 3.3 Of Language and Education in Canada

The history of education policy in Canada is remarkably diverse and broad-ranging,
being rendered even more complex by its constant intersections and interactions with the
country's array of shifting and evolving pieces of language legislation enacted at various levels
of government. Taking four 'moments' in history as fixed focal points around which to orient our
discussion, we have attempted to here trace the outline and shape of developing policy and
practice, our focus trained less on the detailed examination of individual documents than on their
contextualization and strategic placement within the social and political realities of Canadian
history, that is, within the broader scope of the Canadian narrative. Many moments other than
these four could, in truth, have been chosen, and yet in the end, the result of their consideration
would have been exactly the same: at every turn, the policies governing education and schooling
are adjusted, amended and changed such that they continue to uphold the prevailing status quo
and counter the current primary social concerns, thus contributing at a fundamental level to the
legitimation, stabilization and reproduction of an established social and cultural hierarchy.

There can be no doubt that formal systems of education and the approved curriculum
circulated through them are powerful tools of reproduction and regulation in any society.

Bourdieu referred to schooling as "the privileged locus of the illusion of consensus" (1970/1990:

4), arguing that

> every *institutionalized education system* (ES) owes the specific characteristics of its
> structure and functioning to the fact that, by the means proper to the institution, it
> has to produce and reproduce the institutional conditions whose existence and
> persistence […] are necessary both to the exercise of its essential function of
> inculcation and to the fulfillment of its function of reproducing a cultural arbitrary
> which […in turn] contributes to the reproduction of the relations between the groups
> or classes. (ibid.: 54)

Thus a schooling system instituted by a particular group in power for the ostensible benefit of

any number of other social or cultural groups in a given array will, for the sake of its own

perpetuation, tend to reproduce and so reinforce those same structures of power which support it

in turn.

Neither can there be any doubt that this phenomenon has been clearly demonstrated in the

history of Canada's diverse education systems, reproducing the broad hierarchy which not only

governs the economy, politics and social programs of the country, but which also intimately links

these realities with the disparate standings of languages spoken and cultures lived in different

parts of the Dominion. As a result, the time, attention and legitimation given particular languages

and cultures in Canadian public schools have contributed in undeniable ways to the perception

and experience of belonging – of being truly Canadian and fully participant in the social life of

the country – not only for individual students, but also for the communities and groups of which

they are a part.

Of all the languages and cultures that have over time come to grace the northern half of

our continent, only one was never in doubt: To be a Canadian citizen was to be a British subject.

To be a good Canadian was to exemplify British culture and values. With the exception of

Quebec, English was the default, if not the declared, language of school instruction from one end of the country to another.

The francophones of Canada, on the other hand, had first to fight for their place in this country. Intentional and sustained effort was required to ensure the ongoing prominence of French both within the province of Quebec and among the French-speaking communities outside its borders. By the passing of the *Official Languages Act* in 1969, however, it was clear that such effort had borne good fruit; francophones were to have access to mother-tongue education regardless of the province in which they lived and considerable autonomy in the control of their own school boards, programs and curricula. Constitutional recognition of their role in the country's history and provisions for their inclusion in all government institutions left little doubt that French language and culture was considered a foundational and fundamental part of Canadian identity.

The languages of Canada's immigrant communities, which would in time come to be known as 'heritage' languages, were for many years largely ignored – tolerated, but not paid any regard. The communities which clung to these languages and cultures were kept broadly to the margins, drawn into the core of Canadian society only to the extent that they learned to assimilate to the anglophone or francophone standards. As became clear during the public hearings conducted by the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission, however, the prevailing sentiment among many of these communities was that "government support for maintaining their languages and cultures through [various educational] programs was equated with equality and the right to full participation in a multicultural Canadian society" (Tavares 2001: 200); that is to say that inclusion of their languages and cultures in elementary and secondary public schooling systems was equated with inclusion of themselves in this country they now called home. With

the official adoption of multicultural policy, then, and renewed emphasis on the value these now 'international' languages brought to Canada as a whole, these communities were granted a more solid standing and a (slightly) larger space in the Canadian social sphere.

Aboriginal languages and cultures, by contrast, were unfortunately not simply ignored; they were not begrudgingly tolerated, neglected or left to the side. Instead, they were actively judged to be of no civilized value or worth and so were intentionally targeted for deliberate eradication. For many years, this did not change. When in the 1970s the first Aboriginal language programs did appear in public schools, it was without question a positive step. And yet the recognition of any value such languages or cultures might have extended only as far as the members of the apposite First Nation, without admitting the possibility of a more wide-reaching contribution to Canada as a whole, as a nation or in its relations with other countries in the world. Even now, adjustments to this attitude, including openness to how this might affect educational policies and programs, come only at a glacial pace, and then within strict limits.

The discrepancies and differences which mark each level of this four-tiered hierarchy, though clearly borne out in policy, have often been masked by the discourse employed. Though it was perhaps not of particular concern in the drawing up of early documents and legislative pieces, by the 1960s, the discourses of social equality and inequality, of racism and discrimination, of the shared rights and responsibilities of citizenship and nation, were so predominant that they were taken up in nearly every document produced. Only careful attention to the shifting ideas behind the words – for example, from substantive to formal equality or from collective to individual rights – reveal the subtle strategies that allowed authors of commissioned reports, policy documents and even legislative bills to use nearly the very same rhetoric to argue for very nearly opposite points. As a result, regardless of the calls for reordering and change,

regardless of the announcement of recommendations accepted or of promises made, no attempt at transformation of the relationship between the various linguistic and cultural groups within Canada ever got much below the surface of the matter.

Without question, despite small movements in a positive direction, we have still a long way to go if we seek real reformation and equality in the Canadian social sphere. It will be what they call an 'uphill battle' or a 'long haul'. Yet the problem with such images and metaphors in depicting the task still before us is the clear implication of continued effort in the same direction, a persistent pressing on. It is, perhaps, worth pausing to ask whether this is really what we need. In the first volume of his *Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*, Hawthorn wrote,

> In 1847 Commissioners Rawson, Davidson, and Hepburn, in a *Report on the Affairs of the Indians in Canada*, submitted to the Legislative Assembly, came to the conclusion "that the true and only practicable policy of the Government, with reference to their interests, both of the Indians and the community at large, is to endeavour gradually to raise the Tribes within the British Territory to the level of their white neighbours; to prepare them to undertake the offices and duties of citizens; and, by degrees, to abolish the necessity for its farther interference in their affairs."
>
> More than a century later, in July, 1964, the Indian Affairs Branch declared that "the basic objective of the Federal Government in Indian Administration is to assist the Indians to participate fully in the social and economic life of Canada." (1966, v.1: 400)

The similarity of these goals, spaced apart by a full century and yet equally unfulfilled, led Hawthorn to a simple conclusion: "Something has gone wrong." (ibid.) The conclusion drawn by Erasmus and Dussault a further 30 years down the road was not dissimilar as they reflected on the unchanging, and yet unanswered, recommendations for reform in Aboriginal education,

repeated in report after report after report (RCAP 1996, v.3: 411).

Perhaps it is worth pausing to consider that what may be needed is not just a renewed persistence in the same direction, hoping that with enough time change will come. Perhaps it is worth pausing to consider that what may be needed instead is an entirely new perspective, a new paradigm, a new way of imagining and envisioning the whole. Perhaps it is worth peering through the lens of a fuller concept of translation.

## CH. 4 – EDUCATION, TRANSLATION, NARRATION

At the beginning of the present study, it was asserted that we aimed to examine the impact of language and education as important factors in the process of identity formation, and to address two key questions in an effort to draw Translation Studies more fully into the ongoing, interdisciplinary discussions currently swirling around identity, its formation and continual reformation. The previous two chapters engaged with the first of these questions, looking at the reality of linguistic translation required by formal systems of education in Canada, as evidenced in the languages allowed or disallowed, underscored or dismissed, by the laws and regulations governing schools across the country. According to the hierarchy of languages thus established by the schooling system – a hierarchy, it has been noted, which corresponds quite directly to the social one realized in other essential Canadian institutions (see Thobani 2007) – students who grow up speaking a language other than English at home or in their community must to varying degrees translate their speech, their thinking and modes of expression in order to gain the fullest access to education and participation in society. Whether it be a case of French, of another heritage language brought from abroad, or of one of the varied indigenous languages native to this land, the degree of self-translation required of speakers increases proportionally to the distance in status of their language from English as one descends the hierarchical linguistic ladder.

In effect, however, the demands of such linguistic translation extend well beyond language itself, as seen in the fact that the discussions and debates leading toward the enactment of the relevant laws and rulings inevitably encompassed concerns about culture and identity as well. Translating one's language, it was recognized in reports (even if not often respected in

laws), additionally requires more fundamental if less obvious transformations of identity,

comprised in the movement from one cultural sphere to another, from one way of thinking and

perceiving to another, even from one way of being in the world to another. Lack of attention to

these other transformations or 'translations', as it will be argued, is as detrimental to educational

efforts as trying to teach in a language that students simply do not speak or understand. As has

been made dramatically clear in the history of First Nations education in Canada, such

disconnect and disengagement in schooling disadvantages not just individual students within

their particular classrooms, but over time entire communities and language groups in their

relation to broader Canadian society, with impacts touching not only educational attainment

levels, but also subsequent standing in the social, economic and political spheres.[26] When

Grammond writes, then, of the "powerful advantage [given] to the majority culture" (2009: 28)

by the mere fact of schools and state bureaucracies functioning in the majority language, he does

not overstate the case, but rather underlines a matter of crucial importance.

All of this leads us naturally toward the second question with which we are presently

concerned and to which we now turn our attention: If, in light of recent discourses concerned

with 'translated identities', we accept that this linguistic translation of students could be seen as

but one element in a broader program of 'human translation' or 'identity translation' through

education, then what new insight or understanding might such a reconsideration bring to the

discussion as it currently stands? What benefit might be gained that could contribute toward

---

[26] Miller (1996), for example, argues that this failure to relate education to Aboriginal realities and in this way prepare students for life and engagement in Canadian society was, in fact, the greatest failure of the residential school system, standing out even beyond the system's many other failings. He writes: "Residential schools failed in many ways, but above all, they failed to educate […and remain] a glaring example of structural failure so far as their pedagogical role was concerned. […] Peter Jones, Mistawasis, Kate Dudoward, or any of the large number of others had sought schools to prepare their children, and eventually their entire community, for life in a world dominated by the strange newcomers. Instruction was the Native peoples' primary objective; residential schooling was their greatest disappointment" (418).

reforming this Canadian institution? In essence, how might translational thinking inform our theorizing and then our practice of education?

**4.1** <u>**Translating Identities – Towards A Translational Paradigm**</u>

As discussed in Chapter One, recent decades have seen a significant expansion in the theorization of translation and increased complexification of our very understanding of the concept, in part due to growth within the field itself and in part due to a stretching of the term from without. Whatever the impetus, however, and the range of contributing factors, one thing which cannot be denied is that the metaphoric aspect of translation has had an important role to play in this process.

A well-crafted metaphor is, after all, a thing of remarkable beauty; yet it can also be an interpretive tool of great power. A comparison that exceeds mere description, a metaphor has the power to shed light on two objects at once, focusing attention on similarities often previously unremarked. Through creative and purposeful parallel, a metaphor has the power to deepen understanding, drawing on our knowledge of one reality to enhance our experience of another. Well chosen and strategically presented, a metaphor has the power to reinforce what is already known or assumed, serving as evidence to bolster or prove. And yet any time a metaphor is taken up anew, considered by a new individual or regarded from a new perspective, it also holds the possibility of challenging accepted ideas and perceptions, being ever open to multiple and diverse interpretations.

In his introduction to the 2010 volume *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, James St. André argues that although western thought has displayed a tendency toward distrust of metaphoric language stretching all the way back to Plato and greatly emphasized through the advent of logical positivism and the elevation of scientific epistemology, more recent

developments in the study of figurative language have made it both possible and appropriate for us to rethink seriously the place given metaphor in various fields, not least among them Translation Studies itself. Since the latter part of the 20th century, he explains, research has increasingly focused on the role of metaphor in the every day, unveiling its presence in sometimes unexpected places and emphasizing the way it conditions our very perception of the world around us. In the field of linguistics, it was Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) assertions about conceptual metaphors that made the biggest impact in this respect, as they demonstrated their ubiquity and even their necessity for the pragmatic shaping of worldviews. In the sphere of hard science, by contrast, it was a collection of essays penned by the likes of Thomas Kuhn (1979) and Richard Boyd (1979) that moved against the grain to draw attention to three very common uses of metaphor even in this area generally thought to be most resistant to figurative language and description: "in the construction of new theoretical models, in the ensuing battle to persuade others to adopt the resulting 'paradigm shift', and finally for pedagogical use (textbooks, for example) after the new paradigm has been accepted" (St. André 2010: 5). In light of studies such as these, taken together with the several more that ensued; in light of this recognition of the power of metaphor to help us think in new ways and develop new theoretical paradigms; and in light of a renewed interest in how we collectively build knowledge and shape worldviews, it seems evident that theorists of translation need not shy away from metaphorical descriptions of their field, but rather should be open to discover what such figurations may have to teach and receptive to the possibilities that may unfold therefrom. Particularly "given that translation studies is widely perceived as an inter-discipline", St. André concludes, "it is fitting, therefore, to borrow images and metaphors from other disciplines to try and think about the process" (ibid.: 7).

Although the volume edited by St. André was concerned primarily with images drawn from other spheres and taken as metaphors *for* translation, it is not difficult to equally discern in his argumentation rationale for considering seriously metaphors applied in the opposite direction, that is, translation taken *as* an image that can help to elucidate the complex realities of other transformative intercultural encounters and processes. We know that such adoptions of translation as a metaphor have been happening on a more or less *ad hoc* basis since the 1950s at least, beginning with early explanations of 'cultural translation' (cf. Lienhardt 1954). However, the increasing occurrence and broadly varied range of such adoptions in more recent decades – often, though not always, emerging from attempts to explore and address the changing realities of a constantly shifting and ever more globalized world – have led to the call for a more deliberative and systematic development of the translation metaphor, in such a way that it might contribute still more productively to these current discussions and debates. "It would be a mistake," insists Bachmann-Medick, "to pass hastily over the tensions inhering in translation's relationships of appropriation, transformation and conflict. These can be usefully explored and developed" (2009: 2).

Indeed, it is precisely because of these tensions that studies of translation hold so much potential. For although Translation Studies remains in its relative youth as a formally recognized academic discipline, in reality it is rooted in a long and rich history of reflection and debate over a wide range of questions – questions having to do with not only language and textual transformation, but also the formation of cultures, the benefits to be derived from and the difficulties to be faced in any intercultural encounter, the challenge of dual allegiance and of being caught 'in between', the definition and import of 'ethical' conduct toward the Other, and

so on. "If contemporary reality is inescapably multicultural and multinational," Michael Cronin observes,

> then it makes sense to look to a discipline which has mediation between cultures and languages as a central concern to assist us both in understanding globalization and in understanding what it might mean, and why it is sometimes so difficult, to be a citizen of the world. (2003: 6)

Perhaps one of the clearest articulations of this mode of thinking about translation was laid out nearly fifteen years ago by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi when, in the introduction to their book *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, they wrote:

> In our age of (the valorization of) migrancy, exile and diaspora, the word translation seems to have come full circle and reverted from its figurative literary meaning of an interlingual transaction to its etymological physical meaning of locational disrupture; translation itself seems to have been translated back to its origins. As André Lefevere suggested, 'the time may have come to move beyond the word as such, to promote it to the realm of metaphor, so to speak, and leave it there'. (1999: 3)

It is precisely this 'promotion to the realm of metaphor' that scholars approaching the study of translation from this new direction are aiming at as they seek to connect the daily realities of translation practice not only to the broader processes of global transformation, but more specifically within that, to the intimate processes of identity formation and transformation in contexts dramatically marked by multilingualism and multiculturalism; that is to say, identities transformed and translated in contexts of remarkable complexity.

Not surprisingly, the aforementioned etymological connection between translation – which, according to its Latin roots, literally means "to bear or carry across" (Dunmore 1993: 106) – and locational disrupture was one of the early catalysts for such an approach, and so neither is it surprising that the notion of migration as a sort of translation is among the most commonly found and widely accepted examples of such metaphorical thinking to date.

"Migrants are translated beings in countless ways," writes Anne Malena in her introduction to a

special issue of *TTR (Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction)* dedicated to the topic (2003: 9). Not

only are they translated linguistically, she argues, in the movement from one language to

another, but also physically in the transition from one locale to another and culturally in the

exchange of one social environment to another. Taken together, these various translations

combine to effect a transformation of the migrant's very identity, a transformation which, it

could be argued, is the most fundamental translation of them all. Yet, as in the case of written

texts which gain their 'afterlife' through translation (Benjamin 1923/1996: 254), it is only by

undergoing this complex of transformations that the migrant's own survival is ensured.

"Migrating individuals," Malena concludes, in terms very reminiscent of Benjamin, "then

become bi- or multicultural along a complex translation process which, while ensuring their

survival, also transforms their identity" (2003: 11).

These three translational movements observed by Malena – translation of language, of

place, and of culture – are, in fact, the very same three we heard earlier cited by Salman Rushdie

in his description of the 'triple disruption' undergone by the migrant – a 'translated' man, both

bilingual and "borne across the world" (1991: 117).

> He loses his place, he enters into an alien language, and he finds himself surrounded
> by beings whose social behaviour and codes are very unlike, and sometimes even
> offensive to, his own. […] Roots, language and social norms have been three of the
> most important parts of the definition of what it is to be a human being. The migrant,
> denied all three, is obliged to find new ways of describing himself, new ways of
> being human. (ibid.: 277-278)

What results, according to Stuart Hall, yet another of the numerous scholars to take up the

'migration-as-translation' metaphor, are "identity formations that cut across and intersect natural

frontiers" (1992: 310). Forced to find a way of coming to terms with new cultures and

surroundings while yet bearing the traces of those languages, traditions and histories that first shaped them, all migrants, he concludes, "are irrevocably *translated*. […] They must learn to inhabit at least two identities, to speak two cultural languages, to translate and negotiate between them" (ibid.: 310).

