

Dis-cover Canada:

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Canada's Citizenship Guidebook for Immigrants  
and the Making of Settler Colonial Subjects

By

Ikumi Yoshida

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements  
for the degree of *Masters of Arts*  
Graduate Department of *Leadership Higher and Adult Education*  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

University of Toronto

© Copyright by Ikumi Yoshida 2014

# Dis-cover Canada

Ikumi Yoshida

Master of Arts

Graduate Department of *Leadership Higher and Adult Education*  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

2014

## Abstract

Since 2009, *Discover Canada* has been the only official study guide for the Canadian citizenship examination, and I argue that this guidebook is a hegemonic settler-making tool. Critical Discourse Analysis is utilized in combination with theories of subjectivity and analyses of settler colonialism to reveal how *Discover Canada* contains discourses exploitative to both new immigrants and Aboriginal peoples. A clear pioneer narrative is formed, in which images of Aboriginal peoples' presence and loss are used to exalt Canada and its 'original' British and French settlers. Citizenship candidates are interpellated by Canada's pioneer narrative through a promise of future citizenship, even while textually positioned below the existing settler body as second-class settlers who need to prove their 'earned' Canadianness constantly. This interpellation depends on the erasure of Aboriginal peoples by representing Aboriginal peoples' disappearance as mirroring a narrative of Euro-Canadian progress, and disregards structural violence done by settler colonial Canada.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely and fully thank Prof. Jean-Paul Restoule for supporting me from the very start of my journey at OISE until the end. I would like to thank Prof. Angela Mashford-Pringle for encouraging me to pursue this project. I would like to also thank Prof. Bonnie Burstow for teaching me how to situate myself politically in my research. I would like to thank Natasha, Naomi, Philip, Sagal, Sarah, Annie, Monica and Meredith for being such great and inspirational friends and supporting me while researching and writing this thesis. I would like to thank my family in Saga and Tokyo, Japan, especially my mother, Tomoko Watase, and Nova Scotia, Canada for always sending me love and care. Last but not least, I would like to thank Michael for always supporting me, challenging me, and believing in me. With many people's help and love, I managed to complete my first attempt at challenging 'blissful ignorance'.

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Background and Literature Review of Citizenship Guide, <i>Discover Canada</i>	8
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework: Making Canadian Subjects from Immigrants	23
Chapter 4: Methodology and Methods: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in Settler Colonialism	37
Chapter 5: Discursive Construction of Canada	50
Chapter 6: Discursive Constructions of Population	77
Chapter 7: Discursive Population Transfer	98
Chapter 8: Conclusion	112
References	121

# Chapter 1 Introduction

In this thesis, I will analyze *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship*, a citizenship guide issued by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) in 2009, using Critical Discourse Analysis. The main questions that I will ask are: how does *Discover Canada* help to construct subjects in the settler colonial state, Canada? How does this guidebook discursively construct the three-tier relationship of the settler colonial states (settlers, exogenous Others, indigenous Others)? And, what kind of role does this play in the Canadian settler colonial state? This project takes this process of subjugation, *Discover Canada* and test-taking as a discourse, which ‘constructs’ or ‘modifies’ national subjects and their relationality with the population in Canada. What is crucial in this analysis is that each population’s discursive construction is ambiguous. For example, settlers are depicted to be ‘pioneers’ from Europe, though are simultaneously ‘native’ for having built the nation state Canada. Aboriginal peoples are depicted ‘indigenous’ and thus primitive, and at the same time are also ‘newcomers’ through the Bering Strait Theory. Exogenous Others are ‘pioneers’ in coming to Canada to start a new life, but at the same time can never fully be settlers due to their relatively new status and non-Europeanness, which I will argue works as a sign of ‘superiority.’ Such ambiguities can be mobilized for political use in various forms of discourse.

*Discover Canada* is a citizenship guidebook for immigrants and is currently the only official study guide for the Canadian citizenship examination. It was introduced in 2009 and has become the most distributed government publication in Canada’s history (Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC], 2013). If one wants to become a citizen of Canada, he/she has to answer 15 questions out of 20 multiple-choice questions correctly. Citizenship examinations were first created to fulfill the requirement of the *Citizenship Act* (1976), which made it necessary to have knowledge of Canada to become a Canadian citizen. At the time that the *Citizenship Act* was put into effect in 1977, the examination took the form of an interview with a citizenship judge, but since 1996, this examination was changed to the current format of a multiple choice examination, partly due to fiscal concerns and integrity issues (Chapter 1). With this change, the study guide published by the government became the one and only official guidebook for applicants taking

the test, and the first official guidebook was called *A Look at Canada*. In 2009, *Discover Canada* was first published, stirring public discussions, debates, and waves of criticisms and praise from various groups of people. Some criticized *Discover Canada* for its focus on military history while others praised it for the same reason. In my own experience, I learned about this guidebook when I immigrated to Canada in 2011 and started considering the possibility of my taking the examination in order to become a Canadian citizen in the future. When I read this guidebook, I was shocked at how little the book depicted Canadian colonialism, more than anything else. When new immigrants are invited to join the Canadian polity as settlers in relation to Aboriginal peoples, what kind of participation, involvement, or attitudes does this guidebook try to form as the only official study guide for the citizenship examination? This was my initial question.

There is a body of literature already written on the citizenship exams and guidebooks, such as historical analyses, international comparisons, comparisons of *Discover Canada* and the former guidebooks, *A Look at Canada* or *What it Means to Become a Canadian Citizen* (1967), but I am not aware of any other work that has been done on this guidebook which critiques this publication as a mechanism of the settler colonial state. Much of the literature on citizenship exams take a positivist approach, uncritically viewing citizenship exams as necessary integration tools and part of the process of naturalization, and such analyses tend to focus on changes in policy and tendencies of immigration restrictions (Bloemraad 2002; Paquet 2012; Etzioni 2007). Some take a more critical approach to *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examinations, and these critiques will be examined in more detail in chapter 2. Unlike existing positivist and critical analyses of the notions of Canada or ‘Canadianness’, in focusing on the fact that Canada is a settler colonial state, my work analyzes *Discover Canada* and the citizenship exams as part of the larger colonization of Aboriginal peoples, which – even if not acknowledged – has shaped the Canadian polity in a fundamental way. In addition, further differentiating my work from the larger pool of research and critiques of Canadian citizenship guides and examinations, I approach this guidebook from the perspective of subjectivity and the potential effects that the citizenship process may have on new Canadians and their relationships with other people.

For this research, I will conduct Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) on the Canadian citizenship guidebook, *Discover Canada*. Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on power, social

relations, and discourse. Fairclough (2010) stated that CDA's purpose lies in analyzing "how socio-economic systems are built upon the domination, exploitation and dehumanization of people by people" and "how contradictions within these systems constitute a potential for transforming them in progressive and emancipatory directions" (p. 304). To do so, CDA does not only analyze discourse using social and linguistic theories, but also tries to offer alternatives, or at least suggestions for creating new discourse or challenging oppressive discourse. Wodak (2001) stated that Critical Discourse Analysis serves to analyze the "opaque as well as transparent structured relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (p. 2).

This combination of discourse analysis and critical theory allows me to reveal the discursive techniques employed in the guidebook, and the possible outcome in creating relationships between new immigrants and Aboriginal peoples, or even in maintaining the exploitative structure of the settler colonial state, Canada. This framework will lead to observations of power structures created by successive Canadian governments through analyzing discourse aimed at new immigrants. Utilizing the work of Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, and Teun A. van Dijk, this research combines linguistic analysis with critical theory such as theories of subjectivity developed by Judith Butler, notions of power and regimes of truth developed by Michel Foucault, interpellation and ideological state apparatuses by Louis Althusser, and subject exaltation by Sunera Thobani.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In taking citizenship tests, immigrants become candidates for citizenship. In doing so, they put themselves in a place where they are made visible to the state as individuals and will be on a trial to become collectively called 'Canadians'. In this subjugation to state power, many scholars, such as Oded Löwenheim and Orit Gazit (2009) drew upon Foucault's analyses of examinations and that through examinations, candidates enter the gaze of the state. What is crucial here to my work is, in that subjugation, subjects still have agency and are 'willing to' be put in that position of being examined. That stepping forward to be interpellated as national subjects is an important concept in this project. This stepping forward exposes the vulnerability of the candidates, as Butler (1997) theorized. They desire 'to be' in Canada in a different form

than at the time of the examination— they desire to be recognized by the state. In the first citizenship ceremony in 1947, Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, and incidentally the first officially registered citizen of Canada, stated in his speech that without “statutory recognition,” meaning citizenship, “much else is meaningless” (CBC Digital Archive, “Mackenzie King is Canada’s first citizen,” 2013).

For citizenship candidates, the examination is the gate to a ‘meaningful’ life in Canada, and, as mentioned above, since 1996, there has only been one official citizenship guidebook published by the government, and since 2009, this guidebook has been *Discover Canada*. Without citizenship, one has to renew their legal status in Canada periodically and many activities remain legally, economically, or socially limited. To gain a more secure, permanent status, and moreover, to actively engage in the Canadian polity and pass the torch to the next generation as ‘Canadians’, many people step forward to go through this gate.

Lorenzo Veracini (2010), in his work, argued that there are three population groups produced to sustain settler colonial states: indigenous Others, exogenous Others, and Settlers. Using these three population groups, this project will situate *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examination as a settler-making tool as well as a subject-making tool, used to sustain and reinforce the settler colonial structure in Canada. While one might argue that *Discover Canada* is a sparse text at 67 pages, utilized by what might appear to be a handful of people who want to become citizens, in reality hundreds of thousands of people have already read *Discover Canada* and taken the test. In fact, last year, Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) announced that since the launch of this guidebook in 2009, one million hard copies have been distributed and the ebook version has been accessed 400,000 times (Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC], para 4-5, 2013). Moreover, more than 1.5 million people have visited the *Discover Canada* webpage. CIC proudly announced that “*Discover Canada* is one of the most widely read government publications in Canadian history” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC], para. 4, 2013).

People who are targeted by *Discover Canada* are people who are placed between their homes – their old home and their new home – with the implicit threat of their status as a resident of Canada being lost or revoked if they do not secure their status through the examination.



Through such vulnerability, *Discover Canada* gives them a narrative which, reproduced on the test page, becomes a ticket to join the polity.

Foucault (1977) argued that power establishes reality through ritualized practice and repetition. This guidebook does so exactly by presenting *Discover Canada* as the only official story of Canada, and thereby establishing what Foucault called a ‘regime of truth’ produced by the state, and this power lives on in people who read, re-read, memorize, and re-produce this information during the examination. That is why it is crucial to investigate *Discover Canada* and find out what discursive strategies this guidebook utilizes as a settler colonial publication. To put it simply, this thesis asks what kind of national subject they are trying to make.

### **Chapter Breakdown**

Chapter 1 will give a background and literature review of the Canadian citizenship guidebook and examination, including a brief historical account of the changes in test format, with a focus on the development of its current hegemonic and obligatory nature. In this chapter, a former guidebook (active from year 1977 to 2008), *A Look at Canada*, will be introduced alongside a critique of the work of Canadian historian Adam Chapnick, who is notable for praising *Discover Canada*. In addition, the producer of this guidebook, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and a speech of Jason Kenny, at time minister of citizenship and immigration will be analyzed too.

Chapter 2 will situate this guidebook and examination in theories of subjectivity, settler colonialism, and power. As stated above, this project draws heavily on the work of Butler, Foucault, Thobani, Veracini, and Althusser. Through the work of these scholars, this chapter argues that the citizenship selection process depends on the vulnerability and willingness (or consent) to be subjected by Canadian state power, and how such subjugation is exploited to sustain or reproduce a settler colony, Canada.

Chapter 3 will demonstrate how this project will approach and analyze *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examination. This chapter will survey the development and characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis as understood by Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak, including

strengths and weaknesses, and will include a discussion of how CDA methods will be applied in this thesis in conjunction with theories examined in the previous chapter.

Chapter 4 will present findings from my analysis of discourse as a text (textual analysis), discourse as social practice (analysis of *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examination as a practice specifically situated in a settler colonial state, Canada), and discourse as discursive practice (analysis the ways that the discourse is disseminated such as examining the text's producers, the medium and expected readers). Fairclough distinguished discourse as a text and discourse as discursive practice by looking at texts grammatically and semantically with the former, and in the case of the latter, as Jan Blommaert (2005) wrote, discourse can be understood "as something produced circulated, distributed, consumed in the society" (p. 29). Thus, in the analysis of discourse as discursive practice, Fairclough recommended conducting intertextual analysis to find out what kind of information is selected by whom, and for what reasons. This chapter will focus on how the management of Aboriginal peoples and immigrants is historically strongly connected by examining the publisher institution, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, simultaneously reviewing the hegemonic and obligatory nature of this practice. Then the chapter moves on to explain how Canada is depicted in the guidebook. *Discover Canada*, I will argue, very clearly differentiates Canada and Canadians by the usage of different pronouns in the narrative, the effect of which makes Canada appear as an omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent storyteller of the grand narrative.

Chapter 5 will demonstrate discursive strategies used in the representations of the three populations: settlers, exogenous Others, and indigenous Others, with a special focus on the inclusion and exclusion to/from Canadianness presented in the guidebook. Some groups are included by being presented as having the specific traits of Canadians, and some are strictly excluded. At the same time, newcomers and candidates for national citizenship/subjectivity are 'welcomed' to join Canadians in writing the story of Canada. This chapter will focus on how newcomers are included into the settler polity, and are simultaneously placed lower than 'native' settlers who are given specific traits that exalt them as superior national subjects, while excluding Aboriginal peoples from having any traits of Canadians.

Chapter 6 will focus on discursive strategies of indigenization and de-indigenization. To legitimize the presence of the settler body on this land, discursively, Aboriginal peoples are labeled as immigrants/migrants, and in their place, settlers are indigenized as ‘native’ to Canada. The Aboriginal presence is hidden or erased by descriptions of an empty landscape at the time of the arrival of European settlers, which has an effect of indigenizing settlers discursively. More importantly, in this discourse, new immigrants who are taking the test are constantly interpellated as ‘future settlers’ who essentially share the same traits with settlers, but not with Aboriginal people.

In my conclusion, all the findings will be reviewed and I will argue what this guidebook and examination means to new immigrants: how new immigrants are positioned, what is expected of them, and how they can resist this process. I will go back to the notion of subjectivity and will discuss how the new population can challenge settler colonial Canada as ‘would-be settlers’.

First, the historical background of the citizenship guidebook and literature on the citizenship examination and guidebook will be investigated.

## Chapter 2 Background and Literature Review of Citizenship Guidebook, *Discover Canada*

In this chapter, the historical background of the Canadian naturalization process and citizenship guidebooks will be examined, together with a brief literature review. Canadians and British subjects had been strongly linked and legally considered overlapping categories until the introduction of the *Citizenship Act* (1976). With the *Citizenship Act*, the government of Canada abolished the category of Canadian ‘British subjects’ and the citizenship examination came to require knowledge of both the language(s) and the history of Canada. As a part of the process of naturalization, the exam was conducted through an interview, although by 1996, it was changed to a written test consisting of 20 multiple-choice questions. From 1996 until *Discover Canada* was implemented in 2009, the guidebook, *A Look at Canada*, was used. This chapter will investigate how *Discover Canada* came to be and how this study guide has a much more hegemonic nature than the citizenship exam methods in practice before it, and will illustrate why it is important to analyze this guidebook as part of a critique of settler colonialism.

### **1. The Naturalization Process and Rise of Citizenship Education for Immigrants**

‘Canadian’ as a national subject is a recently developed category. In this part, I will lay out how the category of ‘Canadian’ shifted over time. It is not my purpose to give a comprehensive historical description of immigration or naturalization processes of Canada, but rather to trace how the guidebook and examination came to play a role in determining who can become a ‘Canadian.’ The need for a naturalization process for Canada emerged after the American Revolution with a massive population inflow from the United States (Knowles, 2007). Until the

end of World War II, the *Immigration Act* (1910) and the *Canadian Nationals Act* (1921) both created the category of ‘Canadian’ as a sub-category of ‘British subject’ In 1947, the *Citizenship Act* was introduced under Paul Martin Sr., and this Act ended the ambiguous category of British subjects and ‘Canadians’ as a subcategory as was the practice in former citizen registrations, which Paul Martin Sr. called “unending confusion and embarrassment” (CIC, Forging Our Legacy: Canadian Citizenship and Immigration, 1900–1977, para.7, 2006).

With this law’s enactment, Martin Sr. also emphasized the importance of education for adult immigrants, and as a result, , citizenship education has become incorporated into the field of second language acquisition for new immigrants (Joshee and Derwing, 2005,p.63). In 1977, the revision of the *Citizenship Act* stopped labelling Canadians as British subjects, and with this revised *Citizenship Act*, started the practice of the citizenship examination. From 1977 to 1989, the federal government expected provincial governments to provide citizenship education as well as language acquisition. After 1989, the federal government took back responsibility as the funding was underutilized.. The federal government issued a report that explained the change that the *Act* brought to the naturalization process:

An applicant for citizenship must display an adequate knowledge of Canada and of the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. Applicants are asked questions with respect to Canada’s political system, geography and history which are based on information supplied free of charge by the government.  
(Young, M., The Act C-4 Knowledge of Canada, 1998)

What the report refers to as “information supplied free of charge by the government” are the citizenship guidebooks, including the most current one, *Discover Canada*.

## Changes in Testing Method

Since the revision of the *Citizenship Act* (1976), the examinations took the form of interviews with citizenship judges. In the year that the *Citizenship Act* was introduced, the government announced *A Look at Canada*, which was considerably different from guides produced in 1995 and were to be used in preparation for multiple choice citizenship tests which started the following year. In addition, because citizenship judges were allowed to ask questions of their own choice, what candidates should know was not limited to the guidebook (Joshee & Derwing, 2005). Even before *A Look at Canada* was introduced, there were governmental publications made for immigrants for the purpose of educating them about Canada, but these were not so pervasive. For example, a guidebook which was made prior to *A Look at Canada*, called *More of a Welcome*, was distributed to settlement program teachers, but because of the bulkiness of the guide and a lack of funding from the government to put its use into practice, they were not utilized much (Joshee & Derwing, 2005, p. 64-65). In the 1980s, a more economically focused immigrant selection process was adopted, replacing the more socially- or politically-based approach, and Joshee and Derwing (2005) stated that such a limited version of citizenship education could deprive immigrants of actively participating in Canadian society, politically and culturally, which could lead immigrants to be further “exploited for their contributions to the economy while being excluded from social and political domains” (p. 77).