Alongside migration, colonization is another example of a transformative intercultural experience that, in the context of postcolonial dialogue, has also been re-considered in light of the metaphor of translation. In this case, however, the metaphorical extension began not with etymology, but rather with reflection on the centrality of language to the colonial process. Following the line of argument drawn out by anthropologist Johannes Fabian (1986), who posited a common language as one of the fundamental pre-requisites for the establishment of colonial power, Douglas Robinson goes on to further argue that

> translation has always been an indispensable channel of imperial conquest and occupation. Not only must the imperial conquerors find some effective way of communicating with their new subjects; they must develop new ways of subjecting them, converting them into docile or 'cooperative' subjects. (1997: 10)

That is to say that, in the process of colonization, it is not only language that must be translated, changed from one form to another, but also the people themselves, their identities shifted and transformed to fit into the social hierarchy being newly constructed. Such a metaphorical rethinking of translation as transformation, writes Tejaswini Niranjana, "becomes an important task in a context where it has been used since the European Enlightenment to underwrite practices of subjectification, especially for colonized peoples, […] 'subjects' already living 'in translation', imaged and re-imaged by colonial ways of seeing" (1992: 6).

"Europe was regarded as the great Original, the starting point," we read in Bassnett and Trivedi, "and the colonies were therefore copies, or 'translations' of Europe, which they were

supposed to duplicate. […] The metaphor of the colony *as* a translation, a copy of an original located elsewhere on the map, has been recognized" (1999: 4-5). Once accepted, such a consideration of colonization as translation draws attention in a unique way to a number of the conflicts inherent therein. In addition to highlighting the linguistic and cultural clashes between colonizers and those they sought to colonize, Bassnett and Trivedi's formulation of the metaphor also boldly underlines the intentionality of both processes. Just as a translator intends to write a text that is comparable to an original, so the colonizer held as his or her intentional goal the creation of a society that mimicked his or her own. Yet just as few if any translations ever attain equal status with an original, so too were the colonies condemned to be ever regarded as inferior to their European counterparts. Interestingly, according to Bassnett and Trivedi's argument, the emergence of the very concept of an authoritative and unchanging original which holds sway over its translation coincided in European history with the initial period of colonial expansion, and so the parallel exaltation of an original text over its translation and of a European society over its colony renders this metaphorical imaging especially striking (ibid.: 2).

As in the case of the migration-as-translation metaphor, the representation of colonization as translation also has very interesting potential implications for our understanding of identity, here specifically colonial and postcolonial identities. This is true at both the collective and the individual levels, for although Bassnett and Trivedi's assertion addresses only the collective community, as we are reminded by Niranjana's reflection above, we cannot ignore the statement's logical correlate, that is, the notion that if a colony is indeed a translation of its European original, so too is a colonized individual in some way a translation of his or her colonizer.

Despite the fact that such examples have thus far been for the most part lacking in extended or systematic development, their repeated, if limited, appearances to date do serve to point toward the potential and possibility of translation as metaphor if more fully developed as an interrogative tool, "not just as figure of speech or rhetorical ornament," as Parker once suggested, "but as structuring principle" (1987: 52). While calls for a 'translational turn' in the humanities (cf. Snell-Hornby 2009, Bachmann-Medick 2009) may yet be judged by many as premature, these early pieces have nonetheless opened an important door for further studies in this direction. As Bachmann-Medick has observed,

> The path has, at least, been cleared for new methodological approaches to the 'interstitial spaces' so celebrated by the humanities, by examining them as 'translational' spaces: as spaces where relationships, situations, 'identities' and interactions are shaped through concrete processes of cultural translation. (2009: 9)

The task before us, then, is to demonstrate that formal systems of education in Canada in fact comprise just such an interstitial space, where 'relationships, situations, identities and interactions' are strategically shaped through translational processes, and that as such, it can be usefully examined through this lens. And yet before we can carry on toward this goal, there is still one more truth we cannot fail to acknowledge and address: Not all metaphors are born equal.

Not all metaphors will withstand examination long enough to allow for any consequential consideration or meaningful insight. Not all enable the same depth of critical reflection or create the same space to move about and shift perspective. Not all, in a word, are equally productive. This is as true of the metaphors used in relation to translation as it is of any others. Literature on translation is rife with figures taken up in their simplest form, only to be immediately abandoned without the slightest development or reflection of any sort. Nabokov's short piece "On Translating 'Eugene Onegin'", for instance, contains no less than a dozen metaphoric images to

describe the challenging work of translation, from a "parrot's screech" and a "monkey's chatter" to a dark reflection in a black mirror (1955: 34). And although these images are indeed many things – evocative, surprising, amusing, at times insightful – not one of them could be thought to make a serious contribution toward our knowledge of translation. For Nabokov, of course, theoretical reflection was hardly the primary goal and, in light of the poetic genre in which he wrote, he is easily forgiven the use of such liberal imagery. The same, however, can surely not be said for the comparable tendency routinely evidenced in pieces that aspire to the status of academic theory. Farrell's (1996) comparison of the translator's work to topping a serving of *veal alla marsala* with ketchup, St. André argues, is more revealing of the author's attitude toward translation than of anything else. Such 'misuses' of metaphor, he goes on to insist, most often occur

> when theorists, unable to explain what they mean, resort to using metaphors that, while suggestive, do more to cover up the fact that the ideas have not been thought through properly than to help us think clearly about what happens during the translation process. (2010: 3-4)

The same principle naturally holds when we turn to think of translation used as a metaphor for other processes. It is not enough for there to be a single point of easy comparison, particularly if that point is one as broad or general as 'transformation'. Such may be effective (or maybe better yet, affective) in a given moment or perhaps to underline a particular argument, but ultimately cannot serve to gainfully illuminate either of the phenomena involved. In order for this to occur, there must be capacity for sustained development, critical analysis of the parallels drawn out, and even extension following the path of any connected sub-metaphors which may result. That is to say that in the case of translation as metaphor, it is not enough simply to identify a change in the language used or to recognize a shift in form or substance, though both

of these may in fact be realized. Beyond this, if translation as metaphor is to be actually and effectively useful as an interrogative tool, there must be legitimate engagement with the countless other complexities of the process: the various parties involved and the relations of power between them, historical and political contextualization with the ever-present possibility of reformation or revolution, the tension between identity and difference facing the impossibility of simple resolution, and so on. Whether considering Jürgen Habermas' call for religions to be 'translated' into publicly accessible forms (2006), Joachim Renn's positing that all social interaction consists essentially of 'relations of translation' (as in Fuchs 2009), Jhumpa Lahiri's argument for fiction as a limited, 'translational' representation of reality (2000), or Pimjai Sudsawad's proposed model for 'translating' medical research into accepted public practice (2007), the same questions must be asked: Does the metaphor as taken up encompass multiple aspects of translation's complex reality, or are the concept and correlation overly simplified? Can various facets of the suggested relationship be productively illumined through the exploration of sub-metaphors or corollary comparisons, or does the metaphor quickly stumble and reach the end of its potential? Is the metaphor actually used to advance critical reflection, or does it instead mask the absence of it?

It is here, I would suggest, that the distinction between those extensions of the term argued by translation theorists and those drawn out by scholars approaching from other disciplinary perspectives is often most strikingly seen. For although over the course of the last fifty years the concept of translation has been persistently problematized and increasingly nuanced in various directions through the work of the Manipulation School, of feminist translation theorists, of sociologists of translation and more, when taken up as a metaphor by those who have not necessarily been part of these ongoing discussions in Translation Studies, but

who approach uninitiated, as it were, from their own perspectives or fields of inquiry, it is very often an older, more traditional notion of translation that is employed.

An outdated representationalist perspective, for instance, is clearly exemplified in Crapanzano's (2003) discussion of the use of the concept 'translation' in North American legal discourse. The process of 'translating' time and again the unchanging laws of a nation or state into countless unique and ever differing situations, all the while insisting that it is being applied consistently and in the 'same' way, demands – even fundamentally relies upon – a notion of translation that is purely referential, without any real pragmatic effect. In this context, Crapanzano explains, "'Translation' serves as a concrete prop for (the denial of) a metaphorical process that bears all the negative baggage of figuration in certain literalist-prone practices such as practicing law" (2003: 44). This same argument is echoed by Pierre Legrand, who further concludes,

> The point is no longer to ascribe meaning to a legal experience and to appreciate why it has developed in a way that is historically, sociologically, economically, or politically – that is to say, culturally – different from another, but to argue that difference is simply not there or, at least, that it is not there in a meaningful way. […] Difference is inconvenient. Worse, difference is a curse. (2005: 32).

The problem that soon becomes apparent with any metaphorical usage thus rooted in overly simplified concepts of transference and sameness, however, is that they quickly stumble, finding their practical limitations as they bump up against those very same obstacles which translation theorists have spent so much time and energy proving false, that is, against the impossibility of absolute equivalence and the frustrations of a manufactured dichotomy between the translatable and the untranslatable. Such simplified conceptions are what have led some, in fact, to dismiss translation entirely as a potential source of aid in understanding cultural

exchange. Anthropologist Stephen Tyler, for example, has argued strongly against the use of translation as a model for postmodern ethnography, writing,

> Translation? Not if we think of it as fording a stream that separates one text from another and changing languages midstream. This is *mimesis* of language, one language copying another, which never makes a copy anyway, but a more or less contorted original. (1986: 137-138)

Tullio Maranhão has similarly argued the need "to proceed and do anthropology in a direction opposite to translation" given "the debacle of the belief in the correctness and in the usefulness of rendering something from a sylvan source language in a cosmopolitan target language. Anthropological theory and theoretical debates," he concludes, "are by and large a rationalization of failed translation practices" (2003b: 81). Failed translation practice indeed, where the expectation is full equivalence and reproduction of the same. And yet such an expectation is hardly congruent with current understandings of translation as a complex cultural and communicative process.

Among the manifestations of the translation metaphor surveyed thus far, it is clear that those which have been most fully developed and which have most effectively sparked our imagination with regard to the explanatory potential of a translational perspective are those that in turn reflect the most complex and multifacted understandings of translation. Certainly the exaggerated simplicity of 'translation' in the above legal example cannot be said to characterize the writings on migration or colonization as instances of the same. Neither Niranjana nor Rushdie, Hoffman nor Hall seem to anticipate in the same way anything like a direct correlation to a fixed original, but rather choose to lean on the conviction that translation is always productive rather than reproductive, always generative of something new. Nevertheless, patterns of thinking long engrained are difficult to dislodge, and even in discussions such as these, we at

times detect a sort of lapse back toward older patterns of thought and understanding, toward that former reliance on notions of equivalence and measurable difference. Anne Malena's thoughtfully penned piece on migration as "a complex translation process which […] transforms identity" (2003: 11), for instance, yet includes at one point the following evaluation:

> [T]he new versions of their [i.e. the migrants'] selves may be 'perfect' translations, creating the illusion that they are native to the target culture, or retain traces of the foreign, proclaiming their difference […]. While some migrants achieve a high degree of translatability – hence of invisibility – most remain visible because they carry along many untranslatable components, ranging from visual appearance to cultural practices and beliefs. (ibid.: 9)

Despite being relocated into a metaphorical framework where the textual is clearly not the primary focus and where simple transference is not assumed, still we see reflected here that former mindset wherein transparency hails translation's success and any obvious difference marks its failure.

Clearly, it cannot be denied that, across the humanities, a growing number of scholars have begun taking up the metaphor of translation and attempting to apply it in one way or another to their various fields of study. Neither can it be denied that this is being done with greatly varying degrees of concrete or specific application, and with greatly varying levels of conceptual complexity. The potential is there that we might move beyond these initial metaphorical uses of translation toward a more systematic elaboration of the process which could be deemed 'paradigmatic' – one which could actually lead to a methodological approach with real explanatory potential in regard to the complex realities of intercultural encounter. Such movement, however, would clearly require a lesser reliance on *ad hoc* constructions and a more methodical shift in overall perspective than has thus far been achieved. It would require a more persistent letting go of our stable notions of language, difference and equivalence in favour of a

more nuanced understanding of the intricacies of identity, transformation and representation. And so the question stands before us:

> Will the translation category, as it moves beyond the textual and linguistic level, stubbornly stick to the path of purely metaphorical uses of the translation concept? Or will new research approaches begin to elaborate a more sophisticated and detailed translation perspective in methodological and analytical terms? (Bachmann-Medick 2009: 4)

## 4.2 <u>Of Education As Translation</u>

As the call for the elaboration of a translational paradigm has increasingly been heard – whether in the writings of Ricoeur (1996, 2007), Bassnett and Trivedi (1999), Bachmann-Medick (2009) or another – a number of articles have begun to appear which attempt to sketch out and determine the range of intercultural encounters best suited to fruitful investigation through the lens of translation (see, for example, Dizdar 2009 or Basalamah 2010). It is not our goal, however, within the confines of the current discussion, to lay out any such definitive list of criteria which must be met or characteristics which must be exhibited by an encounter in order to qualify it for inclusion or consideration. Rather, it is our purpose to demonstrate only how a single example – education – can begin to be beneficially explored in this way, an exploration that, in time and in turn, may then inform some aspect of the broader discussion already ongoing.

That said, the broad parallels from which we may begin such an exploration are not difficult to recognize. Both translation, understood as a process that transforms texts, and education, understood as one that transforms students, are activities undertaken and carried out in strategic ways and with clear intentions. Both phenomena are complex and multifaceted, involving not just a simple transfer of knowledge or content, but rather the very creation of meaning and understanding, whereby identities and interactions, relationships and realities are

subsequently shaped. Both processes defy any fixed or totalizing methodology and resist any simple solution or equation, being different every time they are approached, determined by countless contextual factors, not least among them the various parties involved. Both are processes marked by an aspect of incompletion, being never so final or definite that they are beyond questioning, revisioning, alteration, challenge or change. Both translation and education are activities long associated with a certain ideal – in the case of the former, the ideal of a mutually-enriching intercultural encounter that promotes communication and communion while yet demonstrating respect for difference; and in that of the latter, the ideal of an unbiased opening up of knowledge and opportunity in preparation for free, equal and responsible engagement with the world around. In both instances, however, it is a matter of ideals that will never be fully reached, of promise that can never be truly fulfilled in light of the limitations and contingencies of reality and experience. And if all this were not enough to provide us a starting point, we have also to recognize that both translation and education have shown themselves to be powerful instruments used in the creation and maintenance of cultural representations and social realities, evidencing close ties with and/or susceptibility to ideological influence, whether recognized or not, thus rendering critical inquiry all the more important.

**4.2.1 A Paradigm Applied**

In all of this it is clear that the stage is well set for a comparative reflection on these two phenomena, and so against this backdrop we can begin to ask more specific questions, first among them that of how the broad strokes of such a paradigmatic schema might initially be laid out. A simple conception of translation which we may take as our starting point sees the translator standing between two worlds – those of the source and recipient cultures respectively, each one equally complex and unique – working to make the realities of one intelligible to the

other, seeking space for a new text or genre within the established dynamics of the recipient culture's complex polysystem. A first statement, then, would see the teacher as similarly positioned between two very different worlds – on the one hand, that of the child, marked by the narrowness of personal experience and relationships, and by the immediacy of bounded history and geography; on the other hand, that of society, characterized by the breadth of shared experience, the longevity of collective memory, and the heavy weight of communal culture and tradition. And just as the translator labours over a text, thoughtfully deliberating the introduction of new concepts, vocabulary and structures, carefully shaping and preparing its lines in the hope that it will be accepted into an appropriate place within the established yet still evolving literary system, so the teacher works to ready their students for entry into wider society – itself relatively stable and yet constantly shifting – gradually introducing new knowledge and behaviours, systematically instilling the narratives, discourses and presuppositions that will structure relationships and experience beyond the confines of the classroom.

Even accepting this as a starting point, however, it is immediately clear that much more remains to be said. It is not enough to claim that either the translator or the teacher actually stands 'in between'. For although they may move between and interact with two languages, two cultures, two worlds, just like the translator who "can never stand in a neutral or free space between cultures, but of necessity operates within some cultural framework" (Tymoczko 2003: 196), so the teacher stands with both feet firmly planted in the 'target culture', so to speak, having a specialized understanding of the student's reality and yet undeniably already positioned within the social and cultural world which the students are seeking to enter. Such positioning is, of course, inevitable; we are all somehow culturally, socially and ideologically positioned. And so, as in the case of translation, in relation to teaching the question of position must be raised, not

as a problem that can in some way be negated or resolved, but rather as a reality with inevitable bearing and effect, a significant consideration in any discussion of the social impacts of education. For, as Tymoczko has reminded us, "it is only by recognizing the position that the investigator holds within a system, that one can understand the ideological contingencies and presuppositions of the investigation itself" (ibid.: 196).

Thus far, these broad parallels and correlate considerations could be applied to virtually any education system, even where differences in language, ethnicity or culture are not of particular concern. And yet just as principles common to both intra- and interlingual translation are often most clearly demonstrated in the latter case, so the translational nature of education is most clearly displayed in multilingual contexts, especially where there is an evident distance and distinction between the language and culture of the majority and those of a minority element. In such a situation, the asymmetry of the power relations involved stands out in all the more relief – asymmetry not only in the immediate relation between teacher and student who lack common ground for understanding one another, common language for the discourses of learning, and common cultural perspective for making sense of the world around; but also in the broader relation between the communities represented by each, between the social environment in which the student is rooted and the one into which they are expected to integrate by the time they reach graduation. In such a situation, to speak of the 'translation' of students through education is to refer quite literally to the translation of their speech and writing into the dominant language of the majority; but even beyond this most obvious manifestation, it is also to refer to the translation of students' identities through the transformation of their ways of thinking and knowing, and through the reformation of their understanding of themselves in relation to the dominant society, and of their role in the narratives of history and of the world. As a result, to speak of the

'translation' of students through education can become a speaking about their locational translation through the social sphere to a position often distressingly predetermined by an existing linguistic and cultural hierarchy.

If we turn to consider the case of education in Canada as laid out in the previous chapters, much of what we have said can be almost immediately discerned. The strategy and intention behind the translational process were from the beginning frankly admitted, with regard to language first, but then with explicit ties to social access, acceptance and engagement. Whether in Thomas Greenway's battle in Manitoba to establish a secular, anglophone system that would "'Canadianize' the non-British and inculcate imperial sentiment" (Rea 1994: 420), in D.C. Scott's assertions about the role of residential schools in putting an end to the "Indian problem" (as cited in Erasmus 2004: 3), or in countless other similar instances, the clearly strategic shaping of Canadian educational endeavours can time and again be seen. From the earliest days of our public education systems, the classroom was not primarily conceived as "a neutral environment […] where teachers respectful of the 'conscience' and 'freedom' of the children […] open up for them the path to the freedom, morality and responsibility of adults" (Althusser 1971: 156-157), but rather a controlled space where teachers could direct students, whatever their background or origin, in behaviours and ways considered rightly Canadian – that is, in most cases British, and in the remainder French – translating them into the structures and languages desired for Canadian society.

In the context of a fledgling nation, the assumption of English as the language of instruction in schools, with relatively few excepted situations, laid out early the demands of translated speech and expression, while the simultaneous writing of official histories and the circulation of sanctioned narratives within these anglophone classrooms ensured that within the

'translational space' of the school, understandings of self and of communities in relation to the broader whole were transformed in parallel with language as "relationships, situations, identities and interactions [were] shaped through concrete processes of cultural translation" (Bachmann-Medick 2009: 9). The public narratives thus naturalized as truth about the history of Canada, the taming of the land, and the bringing of civilization by the country's two founding peoples not only flew in the face of the histories of Aboriginal nations which had preceded the Europeans by unnumbered years, but also challenged the self-understanding of other large settler communities who perceived their own role in the building of Canada very differently. Except for within small pockets on the prairies, it is almost forgotten today, for instance, that the Ukrainian community was once so numerous and influential across the prairie provinces that there was even an early movement to establish their language as the third official one of the country (cf. Hudyma 2011). Clearly, for students from communities such as these who are first taught one version of their history through stories told at home or traditions in community before encountering a second version in school – this time legitimized by the authority of academic presentation – formal education requires an additional effort of negotiating around these "various incompatibilities or conflicts between [their] ontological narrative and those of other the individuals with whom [they] share a social space" (Baker 2006: 31). It is by just such machinations, by the challenging and systematic altering of social understanding, that identities, as well as languages, soon begin to be translated through the process of education.

Against the backdrop of Canada's complex linguistic landscape, the teacher as translator may move between two worlds or between many, working to prepare students from all different backgrounds to enter the same social sphere, governing and grading the translation of their speech and composition, while simultaneously narrating their social relationships, thereby laying

groundwork in the classroom for patterns of interaction that will extend far beyond its confines. From the very beginnings of public education, the translation of students' language has been a central concern and common point of conflict in Canada, but this has never been without clear connection to parallel concern for the transformation of other expressions and elements of identity. For along with linguistic translation come always translations of other sorts; along with new vocabulary and modes of self-expression come new knowledge and manners of self-perception. Education can thus clearly be recognized as a process of translation, in which language is but a single, albeit central, element.

**4.2.2 From Parallels to Problematization**

Even as we move through the elaboration of such parallels and comparisons, we dare not lose sight of the fact that the value of any paradigmatic view of translation, that is, the benefit of viewing other transformational processes through the lens of translation, is discovered less in the correspondences themselves as they are drawn out than in the pathways of inquiry and reflection that are thereby opened up, enabling us to explore and think more clearly or in a new way about what happens during the translational process. In considering education as translation, it is possible to identify several potentially productive methods of entry into such critical reflection: through the variety of significant *questions* that these connections enable us to raise, through the consideration of specific theoretical *concepts* that can be reassessed and applied anew, and finally through the reframing and retelling of *narratives* in translation.

*i. Questions*

Having already briefly broached the issue of positionality, let us take this first as a potentially productive area for interrogative questioning and exploration. There can be little

doubt that the impact of ideological positioning is an issue that has occupied the attention of Translation Studies scholars for years; Tymoczko has asserted that "some of the most searching and revealing discussions of translation in the last decade have focused on questions of ideology" (2003: 181). The notion of translation as a merely reproductive process having now receded far into the background, there has been a steady increase in recognition of the ways in which ideology affects the work of translation, residing "not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in its relevance to the receiving audience" (ibid.: 183). For translation is, at its very core, the making of serial choices – from the selection of materials to be translated through the methods employed to carry out the project – every one of which is freighted with ideological significance, whether recognized and intentionally thought through by the translator or based on presuppositions buried so deeply within that they are simply perceived as natural, not requiring any defense or justification. This realization of the power of choice – whether on the part of the translator him- or herself or instead on that of an editor, publisher or other person involved – has in turn led to a new awareness and conception of responsibility in translation, not just for a determined degree of 'fidelity' to a source text, but more importantly for the social impact that results. From the deliberate framing of translated pieces in prefaces and translator's notes to the selection of styles and vocabularies that underline the machinations of a text, translators increasingly seek modes of intervention in the text, sensitive to their responsibility for the representations and narratives created or repeated in their writings, even in partial or fragmented forms, cognizant of standing in a privileged position to become "an ethical agent of social change" (ibid.: 181).

All of this discussion, already ongoing, provides rich background for the consideration of similar questions in the field of education[27]; for if in schooling we have recognized a powerful instrument of social control, the key role of teachers within this mechanism cannot now be ignored. Just like the translator, the teacher too is in a position of choice, reinforcing or reforming presuppositions and discourses every time they stand up to teach, complicit with or challenging the status quo every time they enter the classroom. Just as the content of a source text is but one element contributing to a translation's ideology and impact, so too is the curriculum laid out before the teacher but one part of what is actually taught. As a result, many of the same questions now commonly posed amongst translators must be asked of teachers, moving from, first, consideration of *presuppositions and positionality*, through second, attention to its *impact and effect*, to third, reflection on the *ethical implications* of it all:

- Who are the teachers in our schools? How are they themselves positioned in terms of the linguistic and cultural hierarchies in place? Have they been long-rooted in the language and culture of the majority, or have they themselves been translated through an educative process after having first been part of a minority community? Do they currently self-identify primarily with the majority group, or do they understand themselves to be still members of a minority or of a hybrid culture?

---

[27] An interesting parallel to this discussion can be found in pedagogue Alison Cook-Sather's book entitled *Education Is Translation: A Metaphor for Change in Learning and Teaching* (2006). In it, Cook-Sather explores how, in the process of education, "one must learn to recognize a new vocabulary, think in new ways, and speak and write using these new ways of thinking and these new words. […] If one engages in that work fully," she explains, "one translates oneself in a more metaphorical sense: one makes a new version of oneself – one integrates the old and the new into a renewed self that has elements of both. In both the translation of language and the translation of self, one preserves something of the original or previous versions, and one renders a new version appropriate to a new context and to the relationships with oneself, with others, and with the content one explores within that context" (25-26). However, Cook-Sather's discussion should also be distinguished from the present one in at least two significant respects. The first is that while we are here primarily concerned with the systems of public elementary and secondary education governed by the state, Cook-Sather's attention is trained on university-level engagement by adult learners. As a result, she discusses education almost exclusively as a process of self-translation, with relatively little weight placed on the influence of the teacher and without significant regard for the social or political aspects of public schooling as an institution.

- At what point does a teacher's personal ideological stance intersect with the politics of education? How do all of the above considerations affect how they approach and relate to students of various backgrounds? How does it affect the methodology of their teaching and the way in which they evaluate the success of a student's growth or transformation? What threads of knowledge or meaning are prioritized in their presentation of the curriculum? Do they focus only on those threads determined from the dominant perspective, or do they take time to highlight alternate perspectives and ways of knowing? And what is the effect of such prioritization on that view of the world laid out before their class? In all their teaching and interactions, do they reproduce dominant representations unquestioningly – whether due to honest subscription or due to lack of critical reflection – thereby reinforcing established structures and stories? Or do they instead leave the door open to questions, making room for alternate understandings of history and society, welcoming expressions of difference?

- How do teachers understand their ethical responsibility within the classroom? To whom do they consider themselves primarily accountable – to the principal? to the parents? to society as a whole? to the individual student? How do teachers negotiate the various demands made by each of these on a practical level? To what degree do they consider themselves responsible for the reproductive force of education? To what extent do they have the freedom or even the obligation to actively introduce counter-narratives and intentionally challenge students to consider multiple perspectives, to test or to resist existing structures of power? How does differential framing and presentation of even common curricular materials mediate its impact on students as they attempt to integrate into, influence or advance the society of which they are a part? Are there elements of

public narratives that should perhaps not be reproduced at all or that should be framed with particular care?

Many questions of this sort, echoing discussions current in translational circles, bring to the fore key issues related to both language and culture in education, and serious consideration of them could contribute greatly to our understanding of the impact of these issues on students as identities are formed and transformed in the classroom and in the world outside.

In his forward to Freire's revolutionary *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Richard Shaull summarized succinctly,

> There is no such thing as a *neutral* educational process. Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes 'the practice of freedom,' the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (2000: 34)

This fundamental belief was at the centre of Freire's work and writing, which was inspired, as we know, by personal experience amid what Shaull describes as "extraordinary misery and suffering" in "extreme situations of poverty and underdevelopment in the Third World" (ibid.: 30). The insights that resulted, however, far from being relevant only to situations of manifest political strife, unrest and violent oppression, should instead prompt questions and reflection in every educational context, for every teacher either confirms or disrupts the system's logic by way of their teaching. In situations multilingual and multicultural, ideas of translation can help us appropriately formulate ideological questions along these lines.

The history of Canada, for instance, is generally perceived to be marked more by diplomacy and compromise than by violent conflict, more by democracy than by dictatorship. Yet given the complexities of our linguistic and cultural landscape, as well as of our various and

intersecting systems of education, it is certainly worth considering the significance of such ideological questions. Our prior survey of one and a half centuries of education in Canada revealed clearly that, despite the emergence of a rhetoric increasingly and insistently proclaiming equality in education, society and politics, the basic hierarchy of languages and cultures remained unaltered and uneven in both schooling and society throughout that time period, pointing us toward the realization that, whatever the rhetoric or discourse in vogue at a particular historical moment, education in Canada has always been of the former type mentioned by Shaull, that is, education "used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it" (ibid.: 34). To what extent, we might ask, is this revelatory of an ideological position that has not significantly changed throughout these years? An ideological position characteristic of society, reinforced through the mechanism of teacher training, and then carried consistently into classrooms across the nation?

Reports on Aboriginal education, for instance, have time and again called for, among other things, control over the selection and hiring of teachers. Though never expressed in quite these terms, perhaps, what we hear in these calls is a repeated demand for teaching that begins from a different ideological stance – one rooted in Aboriginal language, culture, perspectives and presuppositions – and that realizes for Canada's First Nations education as a 'practice of freedom'. For far beyond a teacher's ability to explain the principles of mathematics or expound the foundational concepts of chemistry or biology, it is the manner in which they frame these course materials and the narratives to which they connect them throughout the course of schooling that bears the greatest impact on students; that has historically led to the translation of students away from their languages, cultures and communities; but that yet may hold one key to a reversal of the situation and an upsetting of the status quo.

Questions of ideological positioning are not, of course, the only ones raised by figuring the teacher as a translator in the context of this exploratory paradigm. If the questions already mentioned are representative of what Chesterman has termed the 'cultural branch' of TranslatOR Studies – that is, the branch dealing with "values, ethics, ideologies, traditions, history, examining the roles and influences of translators and interpreters through history, as agents of cultural evolution" (2009: 19) – there remain yet questions to be considered from the 'sociological branch' – that is, concerning "translators'/interpreters' observable behaviour as individuals or groups or institutions, their social networks, status and working processes, their relations with other groups and with relevant technology, and so on" (ibid.: 19).[28] Just like the translator, the teacher operates within a complex web of human relationships and implicated parties, with principals, school boards, policy makers, parents and communities substituted in the place of editors, publishers, professional associations, clients and consumers respectively. Each bears a vested interest in the education system and process, but each from their own perspective and for their own purpose, these being not always well aligned with one another. And just as a translator must learn to negotiate the interaction of their personal code of ethics with the standards imposed by professional associations and the demands laid on by the policies of editors, publishers and so on, so the teacher must determine how to balance the various demands set before them from various directions and how to exercise agency within the limits of professional practice, ever mindful of the impact of such compromises on the experience and trajectory of their students.

---

[28] Note that Chesterman's formulation of TranslatOR Studies is in fact comprised of three main branches: the cultural, the sociological, and the cognitive. This third branch – which is concerned with "mental processes, decision-making, the impact of emotions, attitudes to norms, personality, etc." (2009: 19) – will not be addressed in the current discussion.

Tied to this as well are questions about a teacher's status in society, which in turn urges a connected inquiry into a system or society's approach to education as a whole. In his aptly titled book *The Child and the Curriculum* (1902/2001), Dewey discussed at length the conflicting perspectives that had arisen between "educational sects" which positioned themselves on opposite sides of this central debate in the philosophy of education. On the one side were those who gave clear priority to carefully selected curricular content, accompanied by prescribed teaching methodology, while on the other were those who instead fixed their attention on the child's development, with only contingent views regarding curriculum and method. He writes:

> Problems of instruction are problems of procuring texts giving logical parts and sequences, and of presenting these portions in class in a similar definite and graded way. Subject-matter furnishes the end, and it determines method. The child is simply the immature being who is to be matured; he is the superficial being who is to be deepened; his is narrow experience which is to be widened. It is his to receive, to accept. His part is fulfilled when he is ductile and docile.
>
> Not so, says the other sect. The child is the starting-point, the center, and the end. His development, his growth is the ideal. It alone furnishes the standard. To the growth of the child all studies are subservient; they are instruments valued as they serve the needs of growth. Personality, character, is more than subject-matter. Not knowledge or information, but self-realization is the goal. (105)

In the wake of this central opposition soon follow a whole series of other perceived binary contradictions: discipline vs. interest; the logical vs. the psychological; adequacy in training and scholarship vs. sympathetic and natural instinct; guidance and control vs. freedom and initiative; law vs. spontaneity; conservation of the old vs. progression into the new; inertness and routine vs. chaos and anarchism; suppression of individuality vs. disregard for authority (ibid.: 108). The very thrust of Dewey's argument, of course, was that such extreme positions, though sometimes argued with passion in intellectual debate, in reality make "common sense recoil" and then

"vibrate back and forward in a maze of inconsistent compromise" (ibid.: 108). Despite the fact that Dewey was writing now over a century ago, still the same dichotomous debate rages on in Canada. The website of the Society for Quality Education – an organization dedicated to improving the learning and school experience of Canadian students – to this day includes both general information for parents and links to detailed studies comparing approaches to teaching and learning, contrasting "child-centered" and "conventional" classrooms (http://www.societyforqualityeducation.org). Clearly no fixed compromise has yet been struck. Here again, however, we hear echoes and realize that theorists of translation are well-positioned to make a contribution. For just as the concept of translation as a reproductive process and that of translation as a generative one are not simple opposites, but rather two poles with complex gradations in between, so an understanding of teaching as the straightforward conveyance of content and that of teaching as the active facilitation of students' discovery of and interaction with the world do not represent a simple dichotomy.

One of the immediate impacts of this, of course, is a differential view of the teacher's status, their work in each case being viewed in a very different light. If, on the one hand, teaching is seen as a work of simple reproduction, the teacher becomes a routine labourer, executing predictable tasks. But if, on the other hand, teaching is an interactive and creative endeavor, the teacher is elevated as one skilled in their own right, constantly making decisions in the midst of changing situations. Not only does such a distinction bear significant impact for the requirements and manner of teacher training, but also for the amount of freedom afforded the teacher in the classroom to veer from an expected course, as well as for the amount of risk involved in explicit social engagement.

Obviously we could continue our discussion in this same direction for some time more, and yet the teacher as translator is not the only key figure to be examined within the proposed paradigmatic schema. The figure of the student must also be considered, and the questions here raised are equally interesting and potentially generative of insight, for in considering the student as the object of this translational process, we not only see underlined the practical necessity of translation, but we also see embodied its challenge, unpredictability and potential.

In his seminal writing on "The Task of the Translator", Walter Benjamin underscored the necessity of translation for the survival of a text through the passage of time and space; it is in translation that a text not only outlives its original, but also "attains its latest, continually renewed, and most complete unfolding" (1923/1996: 255). In the very same way it could also be argued that translation through education is equally imperative for the survival of a student, not only in the sense of continual growth and personal development – 'Grow or die', as the old adage goes – but also, and just as importantly in the context of our current discussion, in that of transformation and adaptation in light of the expectations of a society as he or she seeks to make his or her way into the social, political and economic spheres of a nation – spheres where specific linguistic and cultural norms must be adhered to, spheres where anyone who fails to do so "blurts out only undecipherable signs devoid of referent and context, and so appears thoroughly alien to others, […] outside of hierarchy, unavailable as either a source or a recipient of social recognition" (Rafael 1988: 212). The governing norms and discourses must, of course, be learned by all, but here as before we see how much greater a degree of transformation may be required of those rooted since birth in minority communities, those who find it is not just a new range of discourse, but an entirely new language that must be learned, and not just outward behaviours which are challenged, but fundamental worldviews. For these, the experience of

translation that must be undergone is exponentially more complex and multi-layered. To figure the student as an object of translation, then, is to recognize frankly the dependence characteristic of their role – dependence on the guidance and actions of another to shape and prepare them for continued life and social interaction. It is to recognize again the weight and significance of the way others story us and, in the process, plot our character into particular roles in the public and national narratives.

At the same time, however, to figure the student as an object of translation is not to deprive them of all personal agency or autonomy. If that were the case, teaching would not be nearly so challenging a job. In reality, however, despite the degree of dependence already acknowledged, in dealing with every student, as with every text, there remain two factors that neither the teacher nor the translator can ever fully predict or control: resistance and potential. For just as the translator is met with resistance in language and in text – the challenge of unfamiliar concepts, stretched linguistic forms and even incongruent worldviews which must be wrestled with and somehow resolved (cf. Ricoeur 1996) – so the teacher is met by much of the same as they work to introduce new knowledge, norms and narratives into the lives of students, all newness being somehow necessarily placed in relation to the known, but no newness being ever received in exactly the same way by any two given minds. This individuality of understanding, conditioned by each student's prior experience of life in a wide range of linguistic and cultural settings produces resistance to any simple or uniform reception of what is being taught and introduces unpredictable challenges for the teacher in charge.