According to Josee and Derwing (2005), the guidebooks did not have considerable influence on immigrants, but this changed with a change of test format itself, from an interview to a multiple choice examination. In 1996, the Liberal government changed the testing process from an interview to a written exam with just 20 multiple choice questions due to the fiscal restrictions and an accumulated backlog of interviews in urban areas of Canada, in addition to

the “inconsistency” in judges’ interviews (Joshee & Derwing, 2005, p. 67). Myers (2013) stated in his doctoral dissertation that this multiple choice examination is reminiscent of Freire’s concept of “banking style” education (p. 3). In Freire’s (2000) own words, “[i]n the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing” ( p.72). Freire (2000) further argued that the banking concept of education is not designed to make students critical thinkers, but to establish them as members of the “oppressed mainstream” (p. 74-75). With the abolishment of open-ended citizenship interviews, the government started making questions using the examination guidebook, *A Look at Canada*, and the guidebooks’ role in the process of citizenship acquisition. Now one just has to consume the information which is provided ‘free of charge’ uncritically, and be ready to give ‘correct’ answers.

Since the change in the examination style, even people who are not able to read are required to at least attempt to complete the multiple choice exam in order to be granted an interview. Joshee and Derwing (2005) stated that this shift made citizenship education into a rote memorization process, and consequently, the number of citizenship education programs declined by half in 1997 compared to ten years before, because people don’t have to practice speaking or discuss matters related to the test with other immigrants or settlement workers (p. 70-71).

However, it might be reductionist to regard the guidebook and examination as simply exclusive and exploitative. As Joshee & Derwing, and Myers all pointed out, this memorization process does not leave much room for interpretation or discussions, and gives the government a chance to create a space where yet-to-be-citizens will be entrenched in specific information. The government has established for itself what Foucault (1975) called a “regime of truth” (p. 30).

Furthermore, in analyzing immigrants' adult education, Joshee and Derwing (2005) claimed that citizenship education has been greatly affected by global economic trends (p.74). They pointed out the shift in the Canadian government's policy in prioritizing the acceptance of skilled immigrants for the economy rather than political refugees. This shift ended up undermining citizenship education that values immigrants' engagement in the socio-political sphere of Canadian society, and instead kept them focused on economically driven civil activities.

In the end, Joshee and Derwing (2005) raised a fear attached to this trend:

there appears to be a re-creation of the stratified societies established in the colonial world, whereby individuals who did not share the ethnicity of the dominant group were imported to carry out some of the functions that the indigenous people could not perform and which the colonizers thought were beneath them. (Joshee & Derwing, 2005, p.77)

Their research cut into this practice from a perspective of adult education, which is suitable, because people who have to take the citizenship test are from 18 to 54 years old. This guidebook is aimed at the population who does not have to go through the Canadian public education system.

Löwenheim and Gazit (2009) had a similar approach to my research in employing Foucault's notion of power to analyze citizenship tests as a tool of population governance. Although they shared the same point of view that the creation of relationship conveys power, they mainly focused on the relationships between 'aliens' and national born natives, and excluded Aboriginal people from their analysis. In their historical analysis of citizenship exams,



they pointed out that the early American and Canadian citizenship exams were specifically designed to prevent some groups from immigrating; for the United States, illiterate groups, and for Canada, the Chinese (p. 148). They argued that historically, citizenship exams started to be utilized as a civil integration tool, which expected new citizens to contribute and fully integrate into the mainstream normative society (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 149).

Löwenheim and Gazit (2009) applied a Foucauldian approach to the citizenship examinations and concluded that in addition to the effect of normalizing the authority of the examiners' power, exams aim to “achieve objectification, standardization, and a greater accuracy of measurement” (Foucault 1977, p. 190, as quoted in Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 149). While reducing the possibility of individual bias or objections in the multiple-choice tests, individuals are put in a one-way relationship with the state, or in other words, they become subjects of the state. They stated that multiple choice exams don't allow examinees to express their own views and individual understanding, and allow the state to judge what the ‘correct’ understanding of Canada is and eliminate possible controversy (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 155). They further argued that examinees become “transparent” to not only their examiners, but fall into the gaze of the state, and become the objects of surveillance. Through the process, one is dehumanized and made apolitical, and the decision later made by the government to whether grant citizenship or not cannot be questioned by the examinees (Löwenheim & Gazit, 2009, p. 150-152).

## **2. *A Look at Canada and Discover Canada*– Criticisms of Chapnick**

Chapnick (2011) notably published a comparative analysis of *A Look at Canada* and *Discover Canada*, in a defense to popular criticisms that *Discover Canada* is made by “partisan motivations” (p. 29). In many discussions, whether scholarly or in more casual spaces such as online publications, people tend to discuss the fact that the guidebook is ‘conservatized’ (Tonon

& Raney, 2013). To briefly introduce the content and criticisms of these two guidebooks, and to introduce my own approach, I will briefly examine Adam Chapnick's work: "A 'Conservative' National Story? The Evolution of Citizenship and Immigration Canada's *Discover Canada*" (2011) and will demonstrate what is lacking in Chapnick's analysis and what I will be looking at in my own analysis.

Chapnick (2011) tried to debunk the criticisms aimed at *Discover Canada* as a Conservative partisan tool to conservatize the notion of 'Canada' as a mere exaggeration. I do not share many of Chapnick's (2011) opinions and was immediately made suspicious by Chapnick's approving quotation of Tom Flanagan, a disgraced political scientist and former Stephen Harper advisor who is well known for unapologetically racist defense of Canadian colonialism and controversial comments about child pornography. However, one point which is interesting in Chapnick's argument is his claim that *A Look at Canada* between 1995 and 2009 and *Discover Canada* are, rather than reflecting the Liberal and Conservative political agendas, actually not so different in their emphasis.

After a brief interpretation of the history presented in the guidebooks, Chapnick (2011) continued his analysis of each guidebook published by the Canadian government chronologically. In his analysis, he emphasized the similarity of each section of the older guidebooks with *Discover Canada*, and concluded that *Discover Canada* is not a partisan tool. Though, Chapnick (2011) stated that the Liberal Party was indeed using the guidebook, *A Look at Canada*, as a partisan tool: "the Liberal Party was attempting to delete from Canadians' collective memory the aspects of Canada that were somehow more relevant to Conservative supporters" (p. 28).

Chapnick's (2011) criteria for data collection and analysis are not clearly stated. Perhaps the biggest weakness of his argument is that he doesn't consider what language could do beyond the façade of conveying the 'obvious information.' He never analyzes semantics or word choice, and their effect, but only focuses on superficial content. Chapnick did not pay any attention to semiotics or sentence sequence or the order of information. For example, Chapnick argued that the Conservative-published *Discover Canada* and the Liberal-published *A Look at Canada* do not contradict each other on the importance of topics such as environmental matters, stating that *Discover Canada* similarly has the following (single) sentence about the environment: "The quality of the environment is a vital part of our heritage to be protected by each generation for the next" (p. 29). In reality, *A Look at Canada* has an unquestionably larger section on civil engagement on environmental matters, including one full page about environmental citizenship. Chapnick did not explain his rationale for comparing one sentence and one whole page on environmental issues and concluding that the message is the same.

As for representations of Aboriginal peoples, he touched on them very briefly. He mentioned the Chretien Liberals' new *A Look at Canada*, that there was "virtually no mention of Canadian history prior to Confederation," and that "Canada's aboriginal (*sic*) peoples were given prominent treatment, but there was just one (two-page) map of the country" (p. 28). Regardless of the question of whether Aboriginal peoples want to be historically included as part of 'Canada' or not, Chapnick discarded the possibility of Aboriginal peoples being part of Canadian history "prior to Confederation" (and even after), and essentially treats representations of Aboriginal people in the same way that he treated the maps. Moreover, it is interesting that to measure whether these guidebooks are conservatized or not, Chapnick used representatives of Aboriginal people as a measurement of whether texts are more liberal or more conservative, regarding them as a token of 'inclusiveness' or 'liberalness' of the discourse. Chapnick defended

one passage in *Discover Canada* which has been particularly criticized: “Canada’s openness and generosity do not extend to barbaric cultural practices that tolerate spousal abuse, ‘honour killings,’ female genital mutilation, or other gender-based violence” (as cited in Chapnick, 2011, p. 31). Chapnick argued that this is simply a “re-emphasis on citizenship responsibilities,” and further claimed that this line is not as bold as the line of the 1994 *A Newcomer’s Introduction to Canada* guide which promotes the civic virtues of “[g]etting a job, taking care of one’s family and working hard in keeping one’s abilities” (as cited in Chapnick, 2011, p. 31). Both sentences are problematic, but Chapnick completely dismissed the point that the quote from *Discover Canada* specifically targets one group of immigrants, and it is highly prejudicial and discriminatory, while also problematically implying that violence against women does not exist in Canada.

In the end, Chapnick (2011) praised *Discover Canada* for its professional language use and good selection of photographs. Chapnick insisted that *Discover Canada* is reminiscent of William Lyon Mackenzie King’s original citizenship guidebook published nearly 70 years before by the Liberal government because “it privileges the importance of history over the need to avoid controversy (p. 31),” and that “there is nothing particularly Conservative about respecting history, nor is bluntness an approach to political dialogue that is exclusive to Conservatives” (p. 31),

Even if we close our eyes to Chapnick’s (2011) various references to *A Look at Canada* as being as (or more) conservative as *Discover Canada*, notions such as this that national histories exist as one single definite unit itself is very conservative in nature, as is the fact that *Discover Canada* emphasizes the grand narrative of Canada with a particular focus on military history (as will be discussed more below). Although Chapnick failed to prove that *Discover*

*Canada* is not a conservative partisan tool, I do not completely dismiss his argument. The point he made, that Liberal and Conservative guidebooks share many traits, is an important one: both guidebooks do not overtly mention the colonial history of Canada, and thus disavow colonialism as central to Canada's ongoing national story. In the 1995 version of *A Look at Canada* (1996), the description of Aboriginal people is as follows: "Aboriginal peoples were the first people to live in Canada" (p. 8), and it recognizes their existence on the land before the Europeans.

However, *A Look at Canada* goes on to state:

When Europeans arrived in what is now called Canada, they began to make agreements or treaties with Aboriginal peoples. The treaty making process meant that Aboriginal peoples gave up their title to lands in exchange for certain rights and benefits. (*A Look at Canada*, 1996, p. 9)

It is true that there are more inclusive descriptions toward Aboriginal peoples in *A Look at Canada*, but there is no mention of colonialism, and Canada is depicted as an unharmed, innocent, warm-hearted nation. That is why the question of whether *Discover Canada* is a partisan tool or not ultimately does not matter in my analysis, because whatever party rules over Canada, it doesn't change the fact that Canada is a settler colonial state. Their discourse is settler biased, more than anything else. My research explores whether *Discover Canada* is a settler colonial tool with the purpose of producing more settlers and maintaining the exploitation of Aboriginal peoples, by dividing incoming populations and hegemonically making them play the role they are needed to play to sustain the settler colony, Canada.

### 3. Context of *Discover Canada*: Strengthening Value of Citizenship?

In the above criticism of Chapnick's (2011) work, some parts of *Discover Canada's* discourse are revealed. In this section, the background of the making of *Discover Canada* will be discussed. *Discover Canada* was introduced on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2009, and the examination based on this guidebook started in March of the following year. The examination time is 30 minutes, and in order to pass the test, applicants must answer 15 of 20 multiple choice questions correctly.

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration Canada states that the aim of this guidebook and test is to “strengthen the value of citizenship and to emphasize the integrity of the testing process,” and the test is “one of the tools used to assist in determining whether an applicant has an adequate knowledge of English or French” (Operational Bulletin 244B, CIC, 2011). Reflecting these aims, the failure rate is significantly higher than previous tests, and there has been criticism that immigrants who are from non-English speaking countries have higher failure rates (Mills, 2012). According to Mills (2012), the failure rate jumped right after the introduction of the new test with a failure rate of 30%, compared to 4% in the 2008 exam based on *A Look at Canada*. Mills analyzed the data obtained from the CIC and concludes that failure rates are much higher in the population who don't speak English in their home communities, by giving an example of Afghan-immigrants whose failure rate in 2011 was as high as 50 %, compared to only 2% of those from Australia, England, and United States. She pointed out that the citizenship examination is now functioning as “a de-facto language test.” (“How applicants are stumbling on the final step to becoming Canadians,” the Globe and Mail, 2012).

The notion of ‘strengthening the value of citizenship’ is reflected in then-Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Jason Kenny, speech and the amendment of the *Citizenship Act* in 2009, which limited the granting of Canadian citizenship to foreign-born people whose parents are Canadians to just one generation. In addition, with a highly controversial newly proposed

amendment to the *Citizenship Act, Bill C-24*, the required time to reside in Canada before applying for citizenship is extended, the application fee is tripled, the age requirement for test-takers is widened from 18 to 54 years (with younger or older people not required to take the test) to 14 to 64 years, and most controversially, the possibility of one's citizenship being revoked is opened up for people of 'foreign' origin (Parliament of Canada, *Bill C-24*, 2014).

On June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2014, in the House of Commons, in addressing this bill, Kenny stated:

I worked hard with the public servants at Citizenship and Immigration Canada and with new Canadians to strengthen the value of Canadian citizenship, which is one of the most important things we possess as parliamentarians and citizens. Citizenship unites us and defines us. It is the basis of our values and our shared identity as members of the Canadian family. (Kenney, 2014)

The 'value of Canadian citizenship', whatever it means, has become a key word in Conservative discourse in recent years. Ironically, though, this bill proposes to undermine the value of citizenship by introducing the possibility of immigrants' citizenship being taken away by the state, putting all immigrants into a permanently precarious position by setting criteria for the revocation of citizenship as one having a 'foreign origin.'

On September 30, 2010, regulatory amendments regarding the guidebook and examination came in to effect, and the CIC obtained the flexibility to test the applicants for citizenship on broad topics regarding Canada (CIC, 2011, Operational Bulletin 244B).

According to Operational Bulletin issued by the CIC, the test topics now include:

- "The chief characteristics of Canadian political and military history."

- “The chief characteristics of Canadian social and cultural history.”
- “The chief characteristics of Canadian physical and political geography.”
- “The chief characteristics of the Canadian system of government as a constitutional monarchy
- “The characteristics of Canada, other than those referred to above.”
- “Participation in the Canadian democratic process.”
- “Participation in Canadian society, including volunteerism, respect for the environment and the protection of Canada’s natural, cultural and architectural heritage.”
- “Respect for the rights, freedoms and obligations set out in the laws governing Canada.”
- “Any of the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship other than those referred to above.” (CIC, 2011, Operational Bulletin 244B)

To cover all the information, the applicants need to read the guidebook, *Discover Canada*, cover to cover, and memorize the information.

In a speech given at the launch of *Discover Canada*, Jason Kenny (2009), then the minister of Citizenship, Immigration, and Multiculturalism, defined specific roles that this study guide should play. First, he clarified the test is “not just for new citizens, it’s for all Canadians” (Kenny, 2009, para. 22) though Kenny emphasized the obligatory nature of this guidebook for those who wish to pass the test. This shows a clear intention of the government for this guidebook to be utilized beyond the practice of the citizenship examination, which adds to its hegemonic nature as the central text in this regime of truth. Furthermore, for test-takers, I would argue that with the heightened requirement of knowledge and high failure rate requiring



intensive memorization, this widely promoted guidebook has taken on a highly hegemonic nature. All the information in the book is presented as truth which must be reproduced on the test page. In Kenny's words, this guidebook will

- "Help hundreds of thousands of new Canadians better understand the values, symbols, institutions and history of Canada" (Kenny, 2009, para.5).
- "Help young Canadians ... to better understand [their] rights and responsibilities. It will help [them] learn more about our history, traditions and institutions" (Kenny, 2009, para.9).
- "Help newcomers begin the process to know who we are, where we came from, what values define us, to live in accordance with those values and be inspired by the example of our predecessors. " (Kenny, 2009, para. 13)

There is a clear 'we' and 'others' dichotomy here that 'we' Canadians, have something in place for 'them' (newcomers or people who don't know about 'us') to learn and "live in accordance with [our] values" (Kenny, 2009, para. 13). Finally, the most recent remarks of Jason Kenny summarized their focus in *Discover Canada*.

On June 12<sup>th</sup> of 2014, Jason Kenny speaking about *Discover Canada*, said that

Under the citizenship guide called *A Look at Canada*, published by the previous government, there were nearly two pages of information on recycling, but there was not one sentence on Canadian military history... This government took the position that it was more important for new Canadians to know the meaning of the red poppy than the blue box, more important to

know about our military history than such prosaic mundane matters as recycling (Kenny,2014).

This clear bias is embedded in *Discover Canada*, and one can call it a partisan tool or bias. However, even this kind of criticism takes out one important fact about Canada, which even Jason Kenny dare not mention in any of his speeches. That fact is that Canada is a settler colonial state, and this publication, *Discover Canada*, is a crystallization of this kind of discursive nation-building. In the following chapters, the discursive strategies of *Discover Canada* will be demonstrated.

## Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework: Making Canadian Subjects from Immigrants

### 1. Subject Making as Yet-To-Be

Becoming a Canadian citizen means that an individual becomes a national subject, and is absorbed into a collective body of ‘Canadians.’ The official guidebook and citizenship examination play a significant role in the creation of these new national subjects. In this project, it is important to consider the notion of individuals as being subject to a state power, and at the same time, themselves either exercising power or functioning passively in a complex web of relations among the population to sustain the existing power structures of settler colonial Canada. This notion of power is explained very clearly in Foucault (1978)’s *The History of Sexuality* as an omnipresent force, which is “produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another. Power is everywhere” (p. 93). This notion of power as exercised through relations of people is a crucial one, and relations are created through discourse.

In this chapter, I will analyze how *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examinations can be situated in theories of subjectivity and explore how the process of subject-making can be analyzed from the point of view of discourse and power in the Foucauldian sense. How does *Discover Canada* and the examinations influence the process of subject-making for immigrants? Can this guidebook and examination be analyzed as a discourse for population control? Moreover, how does the notion of discourse connect with the settler colony? To answer these questions, I will make use of Althusser’s notion of the ideological state apparatus, Foucault’s

work on discourse and power, and Butler's analysis of the feelings of subjects. This chapter will attempt to situate *Discover Canada* in these theories in order to clarify which vantage point I am conducting Critical Discourse Analysis from. .

Before discussing issues around subjectivity, I would like to expand on the notion of discourse. When people refer to 'discourse', sometimes this refers to practical discourse such as political speeches, institutional documents, or even casual everyday conversations. In my methodological approach for this research, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), discourse is defined, categorized, and classified more strictly by CDA scholars, as explained more in the following chapter. Here, I would like to explore the idea of discourse in a more critical sense. In *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault (1978) described fields of discourse as "a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies" (p. 100). In this sense, Foucault seemed to have a much broader understanding of the word 'discourse' than simply speech or conversation, and used discourse for both micro and macro modes of communication.

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) defined discourse as "practices that systematically form the objects which they speak" (p. 49). He further argued that it is true that discourses are made of signs, but "they do more than use these signs to designate things. It is this more that renders them irreducible to the language (*langue*) to speech" (p. 49). Discourse in Foucault's sense is similar to the notion of a word ideology for Althusser, who considered ideology as practice, though I will not use these terms interchangeably when discussing Foucault and Althusser. In this project, the word discourse is understood as Foucault described it, which combines both expressions and the ideology behind it, and simultaneously, I will examine Althusser's theory of ideology later in this chapter.

First, the notion of subjectivity will be discussed. Butler (1997) pointed out that the term ‘subject’ has an ambiguity in that it means both a subjugation to power and a subject of power. Foucault stated that “the term ‘subjectivation (*assujétissement*)’ denotes both the becoming of the subject and the process of subjection” (as cited in Butler, 1997, p. 83). Once one becomes a national subject/citizen, the national legal system fully applies to him/her, and there are many obligations to fulfill as a citizen. At the same time, as a citizen, one obtains the right to vote, to receive welfare, and the privilege to stay in Canada infinitely as long as this nation state exists. Although there have recently been cases where citizens of non-English/French origins who were deprived of their citizenship and were ‘deported’ in recent years such as the Ottawa-born Canadian citizen Deepan Budlakoti (Keung, 2013), citizens’ security in Canada is usually understood as a right not a privilege as a citizen. Moreover, as a national citizen, as Thobani (2007) argued in *Exalted Subjects*, one is placed in a position which is more ‘exalted’ than others with more power and prestige than non-citizens in the population. The fact that some individuals are chosen to be citizens and some are not already divides the landed immigrant population and classifies more privileged individuals as citizens.

In discussions of the process of citizenship acquisition, Löwenheim and Gazit (2009) argued that test-takers are subjugated by the state power simply by taking the exam, similar to Foucault’s descriptions in *Discipline and Punish* (1977). As such, these scholars talked about the examination as a unilateral practice. I do not disagree with the notion of citizenship examinations being a mechanism of disciplinary power and “a ceremony of objectification”, as Foucault (1977, p. 187) put it. However, we should not forget that test-takers are not ‘pure’ subjects who have no will to be there or to be subjected by that very power. Butler questioned Foucault’s idea in *Discipline and Punish* that prisoners are subjected to power, but not subjects who can execute power, and argued in her book *The Psychic Life of Power* (1997) that some individuals are

willing to be subjugated in order to exist; “to be “ (p. 21). When one’s own existence is threatened, people choose to be subjugated, but that does not necessarily mean that they are powerless. They can resist through subjugation against subjugation (p. 83-85).

Foucault (1977) himself made the point that in thinking about the practice of examination,

[i]t is not simply the level of consciousness, of representations and in what one thinks one knows, but at the level of what makes possible the knowledge that is transcended into political investment (p. 185).

We should remember that this political investment is not only formed by top-down forms of power, but also by each individual who learns from the guidebook in order to take the test. They also make a political investment in order to exist. As Foucault argued, power is everywhere, and this investment is made and sustained by new immigrants’ will to invest to gain particular knowledge in order to exist in the way they want.

In this citizen-making process, it is hard to argue that test-takers are all ‘forced’ to take the test. Probably in some cases, their existence in Canada is at stake when they take tests. However, in either case, it can be said that test-takers are in a vulnerable position where they want to or need to take the test in order to gain something ‘more’ or maintain their present status. Then how does one become a subject or *choose* to be subjugated to power?

Both Althusser and Butler argued that to become a subject, there are two key elements: (1) a sense of guilt (and later declared innocence), and (2) repetitive practice. According to Althusser’s theory of subject-making, a policeman ‘interpellates’ a passerby on the street yelling “Hey you!” and the passerby turns back to acknowledge the police officer. The passerby

acknowledges the voice of Law which represents the authority of the state. While Althusser presented in examples such as this a unilateral formation of power and subjugation, Butler argued that the passerby desires to be identified because “it promises identity” (p. 108), and turns back to the voice. Butler gave an example of Althusser himself. When Althusser killed his wife, he immediately went out on the street and called for the police. Butler argued that Althusser wanted to be identified: the situation had to be clarified by an authority.

Butler’s argument about willingness to be subjugated is particularly interesting to consider in the context of *Discover Canada* and test-taking, because unlike being called upon, candidates for citizenship are stepping forward to take a guidebook which they read voluntarily for the purpose of gaining new recognition and status. Through this willingness, the state can subjectify the candidates and utilize the candidate’s power by manipulating them through their hegemonic discourse.

But why would someone want to be subjectified like this? After living in Canada for a number of years or maybe from the day one, one starts wondering who they are and what they are in Canadian society, and may feel the desire to participate in the political process, or feel insecure that their visa status may not be renewed after expiry. Butler explained that the process of becoming a subject is a process of changing the potentiality and possibility of one’s own existence, and by being subjugated to power, one inherits another form of power to exist and resist. The citizenship examination is at the very core of subject-making, and this is why candidates are made particularly vulnerable when choosing and gaining their new place in Canada.

The other side of this interpellation through citizenship discourse is that the stories or descriptions in *Discover Canada* can be taken as stories of national subject-making. In this

guidebook, any group taken as ‘Canadians’, whether they are Aboriginal people, French settlers, or Asian migrants who were not Canadians in the time of the events depicted in the guidebook, but are equally included and depicted as ‘Canadians,’ and through this normalization, their existence is utilized to ‘exalt’ Canada and Canadians. The combination of this guidebook and the obligatory nature of the examination realize what Foucault (1977) argued power does: “it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth” (p. 194). In such a narrative presented with definite authenticity, candidates are placed in a space where they are constantly interpellated as future citizens who will belong in such a narrative. Moreover, in the textbook, newcomers gain their identity through specific grammar formations, and with such exposure to this citizenship narrative, whether one wants to go against it or not, one is already placed in a framework that the guidebook sets.

The second key in subject-making is the repetition of practice, which is what makes ideology more ‘real’ and more pervasive. Althusser (2008) argued that “ideology ‘recruits’ subjects” (p. 36) in the context of the reproduction of the labour force. According to Althusser, to sustain the capitalist state, there needs to be an ideological state apparatus, which is a system of mechanisms and institutions to disseminate state ideology, such as family apparatuses, education apparatuses, political apparatuses, and so on. Of all of these, he claims that ideological educational apparatus is the most crucial one . To understand the process of subject-making in citizenship examinations, borrowing Althusser’s framework is helpful, but where do *Discover Canada* and the examination fit? According to Althusser (2008), after the collapse of the church, which is understood as a ‘totalized’ ideological apparatus which works to disseminate and make people practice ideology, various systems took over this role. Althusser argued that schools, the centre of the ideological education apparatus, are unique in this system, and are the most powerful for the following reasons: (1) they teach a vulnerable population (children), (2) they are



structured around long-term training, and (3) they are obligatory in nature. Schools work to “provide children with the ideology which suits the role [they have] to fulfill in class society (p. 29).”

As for *Discover Canada* and exam-taking, it might be too much to argue that they are the centre of the educational state apparatus, since in the process of acquiring citizenship, it is not only children who are subjected to disciplinary power and can be defined as a vulnerable population, but also adults who might not immediately appear to be ‘vulnerable’. Nor is the process of gaining citizenship based on highly institutionalized schooling that lasts for several years (although there are many settlement programs that utilize classrooms). However, there is room to argue that these same elements identified by Althusser can be observed in *Discover Canada* as a guidebook and conclude that this process of citizenship testing is part of the educational ideological apparatus. First, as discussed above, it can be argued that candidates for citizenship are a vulnerable population in that many of them are in a situation where the only way for them to maintain or improve their situation in Canada is to learn about the country through the guidebook and pass the examination. Similar to Althusser’s argument that schools work to produce and maintain a labour force, preparing them to fulfill each class role in society, be exploitable or become the agent of the exploitation, this citizenship guidebook and examination are similarly part of the preparation for immigrants to fulfill assigned roles in society. Second, as previously stated, it can be argued that learning from this guidebook and test-taking are mandatory for individuals who want to maintain or improve their state of existence in Canada.

For readers who are not interested in obtaining citizenship, this guidebook might fall into the category of ‘communication ideological apparatus’, by which ideology is disseminated

through the media. However, for people whose long-term existence in Canada and personal security are dependent on gaining citizenship, the role of this guidebook and examination should be taken more seriously. Foucault (1972) stated that the educational system is a “political means of modifying the appropriation of discourse with knowledge and powers it carries with it (p. 227),” and further argued for the importance of role of discourse to the point to describe it as “violence.” *Discover Canada* work as powerfully as part of the educational ideological apparatus.

## 2. Theories of Settler Colonialism

In Canada, or in any other settler colony, discourse is at the core of colonial violence, from the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the United States, the RCMP in Canada, or the *Kaitakushi* in Hokkaido, Japan.. Such things as settler and pioneer narratives have been used to assimilate the ‘improvable’ indigenous populations and eliminate the ‘unimprovable’ through such measures as the educational ideological apparatus. For example, Furniss (2006) explored notions of frontier narratives and Indigenous political discourse, and analyses the stories of two regions in British Columbia and Australia. She stated that there are distinct characteristics in the frontier narratives, in that they are highly flexible as nationalist narratives in order to alternate, affirm, and contest existing power structures (p. 173). Butler and Athanasiou (2013) stated in *Dispossession: the Performative in the Political*, that “Indigenous people’s uprooting, removal to reserves and spatial containment, forced adoptions, and placement in institutions were all enabled and justified by the discursive formation” ( p. 25).

While in the latter part of this chapter, I will connect this theory of discourse and subjectivity with Veracini’s theory of ‘narrative transfer’ in the making of the settler colony and

situate *Discover Canada* in them, first it is important to clearly define settler colonialism.

Colonialism is defined by Österhammel (1997) as

a relationship of domination between an indigenous (or forcible imported) majority and a minority of foreign invaders. The fundamental decisions affecting the lives of the colonized people are made and implemented by the colonial rulers in pursuit of interests that are often defined in a distant metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromise with the colonized population, the colonizers are convinced of their own superiority and of their ordained mandate rule. (as quoted in *Settler Colonialism*, Veracini, 2010, p. 5)

Jacobs (2009) argued the difference between colonialism and settler colonialism is “the way in which settler-colonial states sought to effect the disappearance of Indigenous peoples; child removal and institutionalization constituted an attempt to ‘complete’ this disappearance (as quoted in Henderson and Wakeham 2009, p. 4).” Furthermore, Veracini (2010) argued that if the settlement is normalized and the majority of the population has become settlers, “colonisers are ceased to be colonisers” (p.5), because the control from the metropolitan core (England for Canada) becomes less pervasive and ‘Canadians’ are imagined to have more authority to be on the land than those original colonizers. For Veracini (2010), “settlers are made by conquest and immigration” (p.5).

All of these scholars talk about the innate quality of the settler colony being the displacement or even eradication of Aboriginal populations for the settlers’ benefit, though Veracini added one more actor in this context: the exogenous Others. Veracini (2010) stated that the settler colony is:

an inherently dynamic circumstance where indigenous and exogenous Others progressively disappear in a variety of ways: extermination, expulsion, incarceration, containment, and assimilation of indigenous peoples (or combination of all these elements), restriction and selective assimilation for subaltern exogenous Other (p. 17).

This leads us to consider another element of settler colonialism in the above definitions, which is that the population of settlers exceeds that of Aboriginal peoples. By having higher settler population than Aboriginal people, settlers dominate the political regime of the site of colonization. However, in recent years in Canada, the population of Aboriginal people is the fastest growing of any single demographic. Thobani (2007) argued that this trend threatens the dominant presence of ‘Anglo-Canadians’, and can further threaten that of settler colony in general. In Veracini’s view of settler colonialism, this third actor (exogenous Others) plays a significant role by being manipulated in various settler strategies, which will be demonstrated in the following chapters.

Then what is sustaining the settler colonial structure of Canada? Veracini (2010) argued that the discursive manipulation of three populations (settlers, exogenous Others, indigenous Others) is a crucial strategy deployed in settler colonies to sustain and benefit the settler colony, which is made up of settler collectives, indigenous Others, and exogenous Others. Before describing each category, one question must be asked. In public discussions in Canada, the word ‘settler’ has been often heard in recent years, but who exactly does this word refer to? Are all English Canadians uniformly settlers in the same way? Are French Canadians the same as English Canadians? Are new immigrants settlers in the same way as immigrants’ descended from the English or French metropolises? Are white immigrants to Canada from other settler

colonies such as Australia or the United States settlers in the same way as people of colour who were emigrating from countries which are also colonized, including other settler colonies?

As Lawrence (2005) argued in the article “Decolonizing Antiracism” , the answer to all of these questions is a clear ‘yes’. For Lawrence, all immigrants and refugees, even descendents of African slaves, are settlers, no matter how disadvantaged the population is and whatever their historical contexts are, because they live on and benefit from land that belongs to Aboriginal peoples (Lawrence & Dua, 2005, p. 134 ). It is crucial to consider this matter from two different angles. Factually, I agree with Lawrence. New immigrants, migrant workers, or refugees benefit directly or indirectly from the dispossession of Indigenous people and their land. However, this factual understanding should be considered in a more complex picture, and should not be taken as a simplistic binary as often depicted by mainstream media as ‘settlers’ versus non-settlers or settlers versus Aboriginal people, because by broadly labelling all kinds of migrants, one can overlook the important tertiary role this population plays in sustaining settler colonial power relations— a role which cannot be played by ‘settlers’ or Aboriginal peoples. Namely, in the settler colonial situation, population control is crucial, and in order to conceptually eliminate the Aboriginal presence and indigenize settlers, settlers have utilized the presence of this new incoming population. As Veracini (2010) argued, it is through exogenous Others that “the settler that established himself as normative” (p. 18).

On a discursive level, immigrants are often labeled as ‘settlers’ in order to enhance specific political positions. The term ‘settlers’ is sometimes utilized politically to group people together in order to strengthen particular points of view. While Lawrence’s argument is true in a purely factual sense, when certain people are labeled ‘settlers’ in particular discourses, this binary becomes less clear. It is true that public discussions on a wide range of topics related to

Aboriginal land rights or sovereignty always generate points of view that are situated in a simplistic binary of ‘settlers versus Aboriginals’ and analyzed in that structure not only by the mainstream but also by new immigrants and Aboriginal activists. Veracini (2010) pointed out that even though there are three population groups that are important to consider in settler colonial situations, “externally, settler colonial representational regimes remain stubbornly bilateral” (p. 30), and this simple binary has been a core discursive strategy that settlers have employed in gaining and sustaining power.

Let’s go over the definitions of each category of the population. First, indigenous Others are defined by Veracini (2010) as “those who have not autonomously moved in to the settler collective” (p. 17), and in a settler narrative, they are described as “virtuous” or/and “debased,” always with the notion of being “transformed” or “waiting to be transformed” by European “civilization” (p. 24).

Settlers are “those who belong to the settler collective” (Veracini, 2010, p. 17), and discursively, they are depicted with a great ambiguity as both “exogenous” and “indigenous” as settlers often valorize the notion that “we came here” and that the “land made us” (p. 22). Settlers are always simultaneously trying to maintain European identity while indigenizing their existence to legitimize their presence on stolen land that they don’t originate from, and to sustain their imagined superiority as Europeans. Veracini (2010) pointed out that this doublethink will never be reconciled, and thus, settlers are always turned toward the future in hopes that someday this project will be completed (but never will be) .

Exogenous Others, defined as “those who have not moved out to establish a political order” (Veracini 2010, p. 107), are more precisely, (1) “those who are in place but have not yet been given access to political rights as settlers,” (2) “those who are in place but cannot belong to

the settler body politics,” (3) “those who could belong but have not committed to the settler political community,” and (4) “those who are permanently restricted from entering the settler locale” (p. 20). They can be either taken as “potentially virtuous” or “hopelessly debased” given their ambiguity in settler discourse (p. 26).

The citizenship candidates’ perpetual status of ‘yet-to-be’ offers a potential resource for settler collective to use as ‘new settlers’ to strengthen the settler body collective and maintain the unequal social structure. Veracini (2010) further argued that this yet-to-be population is “routinely imagined as transiting from one section of the population system to another” (p. 20). How do settlers and indigenous Others discursively understand this population that is on the side of settlers based on their physical presence in the settler colony but discursively is still not ‘named’?

To add one more category, Veracini (2010) suggested that there is a population which does not fit the category of either indigenous or exogenous Others or settlers, which are ‘abject Others’, who are not even named and whose existence is not taken account of. Butler (1997) argued that before being accounted legally, one must exist accountable in the law, and there are some who are denied such accountability (p. 108 ). Veracini (2010) suggested that a successful settler society manages “the orderly and progressive emptying of the indigenous and exogenous Others segments of the population economy... drawing lines that cannot be crossed” (p. 28). This process of emptying requires dumping the ‘hopeless’ population, abject Others, then escalating the ‘potential’ population to the settler collective, and *Discover Canada* works as a final confirming nod to those joining in the settler political body.

In this chapter, how *Discover Canada* and test-taking produces national subjects through interpellation and as part of Canada’s educational ideological apparatus has been demonstrated.

The significant point is that the process of subjection necessitates the vulnerability of individuals who are willing to or have no choice but to go through this system to maintain or improve their status as residents in Canada, a promise of secured permanent residency and enfranchisement in Canada, which is to be part of the settler collective body. In settler colonial Canada, this candidate's status of "yet-to-be" can be taken advantage of by the settler government by being sided with the collective settler body, not with the indigenous body.

This project takes the process of subjugation, using *Discover Canada* and the citizenship test, as a discourse which 'modifies' national subjects and their relationality with the population. The population is discursively split into three categories: settlers, exogenous Others and indigenous Others, of which, each population has discursively been constructed with specific ambiguities: settlers as both exogenous and indigenous, indigenous Others as exogenous and indigenous or both virtuous and debased, and exogenous Others as both potentially virtuous and hopelessly debased.. The next chapter will break down this discourse of making/modifying national subjects by utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis.