Not only that, but these same prior experiences become for the student what the webs of intertextuality are to a text, being also the source of that second factor beyond immediate control: potential. A translator labours over a text, ever conscious of the richness and surplus of meaning

they will never fully control, ever aware of the probability that, introduced into a new language and culture, the text will inevitably take on new meanings, whether bold or nuanced, which they themselves cannot yet even imagine. In the very same way, even the most skilled teacher, working to guide and direct the formation of those in their charge, knows that the outcome can never be guaranteed, that the juxtaposition of language, learning, life and relationships will always produce surprising results. It was de Montaigne who once reflected that "The work, by its own force and fortune, may second the workman and sometimes out-strip him, beyond his invention and knowledge" (1580/1700: 176), and though it was of written texts that he wrote, many are the teachers who could identify with his words in thinking of the students they have encountered.

Thus far we have only just begun to consider the figures of the teacher and the student as cast within the paradigmatic schema of education as translation, yet already we see how viewing education through such a lens can focus our attention in new ways on key aspects of education as process and as social, cultural, and linguistic interaction. Already we can see how viewing the school as a 'translational space' can prompt us to ask questions perhaps not often considered before, or perhaps simply not considered as central: questions about the positionality of the teacher within a complex web of social and political relations; questions about the ethics of the teacher, whether complicit with or challenging the existing status quo; questions about the tension that balances the student between dependence and autonomy, between 'reproduction' of the dominant norms and knowledge and the generativity of multilingual, multicultural engagement; questions about how the maintenance of this tension affects the entry and acceptance gained by the student within society as a whole beyond the classroom and the school.

Were we to press on still further, we would soon see how the exploration of other aspects of the paradigm – other sub-metaphors, if you will – bring to the fore other considerations and concerns, continually prompting more questions to be inspected and investigated. Should quality assessment in either case, for instance, be carried out with an eye toward sameness – that is, based on the degree of faithful reproduction of knowledge, narratives and structures – or with a gaze fixed on the productive potential of difference – that is, creative development of notions conveyed through the expansion or deepening of experience? Should curriculum be thought to provide an encyclopedia of answers, or rather a framework within which to ask countless new questions? How far does the ripple effect of decisions made in the classroom extend out in broader society recipient of the translated student? All these questions and others like them are readily opened up to productive examination through the lens of translational thinking, above all in multilingual and multicultural situations where asymmetrical power relations are brought into stark relief and where the paradigmatic structuring is reinforced by the pragmatics of literal translated speech.

### ii. Concepts

A second way in which the translational metaphor might be used to advance critical reflection about other transformative processes is through an intentional reconsideration of specific theoretical concepts drawn from the field of Translation Studies and reapplied in relation to the new context. In looking at our example of education as a form of translation, the concept of *Bildung* presents itself as a particularly interesting case which might be explored in this way.

The thought of *Bildung* as a translational perspective to be brought to discussions of education may at first give pause to all those who recognize the term as one taken up by German pedagogues as far back as the 18th century. Joachim Heinrich Campe, for example, a key figure

in the early German Enlightenment and one-time tutor to Wilhelm and Alexander von Humboldt, employed the notion of *Bildung* throughout his writings published in the late 1700s, with a continual focus on "how pedagogical reform could promote the development (*Ausbildung*) and education (*Bildung*) of the citizenry" (Good 2010: para. 2; cf. Apgar 2008). The understanding of the concept predominant at the time was that of "a critical and emancipatory enterprise", which insisted that individuals and identities, rather than being pre-determined by metaphysical origin, given nature or even social constraint, instead were actively formed through "a practical coping and interaction (*Auseinandersetzung*) with a 'world'"(Masschelein & Ricken 2003: 140). *Bildung* was an experiential process through which "human beings became truly free and in which they emancipated themselves from all kinds of power including the power of the actual given State" (ibid.: 140).

The ideal did not long retain any real semblance of a focused or shared conception, however. Following the term's peak usage in the context of early 19th century German idealism, the 'classic' notion of a *Bildung* which "aimed at a free and harmonious unfolding of 'his' [i.e. the enlightened man's] potential and power" was increasingly found to be in tension with a more functionalist theory of the concept which instead "favoured the ability to plan and apply processes of learning through schools and curricula" (Bauer 2003a: 133, 134). Walter Bauer asserts that "essentially, the bildungsphilosophical discourse in the second half of the nineteenth century can be understood as a 'history of decline' of the humanist understanding of *Bildung*" (ibid.: 134), as the concept was increasingly aestheticized and emptied of its critical and political potential.

Even as the term increased in usage in educational discourse over the course of the 1900s, taken up by pedagogues in countries and contexts ever more removed from the German

philosophical setting in which its roots held, so the nuanced potential of the term steadily faded, as it "expanded to become a 'large field' covering nearly everything in pedagogical discourse", used by some to refer to experiences of self-development, by others to speak of the cultural content of curricula, and by still others to signify the acquisition of formal competencies (Masschelein & Ricken 2003: 141). By the close of the 20$^{th}$ century, the educational concept of *Bildung* had become "imprecise in its delineations and in many senses a used idea" (Siljander & Sutinen 2012: 2), often used "in a very broad and unspecific way (instead of more adequate terms such as 'knowledge', 'achievement', 'key skills', etc.) so that it tends to lose its distinct quality" (Bauer 2003a: 135).

In the North American context, for instance, the name most commonly associated with discussions of *Bildung* remains the pragmatic philosopher and pedagogue John Dewey. Despite the fact that Dewey himself did not use or engage with the term in his writing, those who have followed after have repeatedly drawn lines between a general notion *Bildung* and the expressed ideals of Dewey's progressive education (cf. Fairfield 2009; Good & Garrison 2010; Väkevä 2012), which similarly emphasizes the imperative centrality of experience in learning and the progressive growth of the individual (Dewey 1916/2009). As Dewey scholars have repeatedly lamented, however, Dewey's work is, in fact, "rarely read" and "poorly understood" (Edmondson 2006: 4) by too many educators, to the effect that neither those who advocate passionately for a 'child-centered' approach to education nor those who vehemently oppose them have tended to represent his ideas accurately. In a report on Dewey's legacy prepared for UNESCO, Westbrook recognized that the man "remains a touchstone in debates over the shortcomings of American education: a reputable villain for 'back-to-basics' conservatives and an inspiring forefather for 'child-centered' reformers", and yet concluded that "both sides of

these debates tend to misread Dewey's work, to overestimate his influence, and to underplay the democratic ideals that were at the heart of his pedagogy" (1993: 277). Given the controversy surrounding the reception and legacy of Dewey's work, the close connection of his philosophy with that of *Bildung* only underlines the difficulty of attempting to make sense of the latter concept in the context of North American educational discourse.

It is in light of all this that Siljander and Sutinen, in the introduction to their 2012 book, observe that "in most critical evaluations, the *Bildung* concept represents a relic of a past time, for which no use exists in contemporary theoretical discourse" (2). Similarly, in an article revealingly entitled "Do We (Still) Need the Concept of *Bildung*?", Masschelein and Ricken conclude,

> Even if at one moment in history it probably did play a critical role, *Bildung* has long since lost the possibility of functioning as a point of resistance and critical principle for analyzing the ways in which we conduct our lives and the ways in which our conduct is itself conducted, i.e. the ways we are governed and also govern ourselves. (2003: 139)

The progression of *Bildung* across the discursive terrain of Translation Studies, by contrast, has to date proceeded by a much less circuitous route. With the publication of his 1984 *L'épreuve de l'étranger*, Antoine Berman drew the concept of *Bildung* into the discourse of the emerging discipline in a way that reached back to original writings of German Romantic philosophers, thereby circumventing much of the dispersal just described, and insisted on *Bildung* less as a formal pedagogical model than as a mode of engagement with the foreign that is translational to its very core.  By focusing on particular aspects of the concept thus renewed, then, it becomes possible for us to begin imagining how translation could now turn around and offer back to education some of the strength of *Bildung*, a borrowed term now returned with fresh potential.

James Good (2010) describes the German Romantic concept of *Bildung* as a complex process of growth and maturation through a cyclical movement "of alienation and return, in which the mind is continually stretched beyond its ordinary point of view" (para. 14). Rather than the simple unfolding of an immanent form or innate potential – an overly simplistic idea of *Bildung*, in Good's estimation –, *Bildung* is better understood as an unending process of "relentless self-estrangement" (Schmidt 1996: 630), followed by the movement of return to the self "enlarged and transformed" (Good 2010: para. 14).

According to Hegel's formulation (1807/1977), the self proceeds through the world in artless harmony with it, in a state referred to as 'natural consciousness'. This natural state and process is interrupted only when the self encounters a 'negation', that is, an obstacle on projected path, a "disruption to the process of living" (Good 2010: para. 11). It is only at this moment, when the simple harmony dissolves, that an individual becomes aware of the subject/object dualism which distinguishes the self from that which is outside of it. Reunification can be achieved only if one is able to successfully imagine a solution to the situation, in the process altering the self and the project of living as previously understood, as well as the obstacle encountered, inevitably modified in the attempt to reconcile the self and the environment and dissolve the dualism which had emerged. A negation thus resolved is then considered a 'determinate negation', having led to valuable experience, growth and learning. Far from a passive experience simply undergone by an individual, such growth through the course of *Bildung* instead requires genuine effort of a person responsible for the realization of his or her own progressive growth.

In other words, *Bildung* is conceived as a triadic process – both formative and transformative – that takes place when individuals, already conscious of their own identities, not only come into contact with but truly experience and live something new and foreign – something other – to such a degree that they are able to step back and view themselves in a new way in relation to that other. It is only then that they will be able to return to themselves, to that place where they had formerly been, but now as new people seeing the world and acting differently upon it than they would have previously.

Equally important to understanding the early German conception of *Bildung* is awareness of its (at least) twofold ties to the political. First is simply recognition that this progression of growth or development is not limited to the level of individual formation, but encompasses also that of a people or a society. Herder was among those noted for his decidedly political use of the concept, conceiving of *Bildung* on the collective level as "the totality of experiences that provide a coherent identity, a sense of common destiny, to a people" (ibid.: para 3).[29]

Perhaps even more fundamental, however, is the realization that social and political critique are themselves central to the very model of *Bildung*. This is what Bauer refers to as the movement's "critical impetus" (2003b: 211). For inasmuch as *Bildung* is concerned with the growth in experience of an individual or collective self, it is a growth in experience that takes place within specific social and political circumstances and is inseparable from them. As a result, that struggle of the self to imagine solutions to obstacles encountered along the way, to transform them from negations to determinate negations, likewise comprises a struggle to modify and

---

[29] von Humbolt was also noted for his political use of the term. However, he differed from Herder in that he believed, at least for a time, that such collective *Bildung* could proceed for a group of people even when organized by the State, as long as the State held back from intervening in the actual content or outcome. Such an understanding serves the project of nation-building well and aligns easily with the functional conception of *Bildung* often spoken of in conjunction with curriculum design for public schooling. However, it is doubtful whether such a restrained exercise of State power is sustainable, and so this line of argument is generally regarded as very controversial and simply rejected by many (cf. Masschelein and Ricken 2003: 140).

develop the world around, to imagine "new forms of possible self-world relations" through the "creative reconstruction and transformation" of the cultural and the social (ibid.: 211). The natural course of *Bildung*'s movement, therefore, demands critical reflection about the social environment, its practices, and its capability to adequately deal with changing events and circumstances. It is for this that Smith (1989) characterized *Bildung* as "a method of immanent cultural critique" (10).

This is the conception of *Bildung* that Berman first drew into the discourse of Translation Studies in 1984. Although he by no means ignored or denied the educational aspect of the concept, his was a discussion well removed from pedagogical and curricular debates, a discussion instead with focus trained on *Bildung* as a manner of relation to the foreign and the unknown, an epistemological method through which "an individual, a people, a nation, but also a language, a literature, a world of art in general are formed and thus acquire a form, a *Bild*" (Berman 1984/1992: 43).[30] Considered from this perspective, Berman argues that *Bildung* is a fundamentally translational process, the movements of each phenomenon being mirrored in the other: each

> starts from what is one's own, the same (the known, the quotidian, the familiar), in order to go towards the foreign, the other (the unknown, the miraculous, the *Unheimliche*), and, starting from this experience, *to return to its point of departure*. (ibid.: 46)

At their core, both hold to the same aim, that is, "to open up […] a certain relation with the Other, to fertilize what is one's Own through the mediation of what is Foreign" (ibid.: 4).

---

[30] In this, Berman's work agrees easily with Bauer's, who also attempted to shift the focus of curricular discussions, observing in reference to the *Bildungsroman*: "It is no coincidence that, here, the personal development of the protagonist does not occur through institutionalized processes of learning but through the life experience, especially that gained through travel and encounters with other people and other cultures" (2003a: 134).

If, in light of all of this, we once accept that the concept of *Bildung* as used in translational discourse, with its distinct path of discursive development and comparatively limited scope of usage, does in fact present an understanding sufficiently distinct from that confusion generally existent in current pedagogical discussion, we can then turn our attention to discerning what might be gained from applying the concept anew to education as seen through the lens of a translational paradigm.

The first thing to be noted in this regard is that Berman himself opened the door to such paradigmatic thinking in his own writing on translation and *Bildung*. By its very nature, he asserted, "translation (as the mode of relation to the foreign) is structurally inscribed in *Bildung*" (ibid.: 43) and so is centrally implicated in identity formation, whether at the individual or collective level. And yet as intimate and intricate as this relation is, he went on to reflect, it is not in reality altogether unique, standing instead as part of "a series of other 'trans-lations' which constitute as many critical relations to the self and the foreign" (ibid.: 47). Though he did not go on to elaborate at length on the other 'trans-lations' that comprise this series, it is to other transformative processes in which an encounter with the Other mediates or serves as catalyst for the growth of the Self that he makes reference. And so in this single commentary we can observe an openness toward, even if not an argument for, a paradigmatic mode of thinking about translation, with *Bildung* understood as a central connection. If a primary goal of our current project is, as we have stated, to draw Translation Studies more fully into the interdisciplinary discussions surrounding identity, it seems evident that *Bildung* is one concept that could thus aid us on our way, an initial gain from thus renewed reflection.

If, in the desire for specific application, we maintain our focus on education as a single example, however, and even narrow our perspective more to consider First Nations education in

particular, the lines of connection by which the paradigm could lead us toward critical reflection soon begin to multiply.

We begin with a basic assertion: the movement of *Bildung*, characteristic of translation, is, as we have seen, a triadic cycle, starting "from what is one's own, the same […], in order to go towards the foreign, the other […], and, starting from this experience, *to return to its point of departure*" (ibid.: 46). In terms of education, this naturally corresponds with the notion that learning and development must both begin and end in a space or spaces somehow known to the student, somehow relevant to or understandable within their life and experience. However, from Hawthorn's clear assertion that "neither the contemporary provincial school nor the schools that operate specially for Indians are at all closely integrated with the values and the other aspects of the Indian child's culture" (1967, v. 2: 7) to the National Indian Brotherhood's call for forms of schooling that would not be "culturally alien to native students", but would "maintain balance and relevancy between academic/skill subjects and Indian cultural subjects" (1972: 9), the documentation reveals clearly that time and again, the various structures and programs employed for Aboriginal education have failed to realize even the first of *Bildung*'s three required stages. From D.C. Scott's articulated aim of using schooling to simply "absorb into the body politic" every Aboriginal person in Canada, thereby nullifying 'the Indian Question' (Erasmus 2003: 3) to Cardinal's lament that "the child went to school an Indian – the young man emerged a nothing" (1969:87), the documentation highlighting failure to achieve the cycle's third constitutive motion is equally convincing. It is clear that, if the goal of translation, and thereby of education as translation, is to "fertilize what is one's Own through the mediation of what is Foreign" (Berman 1984/1992: 4), the models of First Nations education which we have surveyed have without exception demonstrated failure to achieve this aim. Consideration in light of

*Bildung* not only directs our gaze toward points of break down, but also of potential reconstruction.

A second basic assertion: *Bildung* as a process of identity formation is one that must be lived by all. "The almost constant use of organic images to characterize *Bildung*," observes Berman, "indicates that the concept deals with a necessary process. But at the same time, this process is an unfolding of freedom" (ibid.: 44). Our line of argument thus continued, then, would suggest that encounter with the foreign, with an Other that presents sincere challenge to the Self and to what is already considered to be 'known', must be an integral part of education for all Canadian students. And yet throughout the history of Canadian schooling, it could hardly be disputed that the unrelenting intensity of the trial of the foreign demanded of First Nations students is not comparable to any such demand made of their Euro-Canadian counterparts. This is, in essence, a restatement of what has already been asserted, that is, that the degree of self-translation required of minority-language students in Canadian schools increases proportionally to the distance in status of their language from English as one descends the hierarchical linguistic ladder. In the context of First Nations education again we see this clearly exemplified: students were expected (forced) to engage with the foreign, whether in English or in French, to accept it and to conform to it, continually distancing themselves –physically, mentally, emotionally – from their cultures, their communities and their collective identities. With very few exceptions, however, engagement in the opposite direction, even in integrated classrooms, did not go any further than a minimal exposure to cultural tropes and stereotypes, with no expectation of nor desire for a lasting impact of any real kind. In *Indian Control of Indian Education* we read:

> Integration viewed as a one-way process is not integration, and will fail. In the past, it has been the Indian student who was asked to integrate: to give up his identity, to adopt new values and a new way of life. This restricted interpretation of integration

> must be radically altered if future education programs are to benefit Indian children. […] Non-Indians must be ready to recognize the value of another way of life; to learn about Indian history, customs and language; and to modify, if necessary, some of their own ideas and practices. (National Indian Brotherhood 1972: 25, 26)

The argument of *Bildung* supports this call for reciprocal engagement, not as an option to be considered, but as an imperative to be realized if we are to truly know ourselves as Canadians, even if such engagement is not without risk: "The passage through the foreign makes the threat of the loss of one's own identity hover perpetually over the level of the individual as well as that of a people and a history" (Berman 1984/1992: 33).