# Chapter 4 Methodology and Methods: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in Settler Colonialism

## I. Methodology

As demonstrated in chapter 1, this research attempts to analyze *Discover Canada's* discourse in order to reveal discursive strategies in settler colonial Canada through an investigation of power and discourse. For this purpose, this research conducts Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) on *Discover Canada*. In this chapter, I will discuss the development of CDA, its traits, advantages, and criticisms of this methodology, and will demonstrate the ways my research is constructed around this methodology will be demonstrated.

### 1. The Development of CDA

Critical Discourse Analysis was developed in the 1970s by scholars such as Norman Fairclough or Ruth Wodak to develop a methodology that combines linguistic analysis with other aspects of social science, such as sociology or political science, which were traditionally divided as distinct disciplines. Fairclough and Wodak drew from critical linguists such as Michael Halliday or critical sociologist Stuart Hall. For CDA scholars, critical social theories become the glue that sticks together theories of ideology, social practice, and discursive practice, and enables them to analyze their relationality. Thus, CDA revolves around the notion of discourse and power and draws from Marxist as well as post-structuralist scholars, such as Foucault, Althusser, Antonio Gramsci, Ernesto Laclau, and Chantal Mouffe. However, one of the things about this CDA that stands out most is that it's eclectic, which means that each scholar, subject matter, or characteristic of the research determines which theories will be utilized. There

is no uniform theoretical framework which determines CDA. Although Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Linguistics are sometimes used interchangeably, critical linguistics started earlier than CDA and sometimes it is called ‘a seed of CDA’ in that it critically analyzes language in social situations and through social theories. In the 1980s, Fairclough, Wodak, and Teun van Dijk started articulating CDA, with the goal of “analyz[ing] opaque as well as transparent structured relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language” (Wodak & Meyer 2001, p.2), working against structuralist understandings of the world by deconstructing hegemonic discourse.

## **2. CDA’s Purpose and Traits**

CDA’s focus often lies in exposing state ideology disseminated by/existing with language use and how ideology flows smoothly under the surface of discursivity, focusing on the effect of discourse disseminated by hegemonic forms of media, or as Althusser would put it, through ideological apparatuses.

In research conducted using CDA, the power structure analyzed tends to be top-down ‘elite’ discourse such as politicians’ speeches or newspaper articles published in the mainstream media. van Dijk (1993) stated that CDA is certainly not limited to such sources, but is particularly suitable to such discourse for the reason that this sort of discourse has “more control over more properties of text and context, involving more people, and is thus generally (though not always) associated with more influence and hence with hegemony” (p. 257). In other words, CDA sees hegemonic discourse as its target.

Fairclough (2010) drew on Gramsci’s theory of hegemony, which he explained as follows: “Hegemony is about constructing allies, and integrating rather than simply dominating

subordinate classes, through concessions or through ideological means to win their consent” (p. 61). To follow this notion of hegemony, *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examination in general should be understood as a hegemonic practice, which elicit ‘consent’ from citizenship candidates by unilaterally providing them the idealized narratives of Canada and its citizens.

On the topic of ideology, Fairclough (2010) stated that ideology does not focus on “questions of truths,” but on “the effects of ideologies,” and texts are taken as “ideological in so far as they affect (sustain, undermine) power relations” (p. 27). Through this understanding, Fairclough connected the two separated notions of linguistics and social critical theory to create a critical picture of discourse. This is how this methodology places critical theory in the centre of analysis. With this critical quality, naturally, CDA is often used to critique ‘social wrongs’ and the obstacles to address them as they are expressed, constructed, re-constructed, justified or even glorified through language.

Thus, topics of research which use CDA as methodology tend to concentrate on political discourse, racism, the mass media, gender, education, literacy or institutions. For example, Wodak has developed what she calls the Discourse-Historical Approach which focuses on changes in discourse over a period of time on topics such as popular xenophobia or anti-Semitism. Fairclough (2010) on the other hand has focused on globalization and the ‘commodification’ of discourse, particularly in political speeches, observing how pervasively observable the trends are.

Transdisciplinarity is another crucial characteristic of CDA. Many CDA scholars do collaborative work beyond their own respective disciplines to capture multiple aspects of discourse. Fairclough (2010) argued that transdisciplinarity is not just about adding ideas or methods from multiple disciplines, but:

working and elaborating one's own theoretical and methodological resources so as to be able to address insights or problems captured in other theories and disciplines from the perspective of one's particular concerns. (p. 295)

### **3. Criticisms**

Some scholars are very critical of CDA. Schegloff (1997) and Widdowson (1995) both remarked that CDA has the risk of merely reproducing or imposing the analyst's ideological motivations on the interpretations of texts, and is thus biased. This sort of critique reflects wider criticisms of CDA being 'fuzzy' due to its eclecticism and flexibility. Their criticism is true not in the sense that researchers should not be biased, but in the sense that it is difficult producing research that is truly objective. Furthermore, Critical Discourse Analysis is typically based on an examination of 'social wrongs', and based on that starting point, any CDA project should ideally be 'biased'. Without this bias, CDA would be impossible to conduct, and a critical stance doesn't mean that these analyses are not 'rigorous' or 'trustworthy'. In my own research, besides identifying 'social wrongs', I take a strongly anti-positivist approach to citizenship and the settler colonial nation state, and based on Schegloff's critique, this sort of critique is by necessity 'biased'. By looking at multiple dimensions of a single strain of discourse and by laying out my methods clearly, I would like to be critical to my own approach and understand this research as itself a discourse.

### **4. CDA and *Discover Canada***

Regarding my use of CDA, I will make use of critical theory, particularly Veracini's description of the conceptual organization of settler colonialism, Thobani's work on the 'exalted subject', and Butler's critique of subject formation, as described in chapter 3. Fairclough, Simon

Pardoe and Bronislaw Szerszynski (2010) observed in their essay “Critical Discourse Analysis and Citizenship” that a great deal of the scholarship which deals with citizenship is “predominantly normative in character” (p. 412). This critique is particularly relevant to my work, because *Discover Canada* is a settler colonial publication, and it is crucial to be able to utilize theories which can deconstruct the settler-biased frameworks which dominate positivistic approaches taken by many scholars on Canadian citizenship. This project regards citizenship examinations and guidebooks as tools for the creation of national subjects and the national subject’s relationship with other groups in the settler colony, and aims to analyze their possible influence and techniques.

## **5. Discourse in My Research**

Depending on scholar and research, discourse is defined and limited in different ways. To structure my research, I utilize Fairclough (2010)’s three dimensions of discourse: (1) discourse-as-text, (2) discourse-as-discursive-practice, and (3) discourse-as-social-practice (p. 448). In the first dimension, discourse is treated as linguistic representations, focusing on grammar, vocabulary, cohesion, or sentence structure, etc. Although CDA places linguistic analysis in the centre, it should not be limited to linguistics, but tries to see connections among each element holistically, rather than as fragmented elements.

Foucault (1972) pointed out that there is a “dependence of the statements” which compose successions: hypothesis/verification, assertion/critique, general law/a particular application, and pointed out these can be combined together, which create/re-creates concepts. Foucault said that in the context of the natural history discipline, in the 17th century, scholars tried to “govern the appearance and recurrence of the concepts,” which were realized through “the relation and interplay of subordinations between describing, articulation into distinctive

features, characterizing and classifying” (p. 57). This point is critical in my analysis in looking at sentence sequence, ruptures, and their mechanisms.

Then how do these three dimensions of discourse fit my analysis?

**1. Discourse-as-text:**

The actual text which makes up *Discover Canada* will be analyzed. While my criteria and coding strategies will be explained later in this chapter, I will analyze the surface ideas in the texts, and will try to analyze the ideologies behind them.

**2. Discourse-as-discursive practice:**

This second dimension highlights the process of circulation: discourse is produced, disseminated, utilized, consumed. In this analysis, *Discover Canada*'s producer, the number of readers, the ways to disseminate the text, and the way to make the text more hegemonic will be analyzed. For this analysis, three aspects of discourse are analyzed: forms of the media, social context, and who the producers of this guidebook are. In this analysis, I will bring in and analyze Jason Kenny's speech made at the time *Discover Canada* was launched.

**3. Discourse-as-social practice:**

The third dimension focuses on the hegemonic quality of discourse in spreading ideology as an ideological apparatus. In my analysis, the citizenship guidebook and test will be analyzed. Questions such as 'what does this examination represent?' or 'how does this examination work in the context of settler colonialism' will be asked. This analysis will

play a role in summarizing the other two aspects of discourse, and to situate it in a broader context.

In this section, the methodology of my research, CDA, has been explained, including its development and how it can be utilized and situated in my research. In focusing on discursive techniques that settler colonial Canada deploys in this text, directed at candidates for Canadian citizenship, CDA is the most effective tool due to its focus on the relationship of language and power and its vantage point to expose social wrongs. This research takes the position that *Discover Canada* can operate as part of the educational ideological apparatus which serves in this case to maintain the existing settler colonial power structure, and for this reason CDA's focus on ideology is a suitable one. Since discourse can refer to a wide range of phenomenon or concepts, in my research, I borrow Fairclough's breakdown of forms of discourse and will focus on the following points: (1) a textual analysis of *Discover Canada*, (2) an intertextual analysis of *Discover Canada*, and (3) critical analysis of the citizenship examination as a social practice (institution and practice of examination).

In the rest of this chapter, sampling and analysis will be demonstrated.

## **II. Methods**

The print version of *Discover Canada* is a 67 page publication, printed in colour on thick paper. I analyzed most of the guidebook, except purely practical descriptions, such as how to apply for citizenship, descriptions of the divisions of government, elections, etc. My sampling process was based on the following criteria: (1) descriptions of people, (2) descriptions of history, (3) descriptions of symbols, (4) descriptions of Canadian traits. If any of these themes

were found within the text, the whole section surrounding the sentence or phrase I identified as fitting the above criteria was sampled and analyzed holistically.

The following section is a description of the texts sampled based on this criteria.

### **i) Overview of Samples**

#### A) “Message to Our Readers” (p. 3)

This section comes right after “The Oath of Citizenship” (p.2 ). At one single page, this is one of the shorter sections in *Discover Canada*, but it plays an important role in this guidebook because it gives a greeting to readers and provides an overview of what Canada is, and what it means to be a Canadian citizen. In this section, people who are labeled as “we” are directly talking to candidates for Canadian citizenship who are labeled “you”.

#### B) “Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship” (p. 8-9)

This section starts with a description of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, additional rights citizens have, formal gender equality, citizenship responsibilities, and ends with a section describing the defense of Canada. In this section, two-pages long, rights of Canadian citizens such as the right to vote, freedom of thought and religion, freedom of assembly, etc. are discussed, along with a description of civic responsibilities, obeying the law, voting, work, and so on. The general tone of this section highlights responsibilities more than rights, taking on a disciplinary tone, such as referring to “working hard in keeping with one’s ability” as a responsibility. There is a section that has generated particular controversy and criticism, which is an aggressive and arguably



racist account of ‘barbaric’ people to whom “Canada’s openness and generosity do not extend (p. 9).”

C) “Who We Are” (p.10-12)

The section “Who We Are” is located in the third part of the textbook, and aims to demonstrate who “the founding peoples” of Canada are. This section starts with the overview of the section, descriptions of Aboriginal peoples, the English and the French, describes the process of becoming Canadian, and ends with a description of diversity in Canada, such as religious or ethnic diversities. In the first edition of *Discover Canada*, gay and lesbian rights were not included in the guidebook at all, and were only included after public opposition made by LGBTQ activists.

In the introduction of this section, the document states, “To understand what it means to be Canadian, it is important to know about our three founding peoples– Aboriginal, French and British. (p. 10)” Space is assigned for a description of each group. These three are split between Aboriginal peoples, and English and French as a single group (settlers). At the same time, it is important to pay attention to the wording of ‘English’, instead of British, since it can become confusing as to whether the guidebook is talking about a language or people.

D) “Canada’s History” (p. 14-23):

This section chronologically lists events in the past or descriptions of various groups or peoples. This section includes descriptions of Aboriginal peoples, “the first Europeans” to come to Canada”, Jacques Cartier and the naming of Canada, “Royal New France”, the “struggle for a continent” between England and France, the British “Province of Quebec”, Canada’s “tradition of accommodation”, the United Empire Loyalists, the

“beginnings of democracy”, the “abolition of slavery”, Canada’s “growing economy”, the War of 1812 (“the fight for Canada”), the “rebellions of 1837-38”, colonial Canada’s “responsible government”, Canadian confederation, the “Dominion from Sea to Sea”, the “expansion of the Dominion”, Canada’s first prime minister, the “challenge in the west”, Canada’s “railway from sea to sea”, late 19<sup>th</sup> century “westward” expansion, the First World War, a description of how “women get the vote”, the inter-war period and great depression, a description of the D-day Invasion, and, finally, the Second World War. The representation of Aboriginal peoples disappears right after the description of “challenge in the west”, which is about Louis Riel’s rebellion. This part has a much higher focus on military history more than anything else.

E) “Modern Canada” (p. 24- 27)

This section depicts Canada after the Second World War from various angles such as the economy, arts, international military activities, or the relationship with Quebec. The section is split into sub-sections: “trade and economic growth”, “international engagement”, “Canada and Quebec”, “a changing society”, “arts and culture in Canada”, and “great Canadian Discoveries and Inventions”.

F) “Canadian Symbols” (p. 38-39)

This section lists Canada’s national symbols and provides descriptions of each one. They list the Canadian crown, the flags of Canada, the maple leaf, the *fleur-de-lys*, Canada’s coat of arms and motto, the parliament buildings, popular sports, the beaver, Canada’s official languages, the national anthem, the royal anthem, the Order of Canada, and the Victoria Cross. The section ends with a description of national public holidays and other important dates.

G) “Canada’s Economy” (p. 42-43)

This section focuses on Canada’s trade, commerce, and industries. It contains the descriptions of Canada as a trading nation, and the three major industries: service, manufacturing, and natural resources.

H) “Canada’s Regions” (p. 44-51)

This section describes each province and territory, with a special focus on economy and industry.

**ii) Process of Coding and Analysis**

I broke down the text into ‘stanzas’, the smallest cluster of words which convey some nuance and meaning, and numbered them accordingly. I then labelled each stanza with the following categories borrowed from Fairclough’s process of CDA research (Fairclough, 2003):

(1) assumptions, (2) modality, (3) nominalization, and (4) representation of social actors.

1. Assumptions is broken down into three sub-groups: (i) existential (what exists), (ii) propositional (what is believed or desired) and (iii) value (wanted, unwanted, good, and bad).
2. Modality examines words such as ‘can’, ‘may’, ‘should’, ‘must’, etc., and expressions such as ‘it is important’ or ‘necessarily’, to attempt to obtain information about the relationship between the writer(s) and the ‘truths’ he/she is conveying.
3. Nominalization looks into an absence of actors in verbs by making them passive or making subjects non-human agents, which can obfuscate agents or completely hide them. At the same time, it is important to pay attention if some things are presented as an absolute truth: words such as “normally,” “commonly,” or “always.”

4. Representation observes which social actors are included or excluded from other groups of actors in the text, or what kind of phrases, verbs, or pronouns are used to describe them, with emphasis on sameness or difference. For example, some actors are described using active verbs and others, passive verbs in otherwise similar descriptions. In addition, I closely examine sequences of stanzas, locating what information comes in what order. In addition, strategies of indigenization/de-indigenization were closely observed in the analysis of representations. These strategies are employed to indigenize the settler collective body and de-indigenize the presence of Indigenous collective body. For example, labelling Aboriginal peoples as immigrants or labelling immigrants as native to the land, etc.

Thematic Analysis: Simultaneously with this linguistic analysis, I conducted a thematic analysis. In this process, the texts are not divided into stanzas, but clusters of stanzas, which I describe in this thesis as ‘descriptions’, ‘parts’, or ‘texts’. Using theories derived from Veracini, Thobani, and Butler, the following five themes are closely analyzed:

1. The idea of ‘Canadians’ or ‘ideal citizens’: what kind of traits are assigned to Canadian citizens? What kind of expectations are given to the readers, who are candidates for future citizenship?
2. The idea of ‘Canada’: what kind of traits are assigned to Canada? When does the nation of Canada discursively begin?
3. The construction of three actors: ‘settlers’, ‘exogenous Others’, and “indigenous Others’. As this construction evolves, it is modified to: settlers (English), settlers (French), exogenous Others (non-English or French immigrants), and indigenous Others

- (Aboriginal peoples). What are the specific traits assigned to each group? What traits of Canadianness are included or excluded from their descriptions, if any?
4. The construction of time: the past, present, and future. In the description of Canada's history and people, what events or people are depicted as existing in the past, present, or future?
  5. The construction of the grand national narrative: what sequence does the grand narrative take? What are the traits? Who are the main actors?

Each theme was assigned a different color, and sampled texts were colour-coded accordingly. After this was completed, texts were cut and organized according to colour, rather than the sequence used by the guidebook, and then analyzed. Finally, the analysis of discursive strategies and thematic analysis are combined, and analyzed together.

In this chapter, I have provided an overview of CDA and clarified applications and methods of this research as they apply to my research. I will present my findings based on the methodology described in this chapter in the following chapter.

## Chapter 5 Discursive Construction of Canada

### **Overview of *Discover Canada* as a Practice of Discourse**

First, I will clarify important traits of the discourse of *Discover Canada: The Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship* as a social practice. It is the most highly read government publication in Canadian history (Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC], 2013). This is in part because of the various methods of distribution, such as PDFs, mobile phone applications, and audio files. In addition, applicants for the citizenship test have to study with this guidebook alone, with no other official guidebook available without consideration for the applicants' level of English or any other consideration that might affect their test performance. As mentioned in chapter 2, *Discover Canada* is now the only guidebook used for the test, and the higher failure rate has risen since its introduction. Even more, the recent change that widens the scope of possible test questions could further expand the range of information that the applicants have to learn. In order to pass the test, applicants now need to read and memorize the guidebook from cover to cover. For these reasons, I consider the discourse of *Discover Canada* a highly hegemonic social practice.

As Foucault (1977) argued, this guidebook and citizenship test, like other forms of disciplinary power, “produces reality” (p. 194). With the nature of the examination, 20 multiple choice, there is no room for interpretations or critical thinking. However one feels about the ‘reality’ produced by *Discover Canada*, in order to become a citizen, one must mark down the supposedly correct answers. The institution that produced and published this guidebook,

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) was formerly the Department of Immigration and Colonization from 1917 until 1936, and was a branch in the Department of Mines and Resources. From 1950 until 1966, it was called the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. All three of these departments/branches were involved in the management of Aboriginal peoples. Besides overlapping discourses, there is a long history of institutional linkages between immigration and the colonization of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

In the following three chapters, secrets of this discourse will be discovered.