At the moment we begin to speak of loss, a certain difficulty emerges, not unique to but certainly evident in Berman's formulation of *Bildung*. Hegel spoke of this risk of loss in terms of 'existential crisis', occurring when a negation which has 'disrupted the process of living' cannot be transformed into a determinate negation, that is, when the self cannot imagine a solution to the problem or obstacle confronted that is sufficient to restore the harmony of their progress (Good 2010: para. 11). Berman, from his perspective, instead frames the question of loss using the simplistic terms of 'good' and 'bad' translation. "Limitation," he writes, "is what distinguishes the experience of *Bildung* from the purely erratic and chaotic adventure where one loses oneself. The *grand tour* does not consist of going just anywhere, but there where one can form and educate oneself, and progress towards oneself" (Berman 1984/1992: 48). A 'good' translation, then, is one which is open to a sincere experience of the other, does not shy away from strangeness, and undergoes "a certain expansion" without failing to return to its point of departure (ibid.: 36). A 'bad' translation, by contrast, breaks the cycle of *Bildung* "in a movement governed by the law of appropriation, […] simply an annexation or a reduction of the other to the same" (ibid.: 46). Such argumentation brings to the fore an unavoidable ethical

component, and the presence of underlying assumptions which, in light of the complexities of reality, cannot be taken as universals of truth. The simple categories of 'good' and 'bad' are infinitely problematic in translation and hardly less so in education (not to mention any other transformative process we might consider looking at in our paradigmatic framework). The ethical debate which may proceed from here could occupy us almost endlessly, and we do not want to minimize its importance. However, even without delving into this vital discussion, in the specific context of our concrete application to First Nations education, there are nonetheless observations that can be made about real-world losses and gains, for better or for worse.

For example, in reflecting on his research into Aboriginal schooling carried out in the 1960s, Hawthorn observed that although

> the efforts made to get all children in school, keep them there for a longer time and have them share all the educational benefits received by other Canadian children have been vastly increased from the time of the first moves towards school integration some twenty years ago, […] the numbers in high school and in post-secondary institutions are not yet near the size that will be needed to reach educational equality with the rest of the nation, and perhaps it could be said that most of the Indian's problems have even moved ahead of their educational solutions in the past few decades. (1967, v. 2: 6)

Fully five decades later, the situation has hardly changed. "Aboriginals are struggling to keep up, even while making tremendous strides," Friesen writes. "The number of aboriginal people with university degrees has nearly doubled over the past decade, yet the gap in education levels between aboriginal and other Canadians has only grown wider" (2013: 1). According to a 2012 Fact Sheet on First Nations Education, "61% of First Nation young adults (20-24) have not completed high school, compared with 13% of non-Aboriginal people in Canada" and "only 4% of First Nations people on reserve, and 8% in total, have a university degree, compared to 23%

of the Canadian population" (Chiefs Assembly on Education 2012: 2). Time and again, as was demonstrated in the previous chapter, continued low levels of engagement in schooling and educational attainment have been consistently attributed in large part (though it cannot be claimed exclusively) to issues of linguistic and cultural disconnect. Whether framed in terms of *Bildung*, of translation, or simply of education, the lack of definitive progress in this regard despite the passage of time, the investment of effort and the progression through various models of schooling points to an undeniable problem which continues to demand redress.

In all of this, our reflection on *Bildung*, understood in translational perspective and applied to First Nations education through the lens of a translational paradigm, leads naturally toward that "immanent cultural critique" (Smith 1989:10) that is an inherent aspect of the concept. Beyond the questions that have already been prompted, if we moreover take seriously the unpredictability of *Bildung* – that is, the idea that the "unfolding of freedom" and "expansion" of the self (Berman 1984/1992: 44, 36) proceeds in a unique manner for every self – we are provided with new grounds on which to contest the apparently immutable linguistic and social hierarchy that continues to result from and be reflected in Canadian schooling.

In this way we might continue at length, and the more detailed our examination and explanation of the *Bildung*, the more complex and incisive our critical reflection on education as translation will become, allowing us to explore and think in new ways about many of the challenges presented by this intricate transformative process. Yet *Bildung* is but one concept among the many which mark the discursive terrain of Translation Studies, holding within themselves to varying degrees potential to similarly open new paths of reflection in expanded contexts through paradigmatic thinking.

*iii. Narratives*

Narrative is the third potentially productive mode of entry into critical reflection on translation and education that we will pause to consider. In the previous two chapters we have considered and rehearsed the overarching public narrative which has come to dominate common understandings of Canadian history. This is the narrative that begins with the discovery of a *terra nullius* – a land empty of culture and civilization, if not exactly empty of people. The narrative continues with the founding of the country, a joint venture of two nations cast as partners, albeit arguably not always equal ones. With the passage of time, people from other ethnic and cultural backgrounds came to join the English and the French in the process of civilizing the unconquered land, while the Aboriginal peoples already here were continually met with "benevolent gentleness", tolerance and justice (Mackey 2002: 1). Alongside this narrative, a particular conception of Canadian identity also consistently emerged: a Canadianness marked, as we have already seen, by tolerance toward difference and openness to dialogue on the one hand – as demonstrated by the federal government structure adopted and the negotiations carried out with the francophone minority – and, on the other, by benevolence to those thought to be less capable or less advanced – as evidenced in the various provisions made for the Aboriginal peoples of the land.

The construction of this narrative identity necessarily involved multiple groups of players – the British, the French, the ethnic 'others' and the Aboriginal communities – and as it was repeatedly written into various official documents and circulated through the organization and teaching of public schooling, each group came to understand the role in which they had been cast and the place that it afforded them in the country, that is, the degree of their proximity to or distance from the Canadian centre and the extent of translation that would be needed in order to

move closer to the core. Strategic governance and careful management of public discourse ensured that, social circumstances changing as they may, nothing would substantially upend or uproot the hierarchy that had thus been established.

Even so, in surveying the history of Canada in terms of its linguistic and educational development, we have yet caught glimpses of counter-narratives that have at different times been given voice along the way. These have ranged from repeated calls for Quebecois independence, particularly on historical grounds (cf. Howard-Hassmann 1991), to the Ukrainian community's demands for recognition of their language at a national level (cf. Hudyma 2011), to the refusal of constitutional amendments which did not include consideration of Canada's First Nations (cf. Parkinson 2007). Each of these – along with countless other incidents we could likewise identify throughout the years – represents a perspective and understanding of history that in some way runs counter to the prevailing public narrative; and though not all are heard at the same volume in the social sphere, each one points to a different way of constructing the Canadian story, a different selection of elements and events to be included and prioritized in the telling. And herein lies the key for our discussion – the key to reframing events in Canadian history and, in the process of the retelling, to reimagining social and linguistic relationships and identity in Canada.

In arguing for the concept of narrative identity, Paul Ricoeur once wrote, "At the same time that the recounted actions receive the temporal unity of a story from the plot, the characters of the story can also be said to be plotted out" (1996: 6). Even as the active process of emplotment composes meaningful lives out of the raw, unprocessed material of discrete and disparate events, so too does this same constructive act of narration simultaneously develop the characters recounted therein – positioning them within their social world, whether in a role of

power or in one of subservience; informing and explaining their relationships with those around them, whether marked by amiability or animosity; and providing motive and rationale for all sorts of actions and reactions in the full range of contexts encountered. In a very real sense, then, we come into being through the shaping of our stories; we come to know ourselves as individuals and as collectivities with meaning and purpose, with identities ever still emerging and mid-formation, through the telling and continual retelling of our ontological and public narratives.

The notion of continual retelling is essential here, for stories, even those once told, are never static entities. On the contrary, they exist as ongoing works of composition. Their recounting is a continuous process of synthesis, ceaselessly seeking to incorporate the apparently heterogeneous elements encountered into the expanding fabric of the tale. In the unending construction of these narratives from which we gain our sense of identity, we are constantly striving to strike a balance between "the concordance of the story, taken as a structured totality, and the discordance imposed by encountered events; […] a dialectic of order and disorder" (ibid.).

This movement between concordance and discordance is a dance that is in one way or another performed by us all, and yet here again it is not difficult to imagine why the experience of this dialectic might be considerably more challenging for those negotiating an intercultural encounter, where the concordance and its discordance arise from entirely different linguistic and cultural settings. For even the most personal of narratives, Ricoeur argues, is reliant on collective symbols and structures, on the shared methods of meaning-making inherent to and learned within a culture. The way we construct and understand our stories, he explains, the way we shape our temporalities and locate ourselves in the world, the way we find a place for our ontological narratives within the space provided by a given public narrative is dependent in large measure, if

not entirely, on the "customs, rules, norms, beliefs and convictions" found in the collective

memory of the culture or group with which we identify (ibid.: 5; cf. Iser 1995). This knowledge

and these values, passed down to us by our parents, our teachers, our elders, often in an implicit

or even subconscious form, provide the subtle background against which each of the narratives

through which we constitute our identities is both shaped and interpreted. And just as the

ideological presuppositions and semantic categories by which a culture divides up and

conceptualizes the world lead to lexical and syntactic structures not commensurable from one

language to the next, so too do the collective memories and beliefs that underlie our narratives

render them in forms incommensurable from one culture to the next.

"This is one reason why even a concrete personal story told in one language cannot

necessarily be retold or translated into another language unproblematically," concurs Mona

Baker (2006). "The interdependence between the personal and the collective means that the

retelling is inevitably constrained by the shared linguistic and narrative resources available in the

new setting" (28-29). In cases of intercultural encounter, then, the dialectic of concordance and

discordance demands not just a simple retelling, but a complete process of decontextualization

and recontextualization, an adaptation to an entirely distinct social order, one in which all of the

"symbols, linguistic formulations, structures, and vocabularies of motive – without which the

personal [narrative] would remain unintelligible and uninterpretable" have been substituted and

replaced (Ewick and Silbey 1995: 212). The narrative, simply speaking, must be translated.

This translation of narrative and self, of course, is driven not only by the need for

personal or psychological satisfaction, but moreover by the imperative of avoiding social

alienation and maintaining relationship with those around us. We must "negotiate our way

around the various incompatibilities or conflicts between our ontological narrative and those of

other individuals with whom we share a social space," Baker insists, "in order to be believed, respected, trusted – in short, to avoid 'ontological abandonment'" (2006:31). The same line of argument was earlier put forward by Rafael (1988), who wrote:

> Translation arises from the need to relate one's interest to that of others and so to encode it appropriately. Translation in this case involves not simply the ability to speak in a language other than one's own but the capacity to reshape one's thoughts and actions in accordance with accepted forms. It thus coincides with the need to submit to the conventions of a given social order. […] Translation is then a matter of first discerning the differences between and within social codes and then of seeing the possibility of getting across those differences. To do so is to succeed in communicating, that is, in recognizing and being recognized within the intelligible limits of a linguistic and social order. Hence, if translation is to take place at all, it must do so within a context of expectation: that in return for one's submission, one gets back the other's acknowledgement of the value of one's words and behavior. In this way, one finds for oneself a place on the social map. (210)

We translate, in other words, both our selves and our narratives in the search for social recognition. We persistently seek ways of relating our experiences to those of the people around us, even when the differences between them require a dramatic reframing of the events we recount if they are to be understood, a fundamental reshaping of our own thoughts and actions. And as our narratives thus intersect with the narratives of others, as we reshape and reframe them in the pursuit of communication and communion, we begin to understand their significance differently ourselves in light of the new place assigned us, the new narrative told about us, within our new social sphere.

For students such as those with whom we are currently concerned – emerging from a community in which a language and culture other than that of the majority predominates, and yet entering the mainstream system of public schooling – this process of reframing lived experience

and translating personal narrative is not carried out independently, but is rather informed by clear suggestions made – if not directions given – in the classroom and the school. Such suggestions begin, as we have already seen, with the structure of the schooling system itself, communicated first through the languages of instruction allowed and disallowed, through the funding allotted for various language and culture classes, and through the degree of integration, or lack thereof, of the school and the community. But this is by no means where it ends, as parallel suggestions are likewise incorporated into the narratives presented by the curriculum itself. This reality was clearly recognized in the findings of the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission who, in speaking of the 'other ethnic groups', acknowledged that their treatment in Canadian textbooks routinely implied that

> they would become good Canadians when they have submerged their ethnic identity. As one textbook says of Ivan, who is presented as the archetype, 'His greatest satisfaction was to see his children go off to school where they could mix with Canadians and learn to speak their language.' Although Ivan is pictured as being proud of his folk traditions, 'Before long, Ivan lost a little of his funny accent and a great deal of his loneliness.' (RCBB 1968, v. 2: 282)

Such examples, drawn in the report from a number of Canadian history books, explicitly link language and culture with social acceptance and belonging, again sending a very clear message about the requirement of translation for increased acceptance in Canadian society.

This sort of directed translation and transformation, of course, is not always easily accepted, and it is from here that counter-narratives emerge. For although we do, in truth, habitually bend our ontological narratives to accommodate the public ones we are told, still every time an individual encounters some incongruity between the accepted collective account and their own personal story, there is an opportunity to contest. Every time the public narrative includes "aspects which the person as a member of the group cannot easily accommodate in their

own story of identity" (Whitebrook 2001: 145), there is an opening to question. Every time they do not see themselves reflected in the authoritative public account, there is the possibility of dissention through the construction and elaboration of an alternative or counter-narrative.

"Since social actors do not freely construct their own private or public narratives," Somers observes,

> we can also expect to find that confusion, powerlessness, despair, victimization, and even madness are some of the outcomes of an inability to accommodate certain happenings within the range of available cultural, public, and institutional narratives. […] Choosing narratives to express multiple subjectivities is a deliberate way of rejecting the neutrality and appearance of objectivity typically embedded in master narratives. […] Writing counter-narratives is a crucial strategy when one's identity is not expressed in the dominant public ones. (1994: 630-631)

It is a crucial strategy for any marginalized individual or group that seeks to maintain a coherent sense of identity in the face of incongruent experiences. It is likewise a crucial strategy for any who seek to challenge, to shift, or even to upend the established social order.

In even our rapid overview of Canadian history, we have seen instances of contestation emerge: the protest at Oka which insistently maintained the sacredness of an ancient burial ground, even to the point of armed conflict (cf. Conradi 2009); the legal fight of Sparrow, insisting on the upholding of Musqueam fishing rights (cf. Salomons & Hanson n.d.); and the sit-in staged at the Blue Quills school in Alberta to protest plans to integrate First Nations students into provincial schools (cf. Carney 1983) are but three examples wherein the movement of the dominant public narrative conflicted violently enough with the counter-narrative of an individual or group that the dispute reached the attention of the Canadian public and sufficiently opened the way for discussion and debate that the outcome of the situation was altered. Clearly such situations remain the exception and not the norm, relatively isolated instances against the broad

backdrop of history, and yet they stand out to us as demonstrations that change is possible where one has the courage to doggedly challenge the dominant narrative. Yet if the calls for change we have already heard are to be seriously considered and pursued, then such instances of challenge will need to be welcomed, rather than resisted, as we willingly open space for these counter-expressions, as we willingly listen to them, ready to hear what they may have to teach.

The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, for instance, was established for the purpose of investigating "the evolution of the relationship among aboriginal peoples (Indian, Inuit and Métis), the Canadian government, and Canadian society as a whole" (1996, v.1: 664). As was discussed in the previous chapter, its recommendations in the end called for nothing short of "a complete restructuring of the relationship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in Canada" (Doerr 2006: para. 5). "The Commission's proposals," it was asserted, "are not concerned with multicultural policy, but with a vision of a just multinational federation that recognizes its historical foundations and values its historical nations as an integral part of the Canadian identity and the Canadian political fabric" (ibid.: 7). It is clear that such a rethinking of Canadian history and recognition of First Nations as equal participants in a 'multinational federation' is not in line with the dominant narrative as it has been repeatedly told and retold.

Similarly, in his historic statement of apology to former students of the residential schools, Prime Minister Harper insisted that it was time to begin

> forging a new relationship between Aboriginal peoples and other Canadians, a relationship based on the knowledge of our shared history, a respect for each other and a desire to move forward together with a renewed understanding that strong families, strong communities and vibrant cultures and traditions will contribute to a stronger Canada for all of us. (Canada 2008: para. 9)

Yet it is equally clear that such progress forward will not be possible as long as we cling to the public narratives that have thus far predominated. Such calls for change cannot be accomplished

through a continuation in the same direction, nor by a retelling of the same narrative. If such

calls for change are to be taken seriously, we must open the way for alternative understandings

of our history and alternative conceptions of our collective identity as the translated narratives of

individual Canadians intersect and intertwine with our collective story.

# CONCLUSION

"The destiny of a people is intricately bound to the way its children are educated" (RCAP 1996, v. 3: 404). It was in this firm belief that the current study undertook its examination of language and education policy in Canada, seeking to understand how these two factors together impacted the formation of identity, not just for individual students in the classroom, but more broadly for the linguistic and cultural communities of which they are a part, as they struggle to establish a place for themselves within Canada's social sphere.

Over the last number of decades, the significance of this connection between language, identity and education as been increasingly recognized. UNESCO's position paper on *Education in a Multilingual World*, for instance, remarked that "questions of identity, nationhood and power are closely linked to the use of specific languages in the classroom," continuing on to explain how

> the choice of language in the educational system confers a power and prestige through its use in formal instruction. Not only is there a symbolic aspect, referring to status and visibility, but also a conceptual aspect referring to shared values and worldview expressed through and in that language. (2003: 8, 14)

Academic studies have similarly focused in on the centrality of language to collective identity, some going so far as to cite this as "the single most important aspect of human language" (Edwards 2010: 3), while turning time and again to consider the role and responsibility of schooling in promoting and perpetuating this aspect of communal life and advancement (ibid.: 133ff, 146ff, 156ff). Repeatedly, Canadian government reports have also been drawn to the same conclusion. "Education is vitally concerned with both language and culture," read the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, for instance.

Educational institutions exist to transmit them to a younger generation and to foster their development. The future of language and culture […] thus depends upon an educational régime which makes it possible for them to remain 'present and creative.' […] Other institutions impose a structure on our economic and social life and their importance cannot be underestimated. Changes in education, however, will facilitate reforms elsewhere and are a prerequisite for some of the other changes which must be made. (RCBB 1968, v.2: 3)

While it remains true, then, that language and education are but two of the many factors which variously contribute to the formation of identity and the structuring of our social context, such reflections continually confirm that they are, in fact, two centrally important factors to consider.

Education systems in Canada – particularly when considered from a linguistic perspective – have been founded on unequal ground from the very start. Although at the moment of Confederation English and French were both afforded official status and ostensibly given equal pride of place at the national level, the linguistic rights laid out by the federal government were only ever matched in two of the ten provinces. While constitutional provisions were in place to protect minority speakers of English in Quebec, no such protection was guaranteed to the francophone minority spread throughout the remainder of the country. Even so, as discourse in the education domain slowly shifted its focus from religious concerns to linguistic ones, requirements for the availability of education in both official languages eventually came to constitute the norm, following arguments for the "moral right of Canadian parents to have their children educated in the official language of their choice" (ibid.: 142).