Throughout the analysis of the sampled text, many tendencies are detected, such as lack of representations of women or the LGBTQ community, and there is almost no mention of Canada's tradition of grassroots activism. Instead of laying out my findings as found in accordance with the flow of the guidebook, findings are carefully organized thematically to demonstrate how the discourse of *Discover Canada* is a product of Canada as a settler colonial state and how discursively the power structure of the settler colony and the dynamic and hierarchy of the three actors (settlers, indigenous Others, and exogenous Others) are maintained. It is clear that discursive strategies for settler colonial management serve to 'exalt' Canada as a state and Canadians as national subjects, as Thobani (2007) demonstrated in her work, *Exalted Subjects*. Simultaneously, there are definite qualities that are given to indigenous Others and exogenous Others, which are intertwined with the expectations that 'Canada' has of new yet-to-be national subjects, whose willingness to be subjugated works to internalize such expectations and assumptions in citizenship candidates. Throughout the discourse of this guidebook, various strategies are employed, such as repetitive discursive strategies of inclusion/exclusion, indigenization/deindigenization, and arbitrary discursive divisions of the past and present to realize a narrative of a 'perfect' Canada which maintains power relations of the settler colony.

In this chapter, discursive strategies and their effects relating to Canada will be demonstrated. Discursively, Canada is given three fundamental qualities that make it unique, and those qualities are given by creating Canadian characteristics in relation to Others, and by drawing the line between the past and the present, normalization and legitimization of the settler state, and by telling a narrative of ‘Canadian civilization’. Before demonstrating each discursive strategy and their effects, how Canada is positioned in this guidebook must be clarified.

### **“We” as Canada Speaks to “You” as New Immigrants**

Wodak (1999) argued that it is important to look at the personal pronouns in narratives of nation-building or national history, because it is ambiguous as to who is included/excluded by the pronoun ‘we’. Wodak especially emphasized that the pronoun, ‘we’ is a particularly tricky one, because it “can have very different referents according to the respective situation” (p. 163). In *Discover Canada*, readers are guided by a storyteller, ‘we’. ‘We’ is telling stories of ‘us’ and ‘them’. In many scholarly observations about national narratives, ‘we’ and ‘them’ are used to contrast differences, but in this narrative, ‘we’ refers to Canada while ‘they’ can be English Canadians, French Canadians, Aboriginal peoples, non-British or French immigrants, or Canadians in general. Here, ‘we’ is not addressee-inclusive or speaker inclusive, because whoever making this publication cannot ‘be’ Canada: ‘we’ is of course written by mere human beings who are working for the government which ‘we’ alludes to. Through Canada’s pioneer narrative, *Discover Canada* places each actor in their proper positions to create hierarchy and order. Simultaneously *Discover Canada* places candidates for citizenship in a place of expectation– the expectation to reach the position that Canadian nationals are placed in the text, such as the following: “Canadians take pride in their identity and have made sacrifices to defend



their ways of life. By coming to Canada and taking this important step toward Canadian citizenship, you are helping to write the continuing story of Canada” (p. 3).

In this guidebook, ‘we’ formerly Canada, is placed on top of the hierarchical order of actors. Even Canada and Canadians are separated very clearly with the usage of pronouns where Canadians become ‘they’, and Canada becomes ‘we’. ‘We’ as Canada is placed clearly on top, and seems to be omnipresent, omniscient, possibly omnipotent force in looking over the three population groups. ‘We’ tells stories about each group, and is given power to directly talk to ‘you’, candidates of Canadian citizenship: “we hope to welcome you as a new citizen with all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship” (p. 3).

The pronoun ‘we’ for Canada is established at the beginning of the guidebook, in the section “A Message to Our Readers”. For example, in this section, there are expressions such as “[w]e hope to welcome you as a new citizen” (p. 3), or “Canada has welcomed generations of newcomers to our shores to help us build a free, law-abiding and prosperous society” (p. 3). In this passage, ‘we’ is clearly used as the pronoun for Canada. On the other hand, the text states, “Canadians take pride in their identity” (p. 3), or “[t]hey must obey Canada’s laws and respect rights” (p.3). In these sentences, the pronoun ‘they’ is used for ‘Canadians’. Thus, this guidebook works to create an illusion that the Canadian state is talking to the candidates directly. ‘We’ is the voice who tells the story not only of immigrants, but also about Canadians, and ‘we’ is presented as an objective voice, who speaks as the Canadian state. While this guidebook does not adopt the structure of simple ‘us’ versus ‘they’ in good versus evil sense, it places them below ‘we’, Canada, altogether, and assigns places in the Canadian hierarchy. However much national subjects are ‘exalted’, they can not exceed the metaphysical superiority of Canada.

Throughout the guidebook, Canada is depicted as the state that is (1) inherently good, (2) of British origin and traditional, and (3) a force of progress and civilization, and these essential valued qualities of Canada are bestowed upon Canadians, especially – as will be discussed in the next chapter – Canadians of British origin. In such a discursive formation of the state, Canadians, Aboriginal peoples, and new immigrants are placed at seemingly arbitrary distance from the state. And in demonstrating the three qualities of Canada, Aboriginal peoples' presence is exploited most heavily. In order to construct an ideal and exalted image of Canada, this guidebook manipulates images and grammar applied to each group.

### **1. Canada as Inherently Good**

Canada is depicted as an essentially good-natured country. Throughout the guidebook, positive words are used repeatedly for expressing Canada or Canadians, similar to discursive strategies Fairclough (2010) found in a discourse of new capitalism (p. 286) and Wodak (1999) found in nationalist discourse (p. 162). Wodak, (1999) writing about Austria, argued that such praise of the whole population acts as a kind of glue to “emphasize national singularity” (p. 162). In *Discovery Canada*, to create this effect, in addition to straightforwardly stating the goodness of Canada, such as “Canada is known around the world as a strong and free country” (p.10) or “Canada welcomed thousands of refugees from Communist oppression” (p. 25), there are three discursive strategies employed to express the benevolence of Canada. Those three strategies are: (i) normalization, (ii) reconciliation discourse, and (iii) the devaluation of others.

As a settler colonial state, whose existence itself is based on the land deprivation and colonial manipulation of Aboriginal peoples, having a strategy to hide such atrocities and even use them to enhance Canada's goodness is necessary, because disclosure of such violence can fundamentally shake the national identity of Canada and Canadians, so these strategies exalt

Canada, discursively erasing its colonial violence or racism. They are particularly used when describing violence or discrimination perpetrated by the state, and enable historical atrocities to be used to prove the benevolence of Canada, not its cruelty or malevolence. The image of inherently benevolent Canada is created through representations of other populations, which are closely linked together.

### **i) Normalization (Disavowal of Atrocities)**

In the descriptions of slavery and voting rights, a pattern of normalization can be observed, and in the case of the description of slavery in Canada, normalization leads to the evaluation/praise of Canada. In the section titled “Abolition of Slavery” (p. 16), the text does not directly state that Canada had a practice of slavery, but states that slavery was a worldwide practice: “Slavery has existed all over the world, from Asia, Africa and the Middle East to the Americas” (p. 16). This description suspiciously omits Europe from the list of areas of the world. However, some may say that it is strongly implied that Canada has a history of slavery. However, the text does not use direct subjects or action verbs, such as to state ‘Canadians owned slaves,’ or ‘Canada had a practice of slavery.’ This indirect phrasing normalizes the practice of slavery as pervasive and existent since times immemorial. The practice of slavery or the suffering of slaves is not discussed, and the text immediately goes on to state that “The first movement to abolish the transatlantic slave trade emerged in the British Parliament in the late 1700s,” and discusses how John Graves Simcoe abolished slavery in Upper Canada. The focus here is not about the fact that Canada had slaves, but the abolishment of it. The text moves on to describe how Canada was in fact progressive in abolishing slavery, and describes how people who escaped from slavery in the United States aimed to reach Canada, “the North Star”, to be saved. This section would have us think that slavery was practiced somewhere else, or that

Britain came to save people and made Canada “the North Star.” This inherited goodness from Britain will be discussed more in detail in the latter of this chapter. Two pictures are beside this section: one is painting of John Graves Simcoe and the other is a black and white photograph of Marry Ann Shadd, who fought for the rights of slaves in the United States. In this section, Canada is not damaged by slavery, but rather, exalted by their ‘heroic’ work.

The same pattern can be observed in the description of voting rights for women, in the section “Women Get the Vote” (p. 21). The text normalizes the fact that voting rights were a privilege, not a right: “At the time of Confederation, the vote was limited to property-owning adult white males.” Though the text continues to state, “This was common in most democratic countries at the time.” Very similarly to the phrases, “slavery has existed all over the world”, by stating that “this was common in most democratic countries,” the text normalizes the existence of dehumanizing practices of the past, without tarnishing the image of Canada.

In *Discover Canada*, other gender issues are not taken up significantly. The women’s movement to get voting rights occupies the bulk of the descriptions of women’s history, and no mention is made of how gender discrimination works to enhance colonial management. As Thobani (2007) stated, “even when disparaged as ... gendered, sexed or classed subject[s] ... in its nationality, this subject positively commands respect as the locus of state power” (p. 4), and in this, *Discover Canada* weaves a masculinist, heteronormative, and racist national history.

The strategy of normalization is used without fail when describing the discrimination or oppression imposed on people as part of reconciliation discourse.

## **ii) Reconciliation Discourse**

What I call reconciliation discourse is the text which indicates an apology or compensation has been made from the Canadian government to the victims of crimes of the state. Such discourse is repeated throughout the text of “Who We Are” (p.10-13) and “History of Canada”(p. 14-23). In reconciliation discourse, there is one particular discursive strategy which is observable, which is a division of the past and the present. Significantly, however, reconciliation discourse related to Aboriginal peoples has a different quality than other groups. The assigned part is longer than the others’, and there are specific strategies used for this section in addition to the simple division of the past and the present. This section discusses residential schooling, and Ottawa’s apology for it in 2008. First, a strategy of drawing the line of the past and the present will be demonstrated.

How can you draw a line in time? This notion perhaps comes from a linear understanding of time, which has become nearly universal through European colonialism, organizing, naming, and categorizing time. The narrative of national history is linear and progressive in nature, and *Discover Canada* is not an exception. In this framework, to have reconciliation, injustice must be rendered in the past tense, and in the present the nation that has since progressed must show remorse.

For example:

Regrettably, the state of war and public opinion in B.C. led to the forcible relocation of Canadians of Japanese origin by the federal government and the sale of their property without compensation. This occurred even though the military and the RCMP told Ottawa that they posed little danger to Canada. The Government of Canada apologized in 1988 for wartime wrongs and compensated the victims. (p. 23)

Regrettably, from 1914 to 1920, Ottawa interned over 8,000 former Austro-Hungarian Empire subjects, mainly Ukrainian men, as ‘enemy aliens’ (p. 21)

Canada welcomed thousands of refugees from Communist oppression, including about 37,000 who escaped Soviet tyranny in Hungary in 1956. (p. 25)

Afterwards the Chinese were subjected to discrimination, including the Head Tax, a race-based entry fee. The government of Canada apologized in 2006 for this discriminatory policy. (p. 20)

The first two examples have the same modality, “regrettably”, which shows the division of the present and the past with a clear value judgment by ‘us’, Canada. Listing the past atrocities and their legal compensation back to back dismisses people’s long suffering in-between and dismisses the activism which made Ottawa or the Government of Canada apologize. Here, the significance is that ‘we’, Canada never apologizes, but always, ‘they’, the government of Canada, or ‘Ottawa’, is the one that apologizes, which separates the government and the nation clearly and indicates that governments in the past did something wrong and other governments have since apologized. Canada is unharmed, always clean and innocent.

The mentioning of these apologies puts an end to descriptions of these issues, as though, bureaucratic apologies erase painful memories. People might argue that such traumatic events happened a long time ago, and that the division of the past events and the present should be taken for granted, but for many, this is not the case. People still suffer, as Joy Kogawa, who is mentioned in *Discover Canada*, writes about in regards to the inter-generational trauma of the Japanese-Canadian internment camps.

Before looking at the description of the Canadian government's apology made by Prime Minister Stephen Harper in regards to residential schools for Aboriginal children, it is noteworthy that the Harper government apologized to Chinese Canadians prior to Aboriginal people. Furthermore, as Edwards and Calhoun (2011) argued, Harper did not focus on explaining the exploitation of Chinese labourers, but instead, "spent the first third of his address remembering the contributions of Chinese immigrants to late nineteenth-century Canada and encasing this discourse within a frontier narrative" (p. 79). Furthermore Harper characterizes Chinese labourers as settlers, calling them "brave" to leave their homes to make a new home in Canada like previous generations of Europeans did (Edwards and Calhoun, 2011). According to the Harper apology, these sometimes involuntary immigrants "were 'pioneers' who performed 'back-breaking' work" (p. 79-80).

This is similar to residential school apology discourse in *Discover Canada*. Residential schools were established and funded by the federal government and managed by various Christian denominations and lasted until the 1990s. It is not so long ago that this system was in place, and many scholars point out that this schooling system was assimilative or even genocidal, targeting Aboriginal children, language, and culture (Grant 1996; MacDonald 2007). The important point to make here is that the legacy of suffering created by residential schools is not in the past, but continues to agonize people in the present, causing inter-generational trauma and casting a huge shadow on the community (Bombay et al. 2009; Quin 2007; Elies et al. 2012). Some might argue that you can draw a line between the past and present, but when the result of such practice is ongoing and keeps people suffering, in some cases destroying people, we must see the problem in drawing such a line and treating the past and the present as completely different.

The act of apologizing itself draws a clear line between the things that are happening now and things that have already happened: one cannot apologize for stabbing someone while the knife is still in. One apologizes after the deed and perhaps after some reflection, remorse, regret, sense of guilt, and a desire for forgiveness and reconciliation. The act of apologizing creates a notion that the deed was done and never more. Harper's apology was an act of labeling the Canadian government's atrocities toward Aboriginal communities as things in the past, and he moves on without any remorse and without any chance of forgiveness or true reconciliation with actual people. In addition to the division of the past and the present, in the description of the residential schools and in Harper's apology, two other discursive strategies are employed: (i) blurred actors, and (ii) depoliticization.

First, a strategy of blurred actors will be discussed. Residential schools are described in the section "Who We Are" (p. 10). The text admits that "the federal government placed Aboriginal children in residential schools" with an explicit actor. However, the text goes on to explain that this was "to educate and assimilate them into mainstream Canadian culture" (p. 10). For readers, immigrants taking the citizenship test for ostensibly the same purpose, 'to be educated and (maybe assimilated) to mainstream culture,' this expressed intention of the government might not sound particularly immoral. Rather, it shows the 'good intentions' of the federal government.

The successive sentences completely lose the specificity of actors: "The schools were poorly funded and inflicted hardship on the students" (p. 10). It is not clear who did not fund the schools, and who inflicted "hardship". It sounds as though it was the schools themselves, not the people working there nor the primary funder and manager of the schools, the federal government, that were responsible. Church involvement is not mentioned at all in the text. By labelling students as the objects of oppression, the document further dismisses parents, families,



and communities, which in many cases, lost their bearers of their future and threatened their very existence, and also survivors who experienced unimaginable pain and hardships through this essentially violent system. Simultaneously, this narrative erases the fact that many survived and fought to re-construct their lives, families and communities. In addition, the use of “and” implies that “hardship” was simply because of the lack of funding, not because of the government’s ideologically-motivated intention to eradicate First Nations cultures and peoples. Later, I will problematize the term, “former student” in such survival discourse, which is utilized to express Canadians’ virtue.

The same pattern of not having the explicit actors is used in the following sentences: “Some were physically abused. Aboriginal languages and cultural practices were mostly prohibited.” In the end of the explanation of the residential schools, they add that “in 2008, Ottawa formally apologized to the former students.” This apology, which in this document closes the issue of residential schools, is itself highly controversial and Henderson and Wakeham (2009) criticized the apology as follows:

the absence of the word ‘colonialism’ from the prime minister’s apology enables a strategic isolation and containment of residential schools as a discrete historical problem of educational malpractice rather than one devastating prong of an overarching and multifaceted system of colonial oppression that persists in the present. (p. 2)

The residential schools were a system that was made possible by the Canadian state and through a number of Christian denominations, and there is no mentioning of church involvement at all. In the latter part of “Who We Are,” in fact, churches are presented as a benevolent crucial actor in Canadian society, which “promote social welfare; harmony and mutual respect; to

provide schools and health care' to resettle refugees; and to uphold religious freedom, religious expression and freedom of conscience" (p. 13). It is noteworthy that the church's involvement in colonization and settlement is not mentioned here at all. And, here too, the actor of the verb 'apologize' is not Canada, but 'Ottawa'. This separation of Canada from Canadians or even from the government of Canada makes the Canadian nation appear infallible: no one can harm this purity and superiority.

After mentioning Ottawa's apology, the document concludes, "In today's Canada, Aboriginal peoples enjoy renewed pride and confidence." There is a divide between this sentence and the previous sentence, and this is a division of the past and the present. The oppression in the past is already amended and "today" Aboriginal peoples "enjoy renewed pride and confidence." The usage of positive words to describe Aboriginal peoples "today" completely erases ongoing exploitation and colonialism perpetuated by the state, as well as the suffering and resilience of Aboriginal peoples. They depoliticize the situation so much that readers might assume that the suffering is all over.

The same pattern is used to describe Acadian people: "during the war between Britain and France, more than two-thirds of the Acadians were deported from their homeland" (p. 11). Here, the document mentions the Acadian deportation without an explicit actor, and then continues onto the next sentence: "Despite this ordeal, known as the 'Great Upheaval', the Acadians survived and maintained their unique identity. Today, Acadian culture is flourishing." Like with residential school survivors, after the word "today," everything is portrayed as being wonderful and happy, especially emphasized by a usage of the word, "enjoy."

The ongoing struggle and the efforts of Aboriginal people are completely erased by such depictions, such as the high number of missing and murdered Aboriginal women and the high

suicide rate. According to the RCMP, there are 1,181 known Aboriginal women who went missing from 1980 to 2013, of which 1071 were murdered (McNabb, 2014). In 2007, the Aboriginal Healing Foundation issued a report on suicide in Aboriginal communities in Canada stating that

Although there are enormous variations across communities, bands, and nations, the overall suicide rate among First Nation communities is about twice that of the total Canadian population; the rate among Inuit is still higher—6 to 11 times higher than the general population. For Aboriginal people, suicide is an affliction of the young. From the ages of 10 to 29, Aboriginal youth on reserves are 5 to 6 times more likely to die of suicide than their peers in the general population. Over a third of all deaths among Aboriginal youth are attributable to suicide. (Kirmayer, Brass, Holton, Paul, Simpson, and Tait, 2007)

Ignoring this ongoing suffering and exploitation, *Discover Canada* keeps using the verb “enjoy” throughout the guidebook. In this section in particular, they use it to describe “Gay and Lesbian” rights: “Canada’s diversity includes gay and lesbian Canadians, who enjoy the full protection of and equal treatment under the law, including access to civil marriage.” The same thing can be said here as with Acadians and Aboriginal peoples: ongoing suffering as well as efforts to work for the betterment of their own people or against ongoing discrimination and prejudice are ignored, not to mention that representations of other sexual or gender identities are completely absent from this discourse. In fact, the inclusion of the description of gay and lesbian rights was initially omitted by Jason Kenny, at the time, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Pressure from the public made Kenny include this one sentence, but the

exclusion of their suffering and existing discrimination in Canada still clearly shows Kenny's bias (Maynard, 2012). In this part, three strategies have been discussed: (i) division of the past and the present, (ii) blurred actors of atrocities, and (iii) positive words to describe the current situation. What these three strategies do is to depict Canada as problem-free and deprive people's suffering of context. Especially in descriptions of residential schools, these three strategies were fully employed.

What is essentially different between Aboriginal peoples (indigenous Others) and immigrants (exogenous Others) is that Aboriginal people are the only group who have more legitimacy or right to be on the land. As Veracini (2010) argued, "exogenous Others, unlike their indigenous counterparts, do not challenge with their very presence the basic legitimacy of the settler entity" (p. 34). In these descriptions of atrocities, Canada does not lose its balance, but keeps it and escalates itself even higher by presenting modern Canada as different from and better than Canada in the past, and as essentially benevolent in having taken responsibility and felt remorse and full of resolve for the future.

### **iii) Devaluation of Others.**

In order to exalt Canada, the devaluation of others is used as an effective strategy. This devaluation is strongly linked to the strategy of progress and civilization discourses which will be discussed later in this chapter. I divide these two strategies because the latter is used explicitly in the expression of Canada's westward movement and the settlers' 'encounter' with Aboriginal peoples. In this section of devaluation of others, I will use as an example the description of Muslim communities.

As briefly mentioned earlier, there is a part in this guidebook which is highly controversial and has been the subject of much criticism (Joppke, 2013; Toron & Raney, 2013). The section is located in “Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship”, and labeled as “The Equality of Women and Men” (p. 9), which essentially ‘bans’ people (ostensibly Muslims) from “honour killing”, “genital mutilation” etc. This section starts with, “Canada’s openness and generosity do not extend to barbaric cultural practices.” Many critiques and scholars pointed out that it is an example of undisguised racism. I argue that by including such a description and thereby devaluing or denouncing one particular community, the text shows Canada’s superiority to those who have “barbaric practices”. This statement has a very strong modality, a definite refusal of ‘do not’, and at the same time, upholds the affirmative traits of Canadians as ‘open and generous.’ By contrasting benevolence and “barbarism,” Canada is presented as civilized, or morally better. Van Dijk (1993) explained that this kind of representation justifies inequality, and explains that it “involves two complementary strategies, namely the positive representations of one’s own group, and negative representations of others” (p. 263-264).

## **2. Tradition and Civilization from Britain**

In the previous section, the question of who ‘we’ are was raised, and I noted that this text uses ‘we’ for Canada specifically, not for Canadians. In the section of “Rights and Responsibilities”, which comes right after the practical explanation of applying for citizenship, the concept of Canada becomes more specific and is equated with Britishness, with a special emphasis on ‘tradition’. In this section, discursively constructed traditional British Canada will be revealed.

In the section of “Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship”, more particularly, the identity of this ‘we’ emerges strongly. As I noted in my description of my samples in chapter 3, this

section describes the rights of Canadian citizens such as voting, freedom of thought and religion, along with responsibilities, such as obeying the law, voting, working, and others. In this section, the text claims that rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizens “come to us from our history” (p.8), and reflect “our shared traditions, identity and values” (p. 8). Continuing on to describe the Canadian legal system, the text states that Canadian law inherited “English common law, the civil code of France and the unwritten constitution that we have inherited from Great Britain” (p.8). In this part, a strong link is created with Great Britain. After making this connection, the text goes on to state that Canada has an 800 year old tradition dating back to the signing of the Magna Carta in England. This has an effect in creating a long history of the Canadian state with roots directly in another state that has an even longer history. It is interesting to note that although the settler colonial state Canada is a relatively new creation, *Discover Canada* values and utilizes the Magna Carta, especially since the utilization of the Magna Carta is not unique to Canada. This English document was utilized in the late 1700s during the French Revolution and in the drafting of the United States constitution. This sentence sequence makes it clear that ‘we’ have a strong lineage influence from Great Britain. Even though Canada is relatively a new country, this guidebook emphasizes its tradition mainly from Britain, and claims that is the source of greatness in Canada.

This connects with the notion of civilization, one of the other valued concepts in *Discover Canada*. The notion of civilization connects with the Britishness and Europeanness, and in the description of French and British people in Canada in the section “Who We Are”, it states “Canadian society today stems largely from the English-speaking and French-speaking Christian civilizations that were brought here from Europe by settlers” (p. 11). This is the only part of this guidebook that uses the word, civilization. The discourse of ‘civilizations’ is not applied to First Nations at all. Warry (2007) argued in his book, *Ending Denial*, that civilization discourse is

utilized by neo-conservative ideologues, such as Tom Flanagan. Because Flanagan worked very closely with Stephen Harper as an advisor, it is interesting to look at Warry's criticism of this particular discourse in a Canadian context:

For Flanagan and other neo-conservatives like Smith and Kay the concept of civilization is important because they believe that European cultural superiority provide the rationale for the conquest of Indigenous peoples in the Americas, Australia, and New Zealand. They cannot see that the attempt to destroy Aboriginal cultures might be considered a sign of barbarism rather than civilization or that colonial actions came from societies that lacked the understanding and moral integrity to search for ways to protect Aboriginal cultures (Warry, 2007, p. 55)

In tracing the development of international law and sovereignty, Anghie (2005) argued that by the 19<sup>th</sup> century, any community which was out of Europe or its colonies was deemed as 'uncivilized' and thereby not protected by European law in the discourse of international law. Such a concept legitimized aggressive assimilation policies and framed treaty making. Consequentially, many treaties between what were supposed to be two sovereign entities were not respected by Europeans. This pattern of behaviour was based on the belief that "European societies provided the model which all the societies had to follow if they were to progress" (p. 62). This notion of European superiority and civilization drives the next discursive strategy that I will discuss: the justification of violence as a force of civilization and progress.

### **3. A Force of Civilization and Progress**

The superiority of Canada constructed discursively above is linked to the self-righteous representation of settler collectives, most significantly expressed in two parts related to representations of Aboriginal people: (1) descriptions of the very beginning of Canadian history and (2) of Louis Riel's rebellion. There are two parts in the guidebook that are specifically assigned to ethnographical depictions of Aboriginal peoples. The first description is located in the section "Who We Are" with Aboriginal peoples introduced as one of the three founding peoples of Canada (Aboriginal peoples, French and British) and again in the beginning of the section on Canadian history, as the starting point of the Canadian history. The second description is located in a section "Challenge in the West" in "Canada's History".

### **i) Discovery Discourse**

After the descriptions of British heritage and European civilization in the sections of "Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship" and "Who We Are", the "Canada's History" section opens by stating that "When Europeans explored Canada they found all regions occupied by native peoples they called Indians" (p. 14).

First, these so-called 'Indians' are portrayed as merely 'occupying' the land rather than actually living in these places or having established lives, which might imply Aboriginal sovereignty.

Second, the active agent in the first sentence is Europeans, which follows 'discovery' discourse. Canada's history opens with this 'discovery' of Native peoples of Canada by Europeans. This very discovery discourse is followed by anthropological descriptions of the diets of Aboriginal communities at the time of contact: the Cree and Dene as hunters and farmers, the Sioux as nomadic, the Inuit as hunters, and West Coast natives as smoked-fish makers. Along



with this description, the text adds that “Warfare was common among Aboriginal groups as they competed for land, resources, and prestige.” In other words, the only information on Aboriginal peoples in this section is what they ate and their war-like nature, which may create or reinforce an image of indigenous people as primitive, or even animalistic.

After this, the text proceeds to state, “The arrival of European traders, missionaries, soldiers and colonists changed the native way of life forever” (p. 14). This shift from an ‘animalistic’ depiction of Aboriginal peoples to the ‘change’ caused by Europeans gives the strong impression that this pattern follows civilization discourse which portrays Europeanization as modernization and progress, and that the European settlement thusly by ‘changing’ Aboriginal communities ‘improved’ them.

## **ii) Normalization**

This clearly shows that despite the deprivation and destruction of Aboriginal communities, the word ‘change’ itself is neutral sounding, and combined with the description of Aboriginal peoples as ‘primitive’, the text doesn’t convey a sense of loss or injustice at all. This section depoliticizes the destruction brought by European settlers, and devalues Aboriginal peoples’ presence and their communities before European colonization.

## **iii) Pioneer Narrative**

This progress and civilization discourse becomes even clearer in the description of the construction of the Canadian railway and the “Métis uprising.” In the section, “Canada’s History” (p. 14-23), after the depiction of primitive or animalistic pre-contact Aboriginal communities, until depictions of Louis Riel’s activism, only seven sentences are assigned to describe Aboriginal people, and even then they are mostly depicted as passive allies for French

or British, mostly partners in war or trade. After these seven sentences, the attention returns to Aboriginal peoples, especially the Métis with the Métis “rebellion” in the late 1800s led by Louis Riel. The depiction in the section “Challenge in the West” (p. 19) strikingly mirrors what Furniss (2006) found in her research of pioneer narratives in BC:

The frontier historical consciousness is made manifest in narrative- specifically, through uniquely Canadian frontier narratives that tell the story of Canada’s past through the heroic encounter of opposing forces– man and nature, civilisation and wilderness, whites and Indians– and of how conquest was achieved sometimes through righteous violence, but more often through Aboriginal people’s willing submission to the benevolent force of missionaries, Mounties and settlers (p. 182).

In the narrative of *Discover Canada*, Mounties are the chosen hero for this context. In this section, this guidebook’s attempt to avoid admitting a history of colonialism becomes compromised in expressing their ‘progress’ in expanding westward.

Just before the section on Riel in “Challenge in the West”, a quote attributed to Leonard Tilley declaring Canada a “dominion from sea to sea” is presented (p. 18), taken from a passage from Psalms 72:8 which in the King James Bible reads, “He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.” He, of course, in the Bible refers to God, in *Discover Canada*, which celebrates Tilley’s quote, God is replaced by Canada. Canada appears as if it were God omnipresently watching over everything and omnipotently controlling, at a whim, people’s lives and by which homes are taken and never given back, similar to what Foucault calls ‘pastoral power’. This also parallels with American ‘Manifest Destiny’ discourse, which was part of the drive for westward colonization in the United States. In the end of this

section, the text claims that Tilley's conception of Canada "remains part of our heritage today." Following is the chart titled "Expansion of the Dominion" (p. 19), which starts in 1867 with the confederation of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and ends in 1999 with the creation of Nunavut. Although the title Dominion of Canada had long since fallen out of use by 1999, *Discover Canada* portrays Nunavut – created through an Inuit land claim – as having been absorbed into the Dominion that year.

Moreover, as if to further trivialize and depoliticize by placing the history of colonization in a small box beside the chart of Dominion expansion, the possibility of British colonies in the Caribbean being incorporated into Canada in the 1920s is introduced with the claim that Canada and these would-be Canadian territories "enjoy close ties today." In the guidebook, Canada has 'ties' or 'bonds' with other colonized populations, similar to how Aboriginal peoples are always depicted as 'allies' of European settlers in early colonial history.

After this introduction of the idea of Canada's "Dominion from sea to sea", two leaders who pushed for the construction of the railway are introduced: John A. MacDonald and George-Etienne Cartier. Especially, the involvement of Cartier in "help(ing) negotiate the entry of the Northwest Territories, Manitoba and British Columbia into Canada" through the expansion of the railway is highlighted. With these two sections, a connection between the construction of the railways and the realization of Canada's "Dominion from sea to sea" is made. Readers are now instructed to look to the west.

#### **iv) Last Stand Narrative**

Here, Louis Riel is introduced as a leader of a rebellion – a rebellion whose cause is not adequately explained: "When Canada took over the vast northwest region from Hudson's Bay

Company ... the 12,000 Métis of the Red River were not consulted. In response, Louis Riel led an armed uprising” (p.19). First, we should remember that this rebellion did not start as an armed conflict, and second, it is not clear where the Red River is and how many settlers and Aboriginal peoples fought side by side with the Métis against the state (Boyden, 2010; Braz, 2003).

Regardless, the text states, in reference to this resistance, “Canada’s future is in jeopardy. How could the Dominion reach from sea to sea if it could not control the interior?” (p. 19) In this, the Métis and Louis Riel are depicted as the hindrance of the destined development of the Dominion, and the text goes on to explain, “Ottawa sent soldiers to retake Fort Garry in 1870.” The armed operation by Ottawa is justified discursively through the simple phrase, “dominion from sea to sea.” Wodak (1999) called this sort of discourse a strategy of “perpetuation”, which is to legitimize the course that the nation state took, justifying particular actions (p. 161). This justification of the violent suppression of the Métis rebellion and the execution of Riel is achieved through the discursive construction of a good and ever-lasting Canada well before reaching this page, along with the “national dream” of “Dominion from sea to sea.”

Immediately after the rebellion, the text continues, “Riel fled to the United States and Canada established a new province: Manitoba” (p.19). The sentence sequence totally dismisses the victory by the Riel-led rebellion, and describes him as a loser. Without mentioning anything at all of the aggressively anti-Catholic Orange Order or intense discrimination or hatred toward Riel which led him to leave Canada (Boyden, 2010), it explains only, “Riel was elected to Parliament, but never took his seat” (p. 19), as though Riel didn’t do so voluntarily, or even out of irresponsibility or laziness.

Then the text moves on to the second rebellion in 1885 when “Métis and Indian rights were again threatened by the westward movement” (p. 19). Here the actor threatening these rights and

how this was done is missing, making this description very vague and light sounding. It continues to state that “the second rebellion in 1885 ... led to Riel’s trial and execution for high treason” (p. 19). Although the opposition to the execution in Quebec and Riel being taken as a hero by many in Aboriginal and French-speaking communities is very briefly stated in the section, Riel is depicted as a criminal with no reasonable context for his actions.

Riel’s rebellion is essentially presented as a “last stand” narrative for Aboriginal people.

Furniss (2006) argued that this sort of narrative is:

an event which epitomises a watershed moment, distinguishing a past in which settlers struggled against indigenous peoples to establish a tenuous hold in the new land, from a present– and a future– in which colonial authority is established, unproblematical and unchallenged (p. 174).

The Métis rebellions ultimately serve as the context for the birth of the RCMP and the completion of the railroad. In the text, the RCMP was said to be established to “pacify the West and assist in negotiations with the Indians.” We might ask if causing Aboriginal communities to scatter or starve were included in this ‘pacification’. While “Riel is seen by many as a hero,” the text admits, members of the RCMP involved in ‘pacifying’ the west are declared “some of Canada’s most colourful heroes” (p. 19).

Francis (1992) examined representations of Aboriginal peoples in Canada in various mediums such as novels, movies, or advertisements. In his book, *The Imaginary Indian*, he examined the representations of the RCMP, how they have been a crucial character or hero in the nation-building narrative of Canada. As seen in this guidebook, the Mounted Police are depicted literally as heroes and an essential part in fulfilling the ‘national dream’. In describing the

development of the mounted police in fiction as national heroes, Aboriginal people were depicted as “savage and ungovernable, a symbol of the dark forces of anarchy which had to be subdued before civilization could flourish in the West” (Francis, 1992; p. 76). Francis was, however, talking about the time range of 1885 to the Second World War. This discursive trope is clearly continued into the 21<sup>st</sup> century in *Discover Canada* in the descriptions of Aboriginal peoples and in the depiction of the Métis as a hindrance of the “Dominion from sea to sea”.

In the narrative of the Mounted Police, the Hegelian concept of history starting with civilization, and civilization starting with order are emphasized, and the mounted police symbolize order, surveillance, and total obedience to authority, which ‘bestows’ progress on Aboriginal peoples. This ideology works very clearly in the narrative of westward movement and the emergence of the Mounted Police. Through the depictions of Aboriginal people as primitive, animalistic, untamed, or in this case, rebellious, national institutions such as the ‘beloved’ RCMP are portrayed as being created out of necessity, and the presence of Aboriginal people enhances the disciplinary power of the state. This is reflected in the work of Anghie (2005) who traced European discourses of sovereignty and international law to the colonization of the Americas, up through to 19<sup>th</sup> century legalistic civilization discourse. In this narrative of the Métis rebellion and the birth of the RCMP to “pacify the west”, traditions of Canadian lawfulness and orderliness are established, but not in the context of lasting injustices done to Aboriginal communities.

Finally, this ‘Dominion’ narrative closes with the section, “A Railway from Sea to Sea” (p. 20), with the completion of the railroad in British Columbia, thus “fulfill[ing] a national dream.” Here, the discrimination toward and exploitation of Chinese ‘coolie’ labourers is briefly described, but we are told that “the government of Canada apologized in 2006 for this

discriminatory policy” (p.20), and the text calls this dangerous labour “heroic work” (p. 20). In the westward expansion of the Dominion through the construction of the railroad, the RCMP, two leaders from English Canada and French Canada: John A. MacDonald and George-Etienne Cartier, Chinese migrant workers are represented as national heroes with definite modalities, while we are told that Louis Riel “can be seen” as a hero by certain people (p. 19).

In these sections describing the westward movement, more immigrants come to appear in the text, making a direct connection between westward expansion and the inflow of immigrants to Canada: “the railway made it possible for immigrants ... to settle in the West.” In this flow of paragraphs, Aboriginal communities are clearly depicted as something that was hindering this movement without mentioning them as having to move westward because of earlier colonization, and readers are made to follow this grand narrative of “Dominion from sea to sea” strictly from a point of view of Anglo-Canada.