No such 'moral right' could be claimed by speakers of others languages, however. To speakers of heritage languages, mother tongue education was only ever presented as a privilege, not a right – something extra that could perhaps be considered a luxury, but that should always

be approached cautiously since, parents were warned, it could later "be resented and may lead some individuals to drift away from their cultural group" (RCBB 1969b, v.4: 107). Far from being that which allowed an individual "to find, at all levels of human activity, a setting which will permit him to develop, to express himself, and to create in accordance with his own culture" (RCBB 1967, v.1: xli), mother tongue education in heritage languages was thought to be more harmful than helpful to Canadians. Aboriginal parents, by contrast, were not even offered such a warning or given this much choice. Instead, the speaking of Aboriginal languages was for many years simply forbidden in schools, as part of an intentional effort of assimilation and resolution of the 'Indian problem' (Erasmus 2003: 3).

As was discussed in chapter 2, it is necessary to recognize frankly that there were, to a certain extent, pragmatic reasons for the variant treatment of different languages within education systems in Canada. However, inconsistencies such as this in the argumentation and reasoning put forward point toward the presence of prejudicial attitudes lying just beneath the surface and also serving as a motivating factor for the differential recommendations made. Not only this, but as the years progressed and social realities began to shift and change, careful management of the lines of public discourse allowed for continued maintenance of the status quo in this regard, even as changes appeared to be announced and hailed. From the strategic conceptual separation of language and culture in Trudeau's introduction of 'Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework', to the gradual shift of focus from cultural to civil rights in the later adoption of official multicultural legislation, to the replacement of concerns for collective cultural rights by those of individual expression and equality, thereby removing from any group other than the English and the French the possibility of significant influence in the political and

social sphere, malleable discursive tactics were continually employed to ensure always reproduction and renewal of the same.

Despite the rhetoric of multicultural equality, then, our consideration of Canadian legislation revealed instead a clear hierarchy of languages and cultures established in law, rooted and reflected in social institutions, reinforced and replicated through formal systems of education.

In parallel to this linguistic and educational hierarchy, there also emerged a notion of Canadian identity which, although framed in terms of multiculturalism and inclusion, proved itself to be similarly stratified. Though in its earliest conception, Canada was unabashed in its desire to emulate Britain, centralizing both English language and culture, in time this evolved instead into an uneasy balance of English and French, particularly following the tabling of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism's final report and the advent of official bilingualism in Canada. Nonetheless, the passing of the *Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54) was less the realization of parity between the two languages and cultures than it was a pledge to pursue that parity moving forward, while still a distance was maintained between the two.

In the same way, the country's move toward multiculturalism – intended to give recognition and place to the many other ethnic groups which were part of the Canadian landscape and to affirm "that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity" (Canada 1971: 8580) – also struggled to fulfill its own goal. "Multiculturalism's commitment to developing a distinct Canadian identity was clear enough," observes Thobani (2007),

> but it was unable to balance the foundational claims of the British and French with the demands for inclusion of the multitudes of other cultural groups. The policy's inability to resolve the contradiction between the definition of the nation as bilingual

and bicultural and the heterogeneous nature of the population, rendered it excessively ambiguous and internally contradictory. (144-145)

Meanwhile, the First Nations of Canada continued to find themselves figured as prominent players in the country's history, but without being thought to have a significant contribution to make to the present. Beyond a single acknowledging mention of the "rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada" in the preamble to the *Multiculturalism Act* (S.C. 1988, c. 31), few further strides were at the time taken to even attempt to equalize the treatment of and respect afforded Aboriginal languages and cultures along with the others.

Thus, the placement of a language on the country's linguistic hierarchy was matched by the place given its culture on the social hierarchy which paralleled it. And just as speakers of minority languages were taught as students that to achieve success in schooling, they must translate their speech, their thinking, and their ways of knowing into the language and manners of the majority, so as members of their communities did they learn that, in order to gain increased acceptance and a place of full participation in society, they must translate their ways of acting, of relating to others, and of being in the world. In short, they must translate themselves.

This idea of translating identities became the focus of our discussion in chapter 4. Increasingly, the concept of translation has been taken up and used in various fields of academic discourse as

> a way of thinking about how languages, people, and cultures are transformed as they move between different places […and] as a way of describing how the individual or the group can be transformed by changing their sense of their own place in society. (Young 2003: 29)

Recognizing that, in the movement from a home or community in which a minority language and culture predominates into a school governed by the language and cultural of the majority,

students are also in this manner transformed; and realizing that as these transformed students return to their communities, these are likewise impacted in terms of their sense of belonging in society; we undertook to examine this educational context in light of a translational paradigm, seeking to discern what new insights might be gained from this sort of critical engagement with the issue at hand.

The first benefit of viewing the school as a 'translational space' proved to be the range of significant questions which such metaphorical consideration enabled us to raise: questions about the positionality of the teacher within a complex web of social and political relations; questions about the ethics of the teacher and the school, whether complicit with or striving against the existing status quo; questions about the tension that balances the student between dependence and autonomy, between 'reproduction' of the dominant norms and knowledge and the generative potential of multilingual, multicultural engagement; questions about how the maintenance of this tension affects entry and acceptance into society beyond the classroom; and more. All these, and countless other questions like them, are opened wide to examination through the lens of translational thinking, especially in a multicultural, multilingual context like Canada, where asymmetrical power relations and hierarchical structures are reinforced by the pragmatics of translated speech.

A second method of engaging with education as translation came in the reconsideration of *Bildung*, a particular conception belonging to translational discourse which was productively applied to challenge certain aspects prevailing in current approaches to First Nations education. Reflection on *Bildung*'s triadic nature, for instance, prompts us to reexamine how teaching should be made relevant to the knowledge and experience of Aboriginal students; recognition of *Bildung* as a necessary, organic process that must be lived by all pushes us to question the

imbalance of other-cultural requirements and the degree of self translation required of Aboriginal students when compared to demands made of their non-Aboriginal counterparts; and remembering that *Bildung* is at its core ultimately an unpredictable process of 'unfolding freedom' leads us to problematize again the apparently immutable linguistic and social hierarchy that continues to time and again both result from and be reflected in the structure of Canadian schooling. By way of inquiries such as these, consideration of education in light of *Bildung* not only directs our gaze toward points of break down in the system, but also toward spaces of potential reconstruction.

The third mode of entry into critical reflection on translation and education to be considered was through the concept of narrative. Throughout our discussion, the notion of narrative provided us a useful framework in which to talk about the complexities of identity formation, and to understand the intricate relationships of interdependency that exist between various narrative levels, allowing insight into the process of the continuous reformation and transformation of identity in light of changing circumstance. Likewise, translation in its turn provided us a more concrete way of talking about the impact that comes with movement of a narrative of identity from one cultural setting to another – when the narrative in which we find our place must be not just retold, but retold in a different language, in a different context, and in light of an entirely different way of seeing the world. This is the experienced lived by so many who migrate from one country to another, learning along the way that, in the words of Verena Stefan, "setting off from one continent and landing on another […] means to translate myself, my whole existence into another one, without knowing the target language" (2000: 23). Yet as so many individual ontological narratives are in this way translated into a new setting, a new

culture, a new context, so too is narrative of the nation itself transformed through the process of mutual revision required by the unavoidable "entanglement of life stories" (Ricoeur 1996: 9).

In a context such as Canada, of course, it is not only the translation of immigrants' and refugees' narratives that should necessarily push us toward this mutual revision, but also and perhaps even more fundamentally the narratives of Canada's First Nations. For although we have now long inhabited the same land, there can be no doubt of the distance maintained between our languages, cultures, perceptions and stories. For at the very root of the persistently conflictual relationship between the Government of Canada and the country's Aboriginal peoples is full subscription to and deep-seated belief in fundamentally different narratives of the nation's history. On the one side is a story of discovery and colonization, the benevolent bringing of civilization and progress, ever structured by the relationship of a dominant majority to the various other minorities in its realm. On the other side, however, is the story of welcoming new and strange others to a land already occupied and cultivated for millennia, of the pursuit of negotiations on equal ground between equally sovereign governing nations. No simple retelling of the story on either side of this divide can ever suffice to cross it; only a sincere commitment of both to mutual understanding and the revision of narratives, a sincere openness to the productivity of translation, which can create new forms and meanings through broadened conceptions and unexpected juxtapositions, offers up the possibility of "revising horizons on both sides" (Fuchs 2009: 28), proceeding together, to use Hoffman's formulation, "by the motions of understanding and sympathy" (1989: 211).

2013 marked the fifth anniversary of Harper's now historic Statement of Apology to former students of Canada's residential schools. It was also the 250th anniversary of King George

III's Royal Proclamation in 1763, which laid out the first grounds of relationship between First Nations and the Crown. The Government of Canada chose to mark the occasion with the elaboration and tabling of new legislation for the governance of Aboriginal education in Canada: the *First Nations Control of First Nations Education Act*, otherwise known as Bill C-33. It began bright with the potential of promise and change, hailed as a "historic milestone for First Nations and all Canadians" (Canada 2014: para. 4) resulting from "unprecedented investment" on the part of the government (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada 2014: 1). It ended a dismal failure. Negotiated over the course of three years, it fell apart in the space of three months, amid complaints that it imposed "increased federal supervision, burdensome compliance and enforcement requirements, […] unilateral national standards and increased administrative reporting" and complaints that, under the new Act, "the Minister has all the authority and no responsibility, while First Nations have all the responsibility and no authority" (Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations; as cited in Crowder 2014: 1, 2).

Barely six months have passed since the Assembly of First Nations formally called for the withdrawal of the bill, and the factors surrounding its demise are even now still emerging. We cannot, as a result, attempt anything like an objective analysis of the process or the document here. Even so, one thing remains clear enough: The underlying narrative has not changed. The underlying hierarchical structure has not shifted. And unless we can address these underlying issues at their root and at their core, no effort at reform – even when made in sincere good faith – will ever be truly sufficient.

Obviously there are no simple solutions to the many complications of negotiating language and culture rights in complex multicultural societies like that of Canada, and yet this

remains an urgently important issue and education remains at its very core. In the conclusion to a

paper entitled "A Second Look at the *First Nations Control of First Nations Education Act*",

recently published by the Caledon Institute of Social Policy, we read:

> Both First Nations and governments are discouraged and disheartened by the
> dramatic failure of the *First Nations Control of First Nations Education Act*.
> Nevertheless, First Nations and all Canadians cannot afford to let the current status
> quo remain for long due to a stalemate. We must gather our resolve, learn lessons
> from what went wrong, and try again to revitalize and renew Canada's support for
> First Nations education. (Mendelson 2014: 16)

The stakes are too high for anything else. For "the destiny of a people is intricately bound to the

way its children are educated" (RCAP 1996, v. 3: 40).

# REFERENCES

**Books/Articles**

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In B. Brewster (Trans.), *Lenin and philosophy, and Other essays* (pp. 127-176). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Apgar, R.B. (2008). *Taming travel & disciplining reason: Enlightenment and pedagogy in the work of Joachim Heinrich Campe*. Ann Arbour: ProQuest Publishing.

Appadurai, A. (1993). The heart of whiteness. *Callaloo*, 16 (4), 796-807.

Axelrod, P. (1997). *The promise of schooling: Education in Canada, 1800-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Babaee, N. (2012, March). *Heritage language learning in Canadian public schools: Language rights challenges.* Retrieved from https://umanitoba.ca/faculties/education/media /Babaee12.pdf

Bachmann-Medick, D. (2009). Introduction: The translational turn. *Translation Studies*, 2 (1), 2-16.

Backhouse, C. (1999). *Colour-coded: A legal history of racism in Canada, 1900-1950.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist & C. Emerson (Trans.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (pp. 259-422). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bal, M. (1985). *Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative*. (C. van Boheemen, Trans.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Basalamah, S. (2010). A translational critique of the Arab postcolonial condition. In S.M. Shiyab (Ed.), *Globalization and aspects of translation* (pp. 68-77). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bassnett, S., & Trivedi, H. (Eds.). (1999). *Post-colonial translation: Theory and practice*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bauer, W. (2003a). Introduction. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35 (2), 133-137.

Bauer, W. (2003b). On the relevance of *Bildung* for democracy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35 (2), 211-225.

Benjamin, W. (1996). The task of the translator. In M. Bullock & M.W. Jennings (Eds.), *Walter Benjamn: Selected writings. Vol. 1: 1913-1926* (pp. 75-85). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1923).

Benmayor, R., & Skotnes, A. (Eds.). (1994). *International yearbook of oral history and life stories*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Benveniste, E. (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard.

Berger, P.L. (1963). *Invitation to sociology: A humanistic perspective*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Berman, A. (1992). *The experience of the foreign: Culture and translation in Romantic Germany*. (S. Heyvaert, Trans.) Albany: State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1984).

Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H.K. (2000). On cultural choice. In M. Gerber, B. Hanssen & R. Walkowitz (Eds.), *The turn to ethics* (pp. 181-200). New York: Routledge.

Bhatnagar, J. (1980). Linguistic behavior and adjustment of immigrant children in French and

    English schools in Montreal. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 29, 141-159.

Birenbaum, A., & Sagarin, E. (Eds.). (1973). *People in places: The sociology of the familiar*.

    New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:

    Prentice-Hall.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2$^{nd}$ ed.).

    (Loïc Wacquant, Trans.). London: SAGE Publications. (Original work published 1970).

Boyd, R. (1979). Metaphor and theory change: What is 'metaphor' a metaphor for? In A. Ortony

    (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 409-419). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boyko, J. (1998). *Last steps to freedom: The evolution of Canadian racism*. (2$^{nd}$ ed.). Winnipeg:

    J. Gordon Shillingford Publishing.

Briggs, C.L. (Ed.). (1996). *Disorderly discourse: Narrative, conflict and inequality*. New York &

    Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruner, J.S. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bryce, P.H. (1922). *The story of a national crime: Being an appeal for justice to the Indians of

    Canada; the wards of the nation, our allies in the Revolutionary War, our brothers-in-arms

    in the Great War*. Ottawa: James Hope & Sons.

Capotorti, F. (1977). *Study of the rights of persons belonging to ethnic, religious and linguistic

    minorities*. U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/384.

Cardinal, H. (1969). *The unjust society: The tragedy of Canada's Indians*. Vancouver: Douglas

    & McIntyre.

Cardinal, H. (1977). *The rebirth of Canada's Indians*. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers.

Carney, R.J. (1983). The Hawthorn survey (1966-1967), Indians and Oblates and integrated schooling. *CCHA Study Sessions*, 50, 609-630.

Cassell, E.J. (1991). *The nature of suffering and the goals of medicine*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chesterman, A. (2009). The name and nature of translator studies. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, 13-22.

Cheyfitz, E. (1997). *The poetics of imperialism: Translation and colonization from* The Tempest *to* Tarzan. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Chiefs Assembly on Education. (2012). *A portrait of First Nations and education*. Gatineau: Palais des Congrès de Gatineau.

Churchill, W. (2004). *Kill the Indian, save the man: The genocidal impact of American Indian residential schools*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G.E. (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Conradi, A. (2009). Uprising at Oka: A place of non-identification. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34, 547-566.

Cook, R. (1963). *Canada: A modern study*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin.

Cook-Sather, A. (2006). *Education is translation: A metaphor for change in teaching and learning*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Crapanzano, V. (2003). The metaphoricity of translation: Text, context and fidelity in American jurisprudence. In T. Maranhão & B. Streck (Eds.), *Translation and ethnography: The anthropological challenge of intercultural understanding* (pp. 44-63). Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

Crehan, K. (2002). *Gramsci, culture and anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.

Cronin, M. (2003). *Translation and globalization*. London & New York: Routledge.

Cronin, M. (2006). *Translation and identity*. London & New York: Routledge.

Crowder, J. (2014, April 16). Open letter to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. Retrieved from http://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/13-11-25_open_letter_to_minister_valcourt_final.pdf

Cummins, J. (1993). The research basis for heritage language education. In M. Danesi, K. McLeod & S. Morris (Eds.), *Heritage languages and education: The Canadian experience* (pp. 1-22). Oakville: Mosaic Press.

Cummins, J. & Mulcahy, R. (1978). Orientation to language in Ukrainian-English bilingual children. *Child Development*, 49, 1239-1242.

Day, R.J.F. (2000). *Multiculturalism and the history of Canadian diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

de Montaigne, M. (1700). "On the art of conference." In *The essays of Michel de Montaigne*. (Vol. 3). (C. Cotton, Trans.). Retrieved from http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3600/3600-h/3600-h.htm (Original work published 1580).

de Swaan, A. (1993). The emergent world language system. *International Political Science Review*, 14 (3), 219-226.

Derrida, J. (1998). Des tours de Babel. In J. Graham (Ed.), *Difference in translation* (pp. 165-207). Ithaca: Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1987).

Dewey, J. (2001). *The child and the curriculum*. Mineola: Dover Publications. (Original work published in 1902).

Dewey, J. (2009). *Democracy and education*. New York: Merchant Books. (Original work

   published in 1916).

Dizdar, D. (2009). Translational transitions: 'Translational proper' and translation studies in the

   humanities. *Translation Studies*, 2 (1), 89-102.

Doerr, A. (2013, December 16). Royal commission on Aboriginal peoples. In D. Aronovitch

   (Ed.), *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from

   http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/royal-commission-on-aboriginal-

   peoples/

Dolson, D. (1985). The effects of Spanish home language use on the scholastic performance of

   Hispanic pupils. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6, 135-156.

Downey, G., Eccles, J.S., & Chatman, C.M. (Eds.). (2005). *Navigating the future: Social

   identity, coping and life tasks*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Duff, P.A. & Li, D. (2009). Indigenous, minority, and heritage language education in Canada:

   Policies, contexts, and issues. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/Revue canadienne

   des langues vivantes*, 66 (1), 1-8.

Dunmore, C.W. (1993). *Studies in etymology*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Books.

Edmondson, H.T. (2006). *John Dewey and the decline of American education: How the patron

   saint of schools has corrupted teaching and learning*. Wilmington: ISI Books.

Edwards, J. (1993). Identity and language in the Canadian educational context. In M. Danesi, K.