However, in so doing, this text lacks consistency in that it cannot state clearly what was motivating the rebellion and why the RCMP was needed in the west to “pacify Indians” (p. 19). This guidebook tries to explain the Canadian fiction of a “Dominion from sea to sea” in historical writing which should require at least superficial evidence and convincing narratives. This narrative of railroad-driven western expansion mirrors an understated narrative of ‘vanishing’ Aboriginal peoples. In fact, Aboriginal peoples literally disappear from the history section altogether after this point, and representations of Aboriginal peoples briefly come back in “Modern Canada” in one sentence: “Aboriginal people were granted the vote in 1960” (p. 25), and also again briefly in a section on Canadian art with one sentence: “Kenojuak Ashevak pioneered modern Inuit art with etchings, prints and soap stone sculptures” (p. 25). In sum, Canada is depicted with three emphases: Canada as innately good, Canada as traditional, and

Canada as a powerful civilizing force. To realize each quality of Canada, a storyteller of the narrative of Canada is established and representations of the populations are also formed through particular discursive strategies. In the next chapter, we will look at discourse around Canadians, Aboriginal peoples, and immigrants.



## Chapter 6 Discursive Construction of Population

In the next two chapters, discursive strategies applied for the three population groups (Canadians, exogenous Others and indigenous Others) will be demonstrated. All three groups are placed below the state, Canada, and accompanied by respective narratives. In the following two chapters, representations assigned to Canadians, Aboriginal peoples and immigrants will be examined. My analysis of the population is divided into two: (1) an analysis of *Canadianness*, and of each population in that framework, and (2) population transfers completed discursively among these three groups.

In this chapter, the question of Canadianness will be used as a lens to examine discursive strategies which exalt national subjects and place population of Others in their suitable place(s) through discursive inclusion and exclusion by way of defining ideal traits of Canadians. Crucial to this analysis is the notion of exaltation of national subjects which Thobani (2007) elaborated in her book, *Exalted Subjects*. Thobani shared the same structural understanding of settler colonial Canada as Veracini (2010), particularly in breaking the binary understanding of the population (Indigenous and settler) and suggesting a three-tier population system. Thobani (2007) examined how Canadian nationals, “a relatively new kind of subject” (p.4), are historically constructed.

According to Thobani (2007):

The figure of the national subject is a much venerated one, exalted above all others as the embodiment of the quintessential characteristics of the nation and the personification of its values, ethics, and civilizational mores. In the

trope of the citizen, this subject is universally deemed the legitimate heir to the rights and entitlements proffered by the state (p. 3-4).

So national subjects, Canadians, are discursively placed higher than the population of Others, close to the Canadian nation-state. This exaltation is not performed in isolation, but rather through comparison, contrast, inclusion, exclusion, or the total elimination of Others. As Thobani (2007) stated, “the national subject is not only existentially but also institutionally and systematically defined in direct relation to the outsider” (p. 5). *Discover Canada* exalts Canadians as well as Canada itself. In so doing, *Discover Canada* goes further than just exalting national subjects, but also calls upon the candidates’ *willingness* to become a national subject and shows them what they will be and what they cannot be. At the same time, this guidebook shows who the new national subjects should align themselves with and who they should not follow.

To begin demonstrating discursive strategies used to exalt Canadians, the guidebook’s framework of representations of the population should be clarified. As briefly discussed earlier, this guidebook places Aboriginal peoples, the French, and English as the three “founding peoples” of Canada. The bulk of descriptions refer to English and French Canadians, with significantly fewer representations of Aboriginal people. In this chapter, how hierarchy of the population is rendered discursively based on the notion of “Canadianness” will be discussed. Through the label “immigrants”, this guidebook distinguishes non-English or French immigrants from English and French immigrants, separating them from the two discursively privileged “founding peoples”. In *Discover Canada*, there is minimal exposure throughout the texts of Aboriginal people’s contributions to or involvement with Canada, even though they are, after all, one of the three founding peoples. Even with the groups that are represented, despite the diverse

and distinct First Nations existing in the geographic territory now called Canada, very few individual nations are represented, with one of the few exceptions being the Iroquois – a nation given titles such as ‘farmers’, ‘hunters’, ‘allies’, and ‘enemies’. The representations are limited not only to the First Nations in relation to their contact with settlers, but also is regionally biased, not including people such as the Mi’kmaq which came to be a significant actor in the relationship with French and English European settlers in what is now called Atlantic Canada. Even when represented, like the Iroquois, Aboriginal peoples are primarily presented as ‘allies’ of British or French settlers in trade or military actions.

There are many sentences which start with “Canadians”, and they clearly state what qualities Canadians have or should have. Categorized thematically, qualities that are given to Canadians are (1) being law-abiding and responsible, (2) having survived, (3) having made military sacrifices, (4) being multicultural, and (5) being traditional. The three traits of Canada (to be inherently good, of British origin, and to be a force of progress), can be observed in some descriptions of Canadians, and especially Britishness is emphasized by sentences such as “Most Canadians were proud to be part of the British Empire” (p. 21). Of the descriptions of the five traits listed above, some are directly stated with an active subject of “Canadians”, while others emerge as a sort of halo around representations of others, a bright glow which tones down the goodness of others. In the following analysis, each trait of Canadians is demonstrated with representations of both Indigenous and exogenous Others.

### **1) Law-abiding and responsible**

This trait of Canadians is expressed in the text in a very straightforward way and sentences assigned to this theme occur repetitively. There are two effects in emphasizing the lawfulness of Canadians. First is to exalt national subjects as responsible people, and the second,

which is probably at least of equal importance to the first one, is to pressure readers, namely candidates to become new national subjects, to be obedient and subordinate to the law. In addition to the specific explanation of the law and legal system of Canada, direct sentences that link Canadians and lawfulness are as follows:

- “Canadian citizens have rights and responsibilities. These come to us from our history, are secured by Canadian law, and reflect our shared traditions, identity and values” (p. 8).
- “Canadians are bound together by a shared commitment to the rule of law” (p. 3).
- “In Canada, men and women are equal under the law” (p. 9).
- “Canadian citizens enjoy many rights, but Canadians also have responsibilities. They must obey Canada’s laws and respect the rights and freedoms of others” (p. 2).

This fits perfectly what Thobani (2011) observed in the Canadian national narrative: “[t]here prevails in Canada a master narrative of the nation, which takes as its point of departure the essentially law-abiding character of its enterprising nationals” (p. 9). By presenting these images of a strong link between Canadians and the law, Canadian subjects are shown in a positive light, and serve as a model for new immigrants. At the same time, it is crucial to note that ‘lawfulness’ has been an important notion in colonialism and settler-colonialism, even where – as discussed above in regards to the “challenge in the west” – the law of the colonizer serves to deprive others of liberty. This emphasis on law and lawfulness of citizens can be understood in this colonial framework by which non-Europeans are, as Anghie (2005) argued, occupying an ambiguous space in the law, if included at all. The trait of being “law-abiding” subjects particularly important as a marker of European superiority, and here distinguishing Canada from the non-West and exalting the state.

## **2) Survival: Canadians Defend Their Way of Life (Survival Discourse)**

At the very beginning of the guidebook, it is stated that “Canadians take pride in identity and have made sacrifices to defend their way of life” (p.3). Throughout the guidebook, there are many parts which are assigned to describe certain groups’ collective hardships, such as the Acadian deportation or Aboriginal residential schooling. It is true that many groups have suffered oppression and survived. However, this guidebook values such survival as a quality of Canadians who “defend their way of life.” The term “survival”, though, is not applied to descriptions of every group which has been oppressed or has faced hardships.

First, let’s look at the examples of the groups to whom the term “survival” is applied.

### **a) Acadians**

The description of the Acadian deportations is as follows: “Between 1755 and 1763, during the war between Britain and France, more than two-thirds of the Acadians were deported from their homeland” (p. 11). In this sentence, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, this grievous act occurs without an explicit actor. The text continues, “Despite this ordeal, known as the ‘Great Upheaval,’ the Acadians survived and maintained their unique identity. Today, Acadian culture is flourishing and is a lively part of French-speaking Canada” (p. 11). Here, we can observe a division of the past and the present by the usage of the word “today”, which was used for other minority groups’ hardships as well. The focus here is the description of the Acadians’ survival. The Acadians here is an explicit actor in “surviving” and “maintaining” their unique identity, which perfectly fits a wider narrative of who Canadians are.

### **b) Quebec**

In the description of the Province of Quebec, after mentioning the battle of the Plains of Abraham (1759) and defeat of the French, the text continues to say, “The French-speaking Catholic people, known as *habitants* or *Canadiens*, strove to preserve their way of life in the English-speaking, Protestant-ruled British Empire” (p. 15, italics in original). Here, too, people in Quebec are portrayed as having this Canadian survival quality, having faced a challenge in which they “strive to preserve their way of life.”

Also, this tendency can be detected in the description of the recommendation made by Lord Durham who said that to achieve progress quicker, people should be “assimilated into English-speaking Protestant culture” (p. 18). The text proceeds to state “this recommendation demonstrated a complete lack of understanding of French Canadians who sought to uphold the distinct identity of French Canada” (p. 18). It is made clear that French Canadians have a trait that matches expectations of Canadians as national subjects. It should be noted that this discourse clearly excludes Aboriginal communities who were also targeted by this sort of assimilatory discourse, though *Discover Canada* emphasizes only the French people as “surviving”.

### **c) Non English or French Immigrants**

This survival trait is applied for non-English or French immigrants, too. In the section “Modern Canada”, the text states: “By the 1960s, one-third of Canadians had origins that were neither British nor French, and took pride in preserving their distinct culture in the Canadian fabric” (p. 25). These immigrants grouped vaguely as ‘neither English nor French’ are even presented as displaying the Canadian trait of survival in “taking pride and preserving their distinct culture.” It is important to note that they are not fighting for their ‘way of life’, but for “their distinct culture”, using a singular noun. This will be discussed further later on in this chapter in my description of multicultural discourse.

Chinese migrants are described in between survival and multicultural discourses. In the description of the completion of the railway, Chinese migrants' "hardship" is described. The text states that the railway was made possible because of European and Chinese labour, and explains, "Afterwards the Chinese were subjected to discrimination, including the Head Tax, a race-based entry fee. The government of Canada apologized in 2006 for this discriminatory policy. After many years of heroic work, the CPR's 'ribbon of steel' fulfilled a national dream" (p. 20). In this statement, too, discursive strategies such as blurred actors and reconciliation discourse are used. In addition, immediately after the apology, Chinese people's hardship is glorified by the word "heroic". It can be taken as "survival discourse" in describing recovery from discrimination.

Simultaneously, Chinese migrants' labour is not rendered as an active subject in "fulfilling the national dream," but stubbornly, the CPR's "ribbon of steel" is credited for constructing the national core. This suggests that inclusion into the larger body of Canadians as 'survivors' does not necessarily lead to inclusion into the core of the national story.

#### **d) Aboriginal peoples**

This discourse of "survival" is not applied to any descriptions of Aboriginal peoples in this guidebook. It is striking that this trait is completely absent from representations of Aboriginal peoples while the guidebook claims that Aboriginal peoples are one of the three founding peoples of Canada and considering that without question, Aboriginal peoples suffered the most discrimination out of any group in Canada. First, in the description of residential schools in the section "Who We Are" (p. 10), which we looked at in the analysis of reconciliation discourse, Aboriginal peoples are never given the status of "surviving". The guidebook labels them as "Aboriginal children," "the students," or "the former students." There is no usage of "survivor," even in the guidebook's description of the government's apology in 2008: "Ottawa formally

apologized to the former students” (p.10). Journalist, activist, and educator Wab Kinew (2012) revealed the inner conflict he had with his employer, the CBC, over the usage of the term survivor when Harper made his apology. CBC’s policy was to address the people who were put in the residential schools as ‘former students’, mirroring *Discover Canada*. The CBC’s reason was that ‘survivor’ was not the accurate term, because in the dictionary, “it was defined as a person, animal, or a plant that lived through disaster without perishing”(“Inclusion Works ‘12 Keynote Address”, CBC, 2012). Wab Kinew wrote a letter to the CBC that what these children had to go through, the abuse and the abject environment they were forced to grow up in, and the trauma that became a legacy which has lasted over generations is truly a disaster (“Inclusion Works ‘12 Keynote Address”, CBC, 2012).

Here, the term ‘former students’ does two things, one is to deprive the survivors of agency and active engagement, and secondly, is to give a picture of residential schools as primarily an educational space, while truly they were in many cases closer to prisons or internment camps.

Throughout the section (p. 10), “children” or “students” are treated as being extremely passive: “the federal government placed many Aboriginal children in residential schools...,” “the schools... inflicted hardship on students,” “some were physically abused,” and ‘Ottawa... apologized to the former students.’ Butler and Athanasiou (2013) pointed out that reconciliation discourse keeps Indigenous people “silent sufferers”, writing that “[o]ngoing (post) colonial subjection and dispossession are further legitimized, normalized, and regulated though, and in the name of, discourses of reconciliation.” (p. 26)

There is no sense of survival or even that there is or was anything to be preserved. After this, the text states, “In today’s Canada, Aboriginal people enjoy renewed pride and confidence (p. 10).” Through this blithe description, the text dismisses the ongoing oppression and struggles of



Aboriginal communities in Canada, and as King (2012) wrote in his book, *The Inconvenient Indian*, this active negligence sends a message that ‘The past is past. Forget about it.’ Not only is this an inaccurate representation of the Aboriginal peoples, but also disguises the reality that many Aboriginal communities are still exploited and are suffering and *surviving*. King (2012) wrote, “[t]he history I offer to forget, the past I offered to burn, turns out to be our present. It may well be our future” (p. 192). This also may deprive new immigrants of the chance to be aware of the ongoing exploitation of Aboriginal communities and their own possible involvement in it, of actively learning about issues and the possibility of getting involved. For new immigrants to do so would be to challenge the existing settler colonial power balance.

In the section “Canada’s History”, Aboriginal peoples are “found” (p. 14) by Europeans as mentioned in the previous chapter. As the first “occupants” of Canada, Aboriginal peoples are introduced through descriptions of how they hunt and prepare food or how they often fought amongst themselves. The texts state that “the arrival of European traders, missionaries, soldiers and colonists changed the native way of life forever” (p. 14). There is a clear strategy of normalization and depoliticization here in use of the word, “change”. Perhaps more appropriate words for this process are ‘destroy’, ‘harm’, etc. Furthermore, the text explains the loss of lives of Aboriginal peoples caused by “European diseases to which they lacked immunity.” The violence inflicted upon Aboriginal communities by Canadians is not mentioned at all, as if to say Europeans’ arrival changed them consequentially rather than an explicit goal on the part of newcomers, and European diseases killed them accidentally.

Interestingly, here, there is no mention of land deprivation or the reserve system. This clearly shows that despite the deprivation and destruction of Aboriginal communities, the guidebook clearly avoids talking about it altogether. Butler (1997) argued that the role of discourse “not

only constitute the domain of the speakable, but ... the production of a constitutive outside, the unspeakable, the unsignifiable” (p. 94). In the description of Aboriginal peoples and their relationship with other populations of Canada, colonialism disappears, dark and transparent like a shadow, “the unspeakable.”

Moreover, there is no sense of strife or survival here like other groups. Acadians, Quebecois, or even immigrants who are not British or French strive to “preserve their way of life,” or at least “their culture”. However, in *Discover Canada*, Aboriginal peoples do not strive nor survive; their way of life is changed without any turmoil. And then they “enjoy renewed pride” in today’s Canada. This clear exclusion of Aboriginal peoples from the core virtues of Canadian national traits demonstrates that Aboriginal peoples are depicted as part of a specific set of discursive strategies. The effect of this strategy is to marginalize Aboriginal peoples’ presence in the Canadian narrative and weakens their position in the present or future.

Butler and Athanasiou (2013) argued that “survival is configured and differently allocated by normative and normalizing operation of power, such as racism, poverty, heteronormativity, ethnocentrism, and cultural recognition” ( p. 79). Through such discursive strategies listed above, *Discover Canada* literally allocates survival to prominent ethnic groups while completely excluding Aboriginal peoples.

### **3. Sacrifice**

Another Canadian trait is to sacrifice. Canadians’ sacrifice is primarily demonstrated through the description of military actions in this textbook. Many critics, such as McKay and Swift criticized this guidebook for its strong emphasis on military history, going as far as to call *Discover Canada* “the beginner’s guide to the warrior nation” (Scharper, 2012).

After the railway construction, the rest of history up until the end of World War II is assigned to military history. Many of the descriptions do not even take the form of narrative, but mostly focused on numbers: how many people died in each war.

For example:

- In total 60,000 Canadians were killed and 170,000 wounded [in World War One]. The war strengthened both national and imperial pride, particularly in English Canada. (p. 21)
- Canadians remember the sacrifices of our veterans and brave fallen in all wars up to the present day in which Canadians took part, each year on November 11: Remembrance Day. Canadians wear the red poppy and observe a moment on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month to honour the sacrifices of over a million brave men and women who have served, and the 110,000 who have given their lives, Canadian medical officer Lieutenant Colonel John McCrae composed the poem “In Flanders Field” in 1915; it is often recited on Remembrance Day. (p. 22)
- Canadians took part in the liberation of Italy in 1943-44. In the epic invasion of Normandy in northern France on June 6, 1944, known as D-Day, 15,000 Canadian troops stormed and captured Juno Beach from the German Army, a great national achievement shown in this painting by Orville Fisher. Approximately one in ten Allied soldiers on D-Day was Canadian. (p. 23)
- More than one million Canadians and Newfoundlanders (Newfoundland was a separate British entity) served in the Second World War, out of a population of 11.5 million. This was a high proportion and of these, 44,000 were killed. (p. 23)

The nation-building narrative is driven by war, and tellingly in World War One, one anonymous Canadian officer is quoted as saying, “It was Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific on parade ... in those few minutes I witnessed the birth of a nation” (p. 21). After descriptions of each war and statistics of the deaths of Canadian soldiers, *Discover Canada* states that particular wars “strengthened national pride in Canada” (p. 21), or “strengthened both national and imperial pride, particularly in Canada” (p. 21). In this military history, a framework is created for Canadians: “Canadians remember the sacrifice of our veterans and brave fallen in all wars up to the present day in which Canadians took part” (p. 22). Sakai (1997) observed that by collectively presenting deaths “for the country,” the state is subjugating the dead as, “the absolutely Other ... whose identity is constituted within the system of collective representations” (p. 190).