   McLeod & S. Morris (Eds.), *Heritage languages and education: The Canadian experience*

   (pp. 123-139). Oakville: Mosaic Press.

Edwards, J. (2010). *Minority languages and group identity: Cases and categories*. Amsterdam &

   Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Erasmus, G. (2003, June 13). *Reparations in practice*. Retrieved from http://www.ahf.ca /downloads/clea-roundtable.pdf

Erasmus, G. (2004, March 12). *Notes on a history of the Indian residential school system in Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.ahf.ca/downloads/is-reconciliation-posible.pdf

Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Ewick, P. & Silbey, S.S. (1995). Subversive stories and hegemonic tales: Toward a sociology of narrative. *Law & Society Review*, 29 (2), 197-226.

Fabian, J. (1986). *Language and colonial power: The appropriation of Swahili in the former Belgian Congo, 1880-1938*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.

Fairfield, P. (2009). *Education after Dewey*. London & New York: Continuum.

Farrell, J. (1996). Servant of many masters. In D. Johnston (Ed.), *Stages of translation* (pp. 45-55). Bath: Absolute Press.

First Nations Studies Group. University of British Columbia. (2009). *Indigenous foundations – The white paper, 1969*. Retrieved from http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home /government-policy/the-white-paper-1969.html

Flanagan, O., & Rorty, A.O. (Eds.). (1990). *Identity, character and morality: Essays in moral psychology*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Folkart, B. (1991). *Le conflit des énonciations: traduction et discours rapporté*. Montreal: Éditions Balzac.

Foote, N.N. (1951). Identification as the basis for a theory of motivation. *American Sociological Review*, 16, 14-21.

Francis, D. (1992). *The imaginary Indian: The image of the Indian in Canadian culture*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Francis, R.D., Jones, R., & Smith, D.B. (2002). *Origins: Canadian history to confederation*. (4ᵗʰ ed.). Toronto: Nelson Thomson Learning.

Freud, S. (1922). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Friedman, J. (1994). *Cultural identity and global process*. London: SAGE Publications.

Friesen, J. (2013, Oct. 7). Widening education gap leaves aboriginal Canadians further behind. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national /education/widening-education-gap-leaves-aboriginal-canadians-further-behind /article14738527/

Fuchs, M. (2009). Reaching out – or, Nobody exists in one context only: Society as translation. *Translation Studies*, 2 (1), 21-40.

Furniss, E. (1998). *Victims of benevolence: The dark legacy of the Williams' Lake residential school*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Gaffield, C. (2013, July 15). History of Education. In D. Aronovitch (Ed.), *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/history-of-education/

Gagnon, D. (2006). Cross-writing and self-translating: One Canadian/Quebec experience. In M. Gonzalez & F. Tolron (Eds.), *Translating identity and the identity of translation* (pp. 46-59). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar's Press.

Gauthier, L. (1997). *La mémoire sans frontières*. Sainte-Foy, Québec: Éditions de l'IQRC.

Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative discourse: An essay in method*. (J.E. Lewin, Trans.). Ithaca: Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1972).

Gentzler, E. (2008). *Translation and identity in the Americas: New directions in translation theory*. London & New York: Routledge.

Gergen, K.J. (1994). *Realities and relationships*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gidney, R.D. (1999). *From Hope to Harris: The reshaping of Ontario's schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gleason, P. (1983). Identifying identity: A semantic history. *The Journal of American History*, 69 (4), 910-931.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of the self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Good, J.A. (2010). *The German* Bildung *tradition*. Charlotte: University of North Carolina. Retrieved from http://www.philosophy.uncc.edu/mleldrid/SAAP/USC/pbt1.html

Good, J.A. & Garrison, J. (2010). Traces of Hegelian *Bildung* in Dewey's philosophy. In P. Fairfield (Ed.), *John Dewey and continental philosophy* (pp. 44-68). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Grammond, S. (2009). *Identity captured by law: Membership in Canada's indigenous peoples and linguistic minorities*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1992). *The prison notebooks*. (3 vols.) (A. Buttigieg, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original publication in 1975).

Grenfell, M.J. (2007). *Pierre Bourdieu: Education and training*. London: Continuum.

Habermas, J. (2006). Religion in the public sphere. *European Journal of Philosophy*, 14 (1), 1-25.

Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 273-326). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hanson, E. (n.d.). *Indigenous foundations - The sixties scoop and Aboriginal child welfare*. First Nations Studies Group. University of British Columbia. Retrieved from

http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/government-policy/sixties-scoop.html?type=123

Haque, E. (2012). *Multiculturalism Within a Bilingual Framework: Language, Race, and Belonging in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Harris, R.C. (1999). Peopling. In P.R. Magocsi (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples* (pp. 1047-1057). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Harvey, C. (2003). *Some general aspects of the syllabics orthography*. Retrieved from http://www.languagegeek.com/typography/syllabics/syl1.html

Hegel, G.W.F. (1977). *Phenomenology of spirit*. (A.V. Miller, Trans). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1807).

Hermans, Theo. (1996). The translator's voice in translated narrative. *Target* 8 (1), 23-48.

Hinchman, L.P., & Hinchman, S.K. (Eds.). (1997). *Memory, identity, community: The idea of narrative in the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hoffman, E. (1989). *Lost in translation: A life in a new language*. New York: Penguin Books.

Howard-Hassmann, R.E. (1991). The national question in Canada: Quebec. *Political Science Faculty Publications*. Paper 22. Retrieved from http://scholars.wlu.ca/poli_faculty/22

Hudyma, K. (2011). Ukrainian language in Canada: From prosperity to extinction? *Working Papers of the Linguistics*, 21 (1), 181-189.

Hugo, V. (2008). *Les misérables*. (J. Rose, Trans.). New York: Random House. (Original work published 1862).

Hyman, H., & Singer, E. (Eds.). (1968). *Readings in reference group theory and research*. New York: The Free Press and London: Collier-Macmillan Limited.

Indian Chiefs of Alberta. (1970). *Citizens plus*. Edmonton: Indian Association of Alberta.

Iser, W. (1995). On translatability: Variables of interpretation. *The European English Messenger*, 4 (1), 30-38.

Ives, P. (2004). *Language and hegemony in Gramsci*. London: Pluto Press.

Jameson, F. (1984). Preface. In J.-F. Lyotard, *The postmodern condition*. (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Johnston, P. (1983). *Native children and the child welfare system*. Toronto: James Lorimer and the Canadian Council on Social Development.

Kirkness, V.J. (1999). Aboriginal education in Canada: A retrospective and a prospective. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 39 (1), 1-29.

Kuhn, T. (1979). Metaphor in science. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 409-419). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lahiri, J. (2000). My intimate alien. *Outlook*, Special Issue on 'Stree' [Woman], 116-120.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Landry, P. (2011). *The road to being Canada, 1815-1867*. Retrieved from http://www.blupete .com/Hist/NovaScotiaBk3/TOC.htm

Langbaum, R.W. (1977). *The mysteries of identity: A theme in modern literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lavie, S., & Swedenburg, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Learned, W.S. & Sills, K.C.M. (1922). *Report on education in the maritime provinces of Canada*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Legrand, P. (2005). Issues in the translatability of law. In S. Bermann & M. Wood (Eds.), *Nation, language, and the ethics of translation* (pp. 30-50). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lewis, M.P., Simons, G.F. & Fennig, C.D. (Eds.). (2014). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world.* (17th ed.). Dallas: SIL International.

Lienhardt, G. (1954). Modes of thought. In E.E. Evans-Pritchard (Ed.), *The institutions of primitive society* (pp. 95-107). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man: An introduction*. New York: Appleton-Century Company.

Longacre, R.E. (1996). *The grammar of discourse*.(2nd ed.). New York & London: Plenum Press.

Lupul, M. (1970). Educational crisis in the new dominion to 1917. In J.D. Wilson, R. Stamp, & L.-P. Audet (Eds.), *Canadian education: A history* (pp. 266-287). Scarborough: Prentice-Hall.

MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue*. London: Duckworth.

Mackey, E. (2002). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Malena, A. (2003). Presentation. *TTR* (*Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*), 16 (2), 9-13.

Malott, C.S. (2008). *A call to action: An introduction to education, philosophy, and native North America*. New York: Peter Lang.

Maranhão, T. (2003a). Introduction. In T. Maranhao & B. Streck (Eds.), *Translation and ethnography: The anthropological challenge of intercultural understanding* (pp. xi-xxvi). Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

Maranhão, T. (2003b). The politics of translation and the anthropological nation of the ethnography of South America. In T. Maranhão & B. Streck (Eds.), *Translation and ethnography: The anthropological challenge of intercultural understanding* (pp. 64-84). Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

Marshall, T. (2014, July 15). Oka crisis. In D. Aronovitch (Ed.), *The Canadian Encyclopedia*.

    Retrieved from http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/oka-crisis/

Masschelein, J. & N. Ricken. (2003). Do we (still) need the concept of *Bildung*? *Educational*

    *Philosophy and Theory*, 35 (2), 139-154.

McCue, H. (2014, October 31). Education of Aboriginal people. In D. Aronovitch (Ed.), *The*

    *Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en

    /article/aboriginal-people-education/

Mead, M. (1974). *Male and female: A study of the sexes in a changing world*. Harmondsworth:

    Penguin Books.

Mendelson, M. (2014, August). A second look at the *First Nations Control of First Nations*

    *Education Act*. Ottawa: Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Retrieved from http://www

    .caledoninst.org/publications/pdf/1049eng.pdf

Miller, J.R. (1996). *Shingwauk's vision: A history of native residential schools*. Toronto:

    University of Toronto Press.

Mol, H. (1985). *Faith and fragility: Religion and identity in Canada*. Burlington: Trinity Press.

Moodley, K. (1983). Canadian multiculturalism as ideology. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 6 (3),

    320-321.

Morley, D., & Robins, K. (1995). *Spaces of identity: Global media, electronic landscapes and*

    *cultural boundaries*. London and New York: Routledge.

Morton, D. (2001). *A short history of Canada*. (5th ed.). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Mumby, D.K. (Ed.). (1993). *Narrative and social control: Critical perspectives*. Newbury Park,

    CA: SAGE Publications.

Murray, J.A.H. & Bradley, H. (Eds.). (1961). Identity. In *Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd ed.). (Vol. I, p. 19). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nabokov, V. (1955). On translating 'Eugene Onegin'. *The New Yorker* (January 8, 1955).

National Indian Brotherhood. (1972). *Indian control of Indian education*. Ottawa: National Indian Brotherhood/Assembly of First Nations.

Nikolaou, P., & Kyritsi, M.-V. (Eds.). (2008). *Translating selves: Experience and identity between languages and literatures*. London: Continuum.

Nilsen, K. (2001). *Deconstructing multiculturalism: How government policy is reflected in current education and practice*. Conference Proceedings: Canadian Association for Information Science/L'Association canadienne des sciences de l'information. Retrieved from http://www.cais-acsi.ca/proceedings/2001/Nilsen_2001.pdf

Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting Translation: History, post-structuralism, and the colonial context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Official Languages Law Group. (1998). *New Canadian Perspectives: Annotated Language Laws of Canada – Constitutional, Federal, Provincial and Territorial Laws*. Ottawa: Department of Public Works and Government Services.

Parker, P.A. (1987). *Literary fat ladies: Rhetoric, gender, property*. London: Methuen.

Parkinson, R. (2007, September 14). *Meech Lake Accord: History and Overview*. Retrieved from http://mapleleafweb.com/features/meech-lake-accord-history-overview

Pigeon, M. (2009,). *Education in Québec, before and after the Parent reform*. Retrieved from http://www.mccord-museum.qc.ca/scripts/explore.php?Lang=1&tablename=theme &tableid=11&elementid=107__true&contentlong

Price, A.J., & Craik, B. (2013, December 16). James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. In

D. Aronovitch (Ed.), *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www
.thecanadianencyclopedia .com/en/article/james-bay-and-northern-quebec-agreement/

Pring, R. (2007). *John Dewey: A philosopher of education for our time?* London: Continuum.

Putman, J.H. (1912). *Egerton Ryerson and education in Upper Canada*. Toronto: William
Briggs.

Rafael, V. (1988). *Contracting colonialism: Translation and Christian conversation in Tagalog
society under early Spanish rule*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Rea, J.E. (1994). Greenway, Thomas. In R. Cook & J Hamelin (Eds.), *Dictionary of Canadian
Biography, vol. XIII – 1901-1910* (pp. 416-422). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1996). Reflections on a new ethos for Europe. In R. Kearney (Ed.), *Paul Ricoeur:
The hermeneutics of action* (pp. 3-13). London: SAGE Publications.

Ricoeur, P. (2007). *Reflections on the just*. (David Pellauer, Trans.). Chicago: University of
Chicago Press.

Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and empire*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Ross, M.H. (2007). *Cultural contestation in ethnic conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.

Ruitenbeek, H.M. (Ed.). (1963). *Varieties of modern social theory*. New York: Dutton.

Rushdie, S. (1991). *Imaginary homelands: Essays and criticism, 1981-1991*. London: Granta
Books.

Russell, L.M. (2009). *Just hospitality: God's welcome in a world of difference*. Louisville:
Westminster John Knox Press.

Ryerson, E. (1847). *Report on a system of public elementary instruction for Upper Canada*.
Toronto: Lovell and Gibson.

Salomons, T. & Hanson, E. (n.d.). *Indigenous foundations - R. v. Sparrow [1990]*. First Nations

 Studies Group. University of British Columbia. Retrieved from

 http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/land-rights/sparrow-case.html?type=123

 &filename=Sparrow%20Case.pdf

Schmidt, J. (1996). The fool's truth: Diderot, Goethe, and Hegel. *Journal of the History of Ideas,*

 57 (4), 625-644.

Siamandis, G. (n.d.). *Language and Manitoba's early public schools: Early efforts to make*

 *Manitoba children into little Brits*. Retrieved from http://timemachine.siamandas.com

 /PAGES/winnipeg_stories/EDUCATON.htm

Siljander, P. & Sutinen, A. (2012). Introduction. In P. Siljander, A. Kivelä, & A. Sutinen. (Eds.),

 *Theories of* Bildung *and growth: Connections and controversies between continental*

 *educational thinking and American pragmatism*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Singh, S. (2006). Writing in my own foreign language: Dilemmas of an Indian writer in English.

 In M. Gonzalez & F. Tolron (Eds.), *Translating identity and the identity of translation* (pp.

 20-25). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholar's Press.

Sinclair, Raven. (2007). Identity lost and found: Lessons from the sixties scoop. *First Peoples*

 *Child and Family Review*, 3.1, 65-82.

Shaull, R. (2000). Foreward. In P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M.B. Ramos, Trans.).

 New York & London: Continuum.

Smith, S.B. (1989). *Hegel's critique of liberalism: Rights in context*. Chicago: The University of

 Chicago Press.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2009). What's in a turn? On fits, starts and writhings in recent translation

 studies. *Translation Studies* 2 (1), 41-51.

Snyder, L. (2006, December 16). New Brunswick school question. In D. Aronovitch (Ed.), *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en /article/new-brunswick-school-question/

Somers, M.R. (1992). Narrativity, narrative identity, and social action: Rethinking English working-class formation. *Social Science History*, 16 (4), 591-630.

Somers, M.R. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23, 605-649.

Somers, M.R. & Gibson, G.D. (1994). Reclaiming the epistemological "Other": Narrative and the social constitution of identity. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social theory and the politics of identity* (pp. 37-99). Cambridge & Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

St. André, J. (Ed.). (2010). *Thinking through translation with metaphors*. London & New York: Routledge.

Stefan, V. (2000). Here's your change 'n enjoy the show. In K. Ogulnick (ed.), *Language crossings: Negotiating the self in a multi-cultural world* (pp. 21-29). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sudsawad, P. (2007). *Knowledge translation: Introduction to models, strategies and measures.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research.

Tavares, A.J. (2001) From heritage to international languages: Globalism and western Canadian trends in heritage language education. In R.C. Bruno-Jofré & N. Aponiuk (Eds.), *Educating citizens for a pluralistic society* (pp. 199-218). Calgary: Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal.

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Toner, P.M. (1970). The New Brunswick schools question. *CCHA Study Sessions* 37, 85-95.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society* (4th ed.). London: Penguin Books.

Tyler, S. (1986). Post-modern ethnography: From document of the occult to occult document. In J. Clifford & G.E. Marcus (Eds.), *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography* (pp. 122-140). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tymoczko, M. (2003). Ideology and the position of the translator: In what sense is a iranslator 'in between'? In M. Calzada Perez (Ed.), *Apropos ideology: Translation studies on ideology – Ideologies in translation studies* (pp. 181-201). Manchester: St. Jerome.

UNESCO. (2003). *Education in a multilingual world*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

United Nations General Assembly, 55th Meeting. *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. 11 December 1946. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/ga /search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/96(I)

Väkevä, L. (2012). Experiencing growth as a natural phenomenon: John Dewey's philosophy and the *Bildung* tradition. In P. Siljander, A. Kivelä, & A. Sutinen. (Eds.), *Theories of* Bildung *and growth: Connections and controversies between continental educational thinking and American pragmatism*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility*. London & New York: Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1998). *The scandals of translation*. London & New York: Routledge.

von Flotow, L. (1999). Genders and the translated text: Developments in 'transformance'. *Textus*, 12, 275-288.

Wallner, J. (2013). Roads to Rome: Alternative intergovernmental routes to policy frameworks in federations. In *The ways of federalism in western countries and the horizons of territorial autonomy in Spain* (pp. 137-148). New York: Springer.

Wells, G. (1981). *Learning through interaction: The study of language development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Westbrook, R.B. (1993). John Dewey. *Prospects: The Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, 22 (1/2), 277-291.

White, H. (1987). *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Whitebrook, M. (2001). *Identity, narrative and politics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Williams, P.J. (1991). *The alchemy of race and rights: The diary of a law professor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wolf, M. (2002). Culture as translation – and beyond. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Cross-cultural transgressions: Research models in translation studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 180-192). Manchester: St Jerome.

Young, E.R. (1899). *The apostle of the north: Rev. James Evans*. Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company.

Young, R.J.C. (2003). *Postcolonialism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zucchi, J.E. (1988). *Italians in Toronto: Development of a national identity, 1875-1935*. Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

**Government Documents**

Alberta. (1988). *Language Education Policy for Alberta*. Edmonton: Government of Alberta.

Bryce, P.H. (1907). *Report on the Indian Schools of Manitoba and the North-west Territories*.

    Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau.

Canada. (1971, Oct. 8.) "Federal Government's response to Book IV of the Report of the Royal

    Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism." Ottawa. *House of Commons Debates*

    *(Hansard)*. 28th Parliament, 3rd Session (vol.8). Retrieved from http://parl.canadiana.ca

    /view/oop.debates_HOC2803_08/846?r=0&s=1

Canada. Indian Affairs and Northern Development. (1997). *Gathering Strength: Canada's*

    *Aboriginal Action Plan*. (Catalogue no. R32-189-1997E). Ottawa: Minister of Public

    Works and Government Services Canada.

Canada. Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. (2008). "Statement of Apology – to

    former students of Indian residential schools." Retrieved from https://www.aadnc-

    aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649

Canada. Library of Parliament. (2009). *Governmental papers – White papers*. Retrieved from

    http://www.parl.gc.ca/Parlinfo/pages/WhitePapers.aspx

Canada. Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. (2013). *First Nations in Canada*.

    (Catalogue no. R3-197/2013E). Retrieved from http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng

    /1307460755710/1307460872523

Canada. Office of the Prime Minister. (2014, Feb 7). *PM announces an historic agreement with*

    *the Assembly of First Nations to reform the First Nations education system*. Retrieved from

    http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2014/02/07/pm-announces-historic-agreement-assembly-first-

    nations-reform-first-nations

Commissioner of Official Languages. (2009). *Two official languages, One common space: Annual Report 2008-2009*. (Catalogue no. SF1-2009). Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada.

Davin, N.F. (1879). *Report on industrial schools for Indians and half-breeds*. Ottawa: publisher not identified.

Dewing, M. (2009). *Canadian Multiculturalism: A background paper*. (Publication no. 2009-20-E). Ottawa: Parliamentary Information and Research Service.

Dolan, B., & Young, M. (2004). *Canada's Immigration Program: A background paper*. (Publication no. BP-190E). Ottawa: Parliamentary Information and Research Service.

Dussault & Erasmus. (1996). "Address for the launch of the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples." Retrieved from http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng /1100100014639/1100100014640

Government of New Brunswick. (1986). *New Brunswick's Multiculturalism Policy*. Department of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour. Retrieved from http://www2.gnb.ca /content/gnb/en/departments/post-secondary_education_training_and_labour/People /content/PopulationGrowth/content/new_brunswick_s_multiculturalismpolicy.html

Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. (2008). *Policy on Multiculturalism*. St John's: Office of Immigration and Multiculturalism. Retrieved from http://www.nlimmigration.ca /media/12706/multi_policy.pdf

Hawthorn, H, ed. (1966-67). *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, political, educational needs and policies*. (2 vols.). (Publication no. QS-0603-020-EE-A-18) Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch.

Hurley, M.C. & Wherrett, J. (2000). *In brief: The report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Parliamentary Research Branch.

Indian Affairs and Northern Development. (1969). *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian policy*. (Catalogue no. R32-2469). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

*James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement*. (1975). Québec: Sainte-Foy. Retrieved from http://www.gcc.ca/pdf/LEG000000006.pdf

Kirkconnell, W. (1941). *Canadians All: A primer on Canadian national unity*. Ottawa: Director of Public Information.

Manitoba Commission on Status and Salaries of Teachers. (1919). *Report of the Commission on Status and Salaries of Teachers*. Winnipeg: publisher not identified.

Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. (2014, April 17). Open letter to Ms. Jean Crowder, MP. Retrieved from https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/1150681-letter-to-mp-jean-crowser.html

Prince Edward Island. Department of Community and Cultural Affairs. (1988). *Provincial Multicultural Policy*. Charlottetown: Cultural Affairs Division. Retrieved from http://www.gov.pe.ca/photos/original/cca_multi_engli.pdf

Québec. (1990). *Let's Build Québec Together: A policy statement on immigration and integration*. Québec: Ministère des communautés culturelles et de l'immigration.

Québec. Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Québec. (1963). *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec*. Quebec: Government Press.

*R. v. Sparrow, [1990] 1. S.C.R. 1075*. Retrieved from http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/609/index.do

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. (5 vols.) Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1965). *Preliminary Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. (1967-70). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. (6 vols.) Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Equality in Employment. (1984). *Report of the Royal Commission on Equality in Employment*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.

Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Cultures. (2005). *Towards A New Beginning: A Foundational Report for a Strategy to Revitalize First Nation, Inuit and Métis Languages and Cultures*. Ottawa: Ministry of Canadian Heritage.

*Terms of Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba for the Settlement of the School Question.* (Canada (1897), no. 35, 1-2). Retrieved from http://www.slmc.uottawa.ca/?q=leg_laurier-greenway_compromise

Trudeau, P.E. (1971, Oct. 8). "Announcement of implementation of Policy of Multiculturalism Within Bilingual Framework." Ottawa. *House of Commons Debates (Hansard)*. 28th Parliament, 3rd Session (vol.8). Retrieved from http://parl.canadiana.ca/view /oop.debates_HOC2803_08/811?r=0&s=1

Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education. (1999). *The Common Curriculum Framework for Bilingual Programming in International Languages: Kindergarten to Grade 12*. Edmonton, Winnipeg & Saskatoon: Minister of Alberta Learning, Alberta; the Minister of Education and Training, Manitoba; and the Minister of

Education, Saskatchewan.

Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education. (2000). *The Common Curriculum Framework for International Languages: Kindergarten to Grade 12*. Edmonton, Winnipeg & Saskatoon: Minister of Alberta Learning, Alberta; the Minister of Education and Training, Manitoba; and the Minister of Education, Saskatchewan.

**Legislation (By Jurisdiction)**

- **Federal**

*Act respecting Immigration and Immigrants* (S.C. 1906, c. 19)

*Act to amend the Immigration Act* (S.C. 1919, c. 25)

*Bill C-33: First Nations Control of First Nations Education Act*. 1st Reading, April 10, 2014, 41st Parliament, 2nd Session. Ottawa: Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, 2014.

*Bill of Rights* (S.C. 1960, c. 44)

*British Columbia Terms of Union* (Order of Her Majesty in Council. May 16, 1871)

*British North America Act, 1867* (30 Victoria, c. 3)

*Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982* (R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 44)

*Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act* (S.C. 1991, c.7)

*Canadian Multiculturalism Act* (S.C. 1988, c. 31)

*Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act* (S.C. 1991, c.8)

*Constitution Act, 1982* (R.S.C. 1985, App. II, No. 44)

*Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act* (R.S.C. 1985, c. C-38)

*Cree-Naskapi (of Quebec) Act* (S.C. 1984, c. 18)

*Criminal Code* (R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46)

*Gradual Enfranchisement Act* (S.C. 1869, c. 6)

*Immigration Act* (S.C. 1910, c. 27)

*Indian Act, 1876* (S.C. 1876, c. 18)

*Indian Advancement Act* (S.C. 1884, c. 28)

*Manitoba Act* (1870, 33 Victoria, c. 3)

*Mi'kmaq Education Act* (S.C. 1998, c. 24)

*Nunavut Land Claims Agreement* (S.C. 1993, c. 29)

*Official Languages Act* (S.C. 1968-69, c. 54)

*Rupert's Land and North-Western Territory Order* (Order of Her Majesty in Council. June 23,

1870. Sch. A.)

- **British Columbia**

*First Nations Education Act* (S.B.C. 2007, c. 40)

*Multiculturalism Act* (S.B.C. 1993, c. 57)

*Multiculturalism Act* (R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 321)

*Public Schools Act* (S.B.C. 1872, c. 16)

*School Act* (R.S.B.C. 1979, c. 375)

- **Alberta**

*Alberta Human Rights Act* (S.A. 1980, c. A-25.5)

*Alberta Multiculturalism Act* (S.A. 1984, c.A-32.8)

*Human Rights, Citizenship and Multiculturalism Act* (R.S.A. 1996, c. H14)

*School Act* (R.S.A. 1970, c. 329)

- **Saskatchewan**

*Education Act* (S.S. 1983, c.11)

*Saskatchewan Human Rights Code* (S.S. 1979, c. S-24.1)

*Saskatchewan Multiculturalism Act* (R.S.S. 1978, c. S-31)

- **Manitoba**

*Human Rights Code* (S.M. 1987, c. H175)

*Manitoba Intercultural Council Act* (R.S.M. 1987, c. 155)

*Manitoba Multiculturalism Act* (S.M. 1992, c. 56)

- **Ontario**

*French Language Services Act* (R.S.O. 1990, c. F-32)

*Ministry of Citizenship and Culture Act* (S.O. 1982, c. 6)

- **Quebec**

*Act to Promote the French Language in Quebec* (S.Q. 1969, c.9)

*Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms* (R.S.Q. 1975, c. C-12)

*Charter of the French Language* (R.S.Q., 1977, c. C-11)

*Education Act* (R.S.Q. 1987, c. I-13.3)

*Official Language Act* (S.Q. 1974, c.6)

- **New Brunswick**

*Human Rights Code* (S.N.B. 1971, c. 8)

*Official Languages Act* (S.N.B. 1969, c. 14)


- **Nova Scotia**

*Education Act* (S.N.S. 1981, c. 65)

*Multiculturalism Act* (R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 294)


- **Prince Edward Island**

*Human Rights Act* (R.S.P.E.I. 1975, c. H-12)

*School Act* (R.S.P.E.I. 1993, c. 35)


- **Yukon Territory**

*Education Act* (S.Y. 1989-90, c.25)

*Human Rights Act* (S.Y. 1986, c. 116)

*Languages Act* (S.Y. 1998, c. 13)


- **Northwest Territories**

*Official Languages Act* (R.S.N.W.T. 1988, c.0-1)


- **Nunavut Territory**

*Inuit Language Protection Act* (S. Nu. 2008, c. 17)

## APPENDIX: LISTING OF LEGISLATIVE CORPUS

**Federal Legislation**

- British North America Act (1867)
- An Act for the Gradual Enfranchisement of Indians (1869)
- Rupert's Land and North-Western Territory Order (1870)
- Manitoba Act (1870)
- British Columbia Terms of Union (1871)
- Prince Edward Island Terms of Union (1873)
- An Act respecting the North-West Territories (1875)
- Indian Act (1876)
- Adjacent Territories Order (1880)
- Indian Advancement Act (1884)
- An Act to Restrict and Regulate Chinese Immigration into Canada (1885)
- Laurier-Greenway Accord (1896)
- Yukon Territory Act (1898)
- Chinese Immigration Act (1900)
- Alberta Act (1905)
- Saskatchewan Act (1905)
- An Act respecting Immigration and Immigrants (1906)
- An Act respecting Immigration (1910)
- An Act to amend the Immigration Act (1919)
- An Act to amend the Chinese Immigration Act (1923)
- Citizenship Act (1947)
- Newfoundland Act (1949)
- Immigration Act (1952)
- Canadian Bill of Rights (1960)
- Official Languages Act (1969)
- Canadian Human Rights Act (1976)

- Citizenship Act (1977)

- Constitution Act, 1982; Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982)

- Cree-Naskapi (of Quebec) Act (1984)

- Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Act (1985)

- Indian Act (1985)

- Translation Bureau Act (1985)

- Northwest Territories Act (1985)

- Yukon Act (1985)

- Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act (1986)

- Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988)

- Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act (1991)

- Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act (1991)

- Referendum Act (1992)

- Nunavut Act (1993)

- Yukon First Nations Self-Government Act (1994)

- Department of Canadian Heritage Act (1995)

- Mi'kmaq Education Act (1998)

- Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (2001)

- Westbank First Nation Self-Government Act (2004)


## Provincial Legislation

**British Columbia**

- An Act respecting Public Schools (1872)

- School Act (1979)

- Independent School Act (1979)

- Multiculturalism Act (1993)

- School Act (1996)

- Independent School Act (1996)

- Teaching Profession Act (1996)

- First Peoples' Heritage, Language and Culture Act (1996)

- Indian Self-Government Enabling Act (1996)

- Indian Advisory Act (1996)

- Sechelt Indian Government District Enabling Act (1996)

- Human Rights Code (1996)

- Heritage Conservation Act (1996)

- Public Education Flexibility and Choice Act (2002)

- First Nations Jurisdiction over Education in British Columbia Act (2006)

- First Nations Education Act (2007)

**Alberta**

- School Act (1970)

- Alberta Bill of Rights (1980)

- Alberta Human Rights Act (1980)

- Northland School Division Act (1980)

- Alberta School Boards Association Act (1980)

- Teaching Profession Act (1980)

- Alberta Multiculturalism Act (1984)

- Foreign Cultural Property Immunity Act (1985)

- Languages Act (1988)

- Language Education Policy for Alberta (1988)

- Métis Settlements Act (1990)

- Human Rights, Multiculturalism and Citizenship Act (1996)

- Métis Settlements Accord Implementation Act (1998)

- First Nations Sacred Ceremonial Objects Repatriation Act (2000)

- School Compulsory Attendance Amendment Act (2003)

**Saskatchewan**

- Larger School Units Act (1944)

- Multiculturalism Act (1974)

- Saskatchewan Human Rights Code (1979)

- Indian and Native Affairs Act (1983)

- Elementary and Secondary Schools Act (1983)

- Saskatchewan Languages Act (1988)

- Multicultural Education and Heritage Language Policies (1994)

- Education Act (1995)

- Department of Post-Secondary Education and Skills Training Act (2000)

- Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technologies Act (2000)

- Métis Act (2001)

**Manitoba**

- An Act to Establish a System of Education (1871)

- Official Language Act (1889)

- Public Schools Act (1890)

- Human Rights Code (1987)

- Public Schools Act (1987)

- Manitoba Intercultural Council Act (1987)

- Education Administration Act (1990)

- Manitoba Multiculturalism Act (1992)

- Council on Post-Secondary Education Act (1996)

- Manitoba Ethnocultural Advisory and Advocacy Council Act (2001)

- Aboriginal Education Action Plan (2004)

**Ontario**

- Common and Grammar Schools Act (1871)

- Consolidated School Act (1919)

- Education Act (1977)

- Ministry of Citizenship and Culture Act (1982)

- French Language Services Act (1986)

- Human Rights Code (1990)

- Indian Welfare Services Act (1990)

- Ontario Heritage Act (1990)

- Provincial Schools Negotiation Act (1990)

- Education Quality and Accountability Office Act (1996)

- Fewer School Boards Act (1997)

- United Empire Loyalists Day Act (1997)

- Celebration of Portuguese Heritage Act (2001)

- South Asian Heritage Act (2001)

- Franco-Ontarian Emblem Act (2001)

- Irish Heritage Day Act (2004)

- Asian Heritage Act (2005)

- Emancipation Day Act (2008)

**Quebec**

- Public Instruction Act (1869)

- Municipal Code of Quebec (1903)

- Education Act for Cree, Inuit and Naskapi Persons (1964)

- An Act respecting Private Education (1968)

- An Act to Promote the French Language in Quebec (1969)

- Official Language Act (1974)

- Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms (1975)

- Charter of the French Language (1977)

- An Act to Promote Good Citizenship (1977)

- An Act respecting Cree, Inuit and Naskapi Persons (1978)

- An Act respecting the Cree Regional Authority (1978)

- Referendum Act (1978)

- An Act respecting a Judgment Rendered in the Supreme Court of Canada on 13 December 1979 on the Language of the Legislature and the Courts of Quebec (1979)

- An Act respecting the Constitution Act, 1982 (1982)

- An Act respecting Public Elementary and Secondary Education (1984)

- An Act respecting the Conseil des relations interculturelles (1984)

- Education Act (1987)

- An Act respecting School Elections (1989)

- An Act respecting Immigration to Quebec (1994)

**New Brunswick**

- Common Schools Act (1871)

- Official Languages of New Brunswick Act (1969)

- Human Rights Code (1971)

- Education Act (1973)

- An Act recognizing the Equality of the Two Official Linguistic Communities in New Brunswick (1981)

**Nova Scotia**

- Education Act (1981)

- Human Rights Act (1989)

- Multiculturalism Act (1989)

- Nova Scotia School Boards Association Act (1989)

- Handicapped Persons' Education Act (1989)

- Heritage Property Act (1989)

- Indian Lands Act (1989)

- Education Amendments Act (1994)

- The Office of Acadian Affairs and Delivery of French-Language Services Act (2004)

- Provincial Acadian Day Act (2004)

- Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission Act (2004)

- Pre-Primary Education Act (2005)

**Prince Edward Island**

- Public Schools Act (1877)

- University Act (1974)

- Human Rights Act (1975)

- Heritage Places Protection Act (1992)

- School Act (1993)

- Private Training Schools Act (1995)

- French Language Services Act (1999)


**Newfoundland and Labrador**

- Department of Education Act (1984)

- Human Rights Code (1990)

- Historic Resources Act (1990)

- Private Training Institutions Act (1990)

- Literacy Development Council Act (1994)

- Education Act (1996)

- Labrador Inuit Land Claims Agreement Act (2005)

- Council on Higher Education Act (2006)


**Yukon Territory**

- Human Rights Act (1986)

- Languages Act (1988)

- Education Act (1989)

- Historic Resources Act (1991)

- First Nations (Yukon) Self-Government Act (1993)

- Yukon College Act (2002)

- Yukon Day Act (2002)

- Yukon Lands Claim Final Agreements Approval Act (2002)


**Northwest Territories**

- Ordinances of the North-West Territories [Ch. 29 & 30] (1901)

- Official Languages Act (1984)

- Adoption of the French Version of Statutes and Statutory Instruments Act (1988)

- Education Act (1995)

- National Aboriginal Day Act (2001)
- Human Rights Act (2002)
- Tlicho Land Claims and Self-Government Agreement Act (2003)
- Tlicho Community Government Act (2004)
- Tlicho Community Services Agency Act (2005)

**Nunavut**

- Education Act (1996)
- Official Languages Act (2000)
- Human Rights Act (2003)
- Inuit Language Protection Act (2008)

## Reports and Royal Commissions

- Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds (1879)
- Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for the Province of British Columbia (1916)
- Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Quebec (1963)
- A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political Educational Needs (1966-67)
- Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Newfoundland and Labrador (1967-68)
- Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1967-70)
- Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (1969)
- House of Commons Special Committee Report on Indian Self-Government (1983)
- Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996)