Namely, dead soldiers are made into a national narrative as a sacrifice to the nation, while they have literally no voice to speak about their different circumstances in their deaths and their actions of going to war. This kind of nationalist narrative exploits the dead who by the merit of being dead are excluded from the nation. In *Discover Canada*, through this massive sacrifice, the worthiness of Canadians and Canada is exalted even more. In the descriptions of war and deaths, there’s no breakdown of racial, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, or class categories such as British Canadians, French Canadians or Aboriginal peoples. All the people are described as “Canadians” despite all the varied differences that this guidebook constructs. In wars, people in Canada become as one. All groups are unified as Canadians in this section as if to indicate that all divisions, discrimination, inequality, etc. just disappear in the war, in fighting for Canada.

In addition, the guidebook also pressures (or at least demonstrates an expectation) for new immigrants to join the army. In the section of “Rights and Responsibilities of Citizenship”, there is one corner assigned for “Defending Canada”. It states that Canada does not have a military

draft, but “serving in the regular Canadian forces ... is a noble way to contribute to Canada and an excellent career choice” (p. 9). This section ends with the following sentence: “By helping to protect your community, you follow the footsteps of Canadians before you who made sacrifices in the service of our community” (p. 9). Despite glorified descriptions of death tolls, this is an invitation to join the ‘glorious’ war dead. The death tolls and accompanying descriptions demonstrate an expectation that candidates serve in the military. This further exalts Canadians as subjects who have sacrificed their lives collectively and have been loyal to Canada, thereby simultaneously exalting the state and drawing a line between those who sacrifice and those who don’t.

Candidates are offered the right to kill and privilege to die for Canada. In this invitation, British and French immigrants, depicted as people who sacrificed their lives for this country, are exalted, and citizenship candidates are placed below them as those who have ‘yet to be’ a sacrifice (meaning dead). Newcomers do not have such a history and are thus excluded. Furthermore, Aboriginal peoples’ deaths by disease, in residential schools or in massacres, or even their lost lives in volunteering to fight for Canada., are not counted as “sacrifices” for the country. Even when such deaths are made reference to or depicted, they are utilized as part of the exaltation of the state (as seen in my discussion of reconciliation discourse in the previous chapter).

#### **4. Being Multicultural**

Multiculturalism is explicitly stated as one of the Canadian traits: “Multiculturalism – a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity. Canadians celebrate the gift of one another’s presence and work hard to respect pluralism and live in harmony” (p.8), or, “Together, these diverse groups, sharing a common Canadian identity, make up today’s

multicultural society” (p. 13). In both sentences, a word, “identity”, is used and multiculturalism is presented as the foundation of this identity. At the same time, multiculturalism is depicted as glue which holds various populations together through the use of such words as “together”, “common”, “share”, “in harmony”. Even in sentences that are not directly addressing multiculturalism, emphasis on this discourse can be traced: “For 400 years, settlers and immigrants have contributed to the diversity and richness of our country, which is built on a proud history and a strong identity” (p. 3).

Multiculturalism is often represented by words such as “diversity”, “diverse”, or “diversify”. In describing non-English or non-French immigrants’ struggles against oppression and discrimination, they are described as fighting to “preserve their culture” (p. 25), but not to “defend their way of life” as English and French immigrants do. The usage of the word, “culture” here is worth noting, because the degree of suffering one can associate with the phrase “defend their way of life” and “preserve their culture” is completely different. To defend one’s “way of life” has a much stronger sense of crisis or of an immediate threat with a much stronger political undertone. At the same time, this connects with Thobani’s criticism of multiculturalism: “multiculturalism has had the effect of constituting people of colour as possessing an excess of culture that marked them as outsiders to the nation” (Thobani 2007, p. 162). The most highlighted possession of non-English or non-French Canadians is “culture,” not their lives.

In addition, in *Discover Canada*, immigrants’ accomplishments and physical or cultural survival does not become part of Canada’s core narrative, but benefits the central body of citizens, as evidenced in sentences such as: “today, diversity enriches Canadians’ lives, especially in our cities” (p. 25). The same pattern can be seen in a list of popular Canadian writers following an explanation of multiculturalism. On a list of Canadian authors, for example,

when authors are not of European origin, such as in the case of Joy Kogawa, Michael Ondaatje, or Rohinton Mistry, they are said to “have diversified Canada’s literary experience” (p. 25). Thobani (2007) argued that multiculturalism gives the (white) national subjects a quality of “both experiencing a dearth of their own culture and as being more accepting of cosmopolitanism by their interactions with ‘multicultures’” (p. 162). In this logic, *Discover Canada* also exalts (white) Canadians and Canada by describing multiculturalism as part of their ‘heritage.’ Similarly, at the very end of a list of visual artists, one Inuit artist, Kenojuak Ashevak, is listed. Ashevak “pioneered modern Inuit art with etchings, prints and soapstone sculptures” (p. 25). Aboriginal people are not mentioned at all in this section except for Ashevak’s art, which is included as part of Canada’s ‘multicultural’ cosmopolitanism. This has the effect of treating indigenous cultural production as being part of immigrant-driven multiculturalism, and even in such a short sentence, the word “pioneer” is slipped in.

Furthermore, even in this wider multicultural discourse, not all ‘multi-cultures’ are presented as equal. As discussed in the previous chapter, *Discover Canada* warns immigrants whose practices are ‘barbaric’ that Canada will not tolerate such behaviour.

## **5. Being Traditional**

The word “tradition” is used repetitively throughout this text to describe Canada or Canadians. In the previous chapter, traditions which are claimed to have been inherited from Great Britain are described. Here, a newer distinctly Canadian tradition will be discussed. *Discover Canada* states, “You are becoming part of a great tradition that was built by generations of pioneers before you” (p. 3). Elsewhere, the text states that “Canadian citizens have rights and responsibilities. These come to us from our history, are secured by Canadian law, and reflect our shared *traditions*, identity and values” (p. 8). In addition, in the section of “Who

We Are”, there is an image of John Buchan, the 15<sup>th</sup> Governor General of Canada wearing a headdress which was given to him by the Blood Nation placed above the descriptions of the Inuit and Métis. The background behind this photograph or how the Blood Nation came to give Buchan this headdress is not clear. However, a description of Buchan is entitled “Unity in Diversity”, and Buchan is quoted as saying that immigrants should enjoy their own “special loyalties and traditions” but should “cherish not less that new loyalty and tradition which springs from their union” (p. 11). It is not clear what exactly this “tradition” indicates. As described in the previous chapter, Canada’s 800-year-old tradition is depicted as stemming from British customs. However, the notion of tradition here is made to appear to be constructed in Canada, and includes new immigrants, even though “new” and “tradition” work as an oxymoron.

Hobsbawm (2013) gave a hint to solve this mystery. He argued in *The Invention of Tradition* that a central trait in modern nation states or these states’ colonies is the sometimes conscious creation of new ‘traditions’. Hobsbawm (2013) argued that traditions are invented not because “old ways are no longer available or visible, but because [old ways] are not deliberately used or adapted” (p. 8). He distinguished traditions from customs, with the difference being that traditions are something ideological, while customs are formed out of practicality. He did not deny the existence of ‘organic’ traditions, but argued for the importance of historians to be conscious of “invented traditions”, which are a more common practice than one might think.

Hobsbawm specifically defined these ‘traditions’ as:

a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past (p. 1).



This situation parallels the rise of multiculturalism of Canada as Canada liberalized citizenship and included the idea of ‘diversity’ into Canadian social and political discourse. Thobani (2007) argued that by including diversity into the national polity using multicultural discourse, Canada is exalted as “a liberal democratic country, not a settler colonial country” (p. 100).

Although invented tradition as discussed by Hobsbawm (2013) indicated material culture or ritualistic ceremonies, in this case, I argue that *Discover Canada* itself is inventing or reinforcing a discursive tradition. Keeping in mind Foucault’s notions of discourse being a practice, that the discourse makes practice, and practice makes discourse, this guidebook claims many things as ‘traditional’ while not giving a clear definition or explanation of what ‘Canadian tradition’ really means. While Hobsbawm (2013) argued that new traditions are utilized when the old practices are dismissed, *Discover Canada* both repurposes old practices (ie. British tradition) and pairs them with new invented traditions. Old practices become a tool to demonstrate Canada’s Britishness or Europeanness, and are thus symbols of superiority. New invented traditions are the traditions of ‘pioneers’ which glues all immigrants together under the pretence that they all came to the new world to ‘discover’ what’s there. For the remainder of this section, the representations and applications of this newly invented tradition will be demonstrated.

As Hobsbawm (2013) argued in the *Invented Tradition*’s introductory chapter, it is a challenge for historians to observe when and how new traditions are invented, but he stated that “traditions are partly invented ... informally over a period of time ... in parliament and the legal profession” (p.4). This section does not trace where this trend of inventing Canadian traditions started, but examines representations of the assertion of tradition in *Discover Canada* which informs citizenship candidates.

- “You are becoming part of a great tradition that was built by generations of pioneers before you” (p. 3).
- “Canadian citizens have rights and responsibilities. These come to us from our history, are secured by Canadian law, and reflect our shared traditions, identity and values” (p. 8).
- “Each could learn ‘from the other, and ... while they cherish their own special loyalties and traditions, they cherish not less that new loyalty and tradition which springs from their union’” (p. 11).

In these three sentences, it is impossible to define what “shared tradition” or “pioneer tradition” are. Pal Ahluwalia (2001) argued that in the Australian settler colonial situation, “the lack of definition of the ‘Australian way of life’” is the very key to “maintaining the power and hegemony of the white Anglo-settler population” (p. 65). In *Discover Canada*, through the guidebook, readers can have a vague image of what the Canadian tradition is through the representations of Canadianness. Based on the sentence which describes this “tradition” as built by “pioneers,” tradition could refer to the idea that Canadians are all “pioneers” who have survived, have sacrificed, are responsible, and are multicultural. Significantly, this tradition is as an open entity that newcomers can easily join just by being a ‘pioneer’, who are worthy of being national subjects. Instead of emphasizing the oldness of Canada, this tradition emphasizes candidates’ inclusion as new subjects. By just coming to Canada and joining the settler polity, this invented tradition of pioneers is strengthened.

Hobsbawm (2013) stated that there are three characteristics of invented tradition:

- a) “those establishing or symbolizing social cohesion or the membership of groups, real or artificial communities”

- b) “those establishing or legitimizing institutions, status or relations of authority, and
- c) those whose main purpose was socialization, the inclusion of beliefs, value systems and conventions of behavior.” (p. 9)

These three characteristics fit very well with what *Discover Canada* does to the candidates through this new form of tradition: (a) this new tradition lets newcomers come in as long as they become national subjects and strengthen their sense of belonging by sharing in Canadian tradition, (b) tradition is always paired up with the notion of responsibility for, loyalty to, and belonging in the Canadian state, and (c) new candidates beliefs, values and conventions are already partly included into the settler body just by being ‘pioneers’ (and thereby settlers).

Although Winter (2011) argued that Aboriginal peoples are sometimes included in the traditions of the British and French (p. 170), in this guidebook, Aboriginal peoples are for the most part excluded, again, from having their own ‘traditions’ despite the fact that Aboriginal peoples’ traditions are unquestionably older than any settler traditions. The only part of *Discover Canada* where a link between Aboriginal peoples and tradition is made is not in descriptions of peoples, history, or in messages to the candidates, but in the section of “Canadian Symbols” (p. 38-41), located after the section describing the justice system (p. 36-37). In this section, many Canadian symbols are listed from the Canadian Crown to popular sports. Aboriginal peoples’ traditions appear in the description of the Parliament Buildings, itself one of the Canadian symbols. The description states, “the towers, arches, sculptures and stained glass of the Parliament Buildings embody the French, English and Aboriginal traditions and the Gothic Revival architecture popular in the time of Queen Victoria” (p. 38- 39). This is not part of the narrative of Canada, but is treated as a sub-section of the description of symbols of Canada, and Aboriginal traditions are represented as literally decorative.

Hobsbawm (2013) argued that the invented traditions are formed through repetition. We should remember that in order to pass the citizenship test, candidates will typically read this textbook many times, reading through descriptions carefully to memorize the ‘facts’. This repetition itself reinforces the ‘invented tradition’ of *Discover Canada*, which is a practice and ritual itself, and may act as a base for future practices. As Jason Kenny stated in his speech made at the time of the launch of *Discover Canada*, this guidebook will be utilized to make materials for language education and settlement programs (Kenny, 2009). To make a bold statement, this national narrative of Canada is itself a sort of invented tradition that is to be told, retold, memorized, and marked on the test sheet and onto the candidates’ consciousness. *Discover Canada* is an invented tradition, and as always, there is an invitation to new ‘pioneers’ to take part in it.

Chart: Assigned Canadianness to the three population

	Survival	Sacrifice	Tradition
Settler (English)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Settler (French)	Yes	Yes	So so
Exogenous Others	Yes	Not yet	Soon
Indigenous Others	Excluded	Excluded	As a decoration

In this chapter, the representations of the three populations have been examined through the scope of Canadianness, by which they are discursively assigned necessary traits to be Canadian, and how the exaltation of the national subject is accomplished in such discourse. Five traits related to Canadianness have been identified: (1) to be responsible, (2) to have survived, (3) to sacrifice, (4) to be multicultural, and (5) to be traditional, as demonstrated using several identifiable discursive strategies. First, there are straightforward sentences that define Canadians

as ideal citizens. Second, discourse is used to include or exclude Others into/from the virtues of Canadianness, and third, a comparison and contrast between exalted subjects with Others which further heightens the value of Canadianness. In addition to these discursive strategies, a new tradition is invented through the texts to glue divergent new members together, simultaneously exalting national (white) subjects to a higher level.

In the next chapter, the strategies of population transfer will be discussed.

## Chapter 7 Discursive Population Transfer

As demonstrated in the previous chapters, the structure of this guidebook revolves around four actors: Canada, Canadians, Aboriginal peoples and immigrants. In these four actors, there are more divisions. Immigrants are divided very clearly into English and French immigrants and immigrants who are neither English nor French. Some groups are given the traits of Canadians and others are excluded. Quite significantly, the representations of Aboriginal people do not include any Canadian traits. In the previous chapters, several discursive strategies appearing alongside representations of Canada and Canadians are analyzed with close attention to representations of Others. This chapter focuses on the discursive strategies that establishes or enhances the legitimacy of settlers to occupy both the physical and historical space of Canada, while delegitimizing Indigenous peoples' existence.

Veracini (2010) argued that in settler colonial states, there are various population transfer strategies aimed at Indigenous peoples (p. 33-34). Population transfer refers to the practice of placing a group of people somewhere else, physically or/and discursively onto or away from the colonized land, such as seemingly benevolent multicultural policies, military liquidation of Indigenous populations, or “name confiscation”, where the physical landscape is ‘rebranded’. In this chapter, discursive strategies of population transfer aimed at the indigenization of settlers and de-indigenization of Aboriginal people that are used in *Discover Canada* will be analyzed. Specifically, it is my argument that in some descriptions, immigrants are depicted as being indigenous and Indigenous people are depicted as being immigrants. Each population is assigned ambiguous traits that can be thought of as ‘more settler-like’ or ‘more

indigenous’, and to realize such transfer, specific discursive strategies are combined and applied to the representations of other population groups.

Veracini (2010) argued that population transfers are conceptually established because “all settler projects are fundamentally premised on fantasies of ultimately ‘cleansing’ the settler body politics of its (indigenous and exogenous) alterities” (p. 33). Here, the main reason is that Canada is built on land that is deprived from First Nations, and if the government wants to tell the Eurocentric pioneer narrative unchallenged, as we’ve seen in the previous chapters, the legitimacy or sovereignty of Aboriginal peoples has to be negated, or imagined as non-existent in the first place. In the settler colonial state, at times this is done on a discursive level, at times *at first* discursively, and sometimes simultaneously in discourse and in practice.

At the same time, by giving settlers more legitimacy on the land and delegitimizing the Indigenous presence, there’s an influence on how immigrants are depicted too. In this chapter, the indigenization of settlers, de-indigenization of Aboriginal peoples, and the discursive strategies applied to the representations of immigrants will be demonstrated.

## **1. Indigenization of Settlers**

### **i) The Arbitrary Division of Time**

What is the difference between ‘immigrants’ and ‘settlers’? In many parts of this project, I argue that all immigrants are ultimately settlers, but it is not to say that the whole settler body is or should be thought of as homogeneous in its support of the settler colonial management of Canada. This guidebook, furthermore, does not divide immigrants, settlers, or pioneers for the

most part. However, one passage in the guidebook that divides immigrants and settlers states that:

The majority of Canadians were born in this country and this has been true since the 1800s. However, Canada is often referred to as a land of immigrants because, over the past 200 years, millions of newcomers have helped to build and defend our way of life. (p. 12)

In this paragraph, there are two points to make: (i) the arbitrary division of 200 years, and (ii) the indigenization of settlers. First, it is not clear how “the majority of Canadians” can be counted more than five decades before the establishment of Canada as an independent state, and if this guidebook includes Aboriginal peoples as ‘Canadians’, as they in fact do in other sections by labelling them as one of the “founding peoples”, when European settlers first came in the land, most of the people in ‘Canada’ were by definition ‘Canadians’. In fact, early European explorers and settlers referred to Aboriginal people as ‘Canadians’, and French and then British settlers only later appropriated the name for themselves, defining themselves as people from the land.

An arbitrary division of time can be observed in the following sentence, too:

For 400 years, settlers and immigrants have contributed to the diversity and richness of our country, which is built on a proud history and a strong identity.

(p. 3)

This 400 years, refers to the 1600s, when, according to *Discover Canada*, French settlers first came to Canada (p. 11) and when “hundreds of thousands of English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish settlers, soldiers and migrants” started establishing “[t]he basic way of life in English-



speaking areas” (p. 12). There are two parts of the guidebook which reveal the clear difference between the labelling of ‘newcomers’, ‘pioneers’, ‘immigrants’, and ‘settlers’. For 400 years, “settlers and immigrants” are the actors, and by listing these two groups, the text creates a sense of apposition. However, in the quote referring to Canada’s 200 year history of immigration above, the reason why Canada is called “a land of immigrants” is because “over the past 200 years, millions of newcomers have helped to build and defend our way of life” (p. 12), even though the same passage states that the “majority of Canadians were born in this country and this has been true since the 1800s.” There is a division between settlers 200 years before and settlers who came after. Why is this divide important?

### **(ii) Indigenization of Settlers**

The reason why it is important for *Discover Canada* to draw a line between people of British and French descent and people who are immigrants but not from Britain or France is to indigenize the settlers’ presence in Canada. The fact that the “founding peoples” (except the First Nations) are capable of ‘welcoming’ newcomers, and have done so for 200 years, creates a sense of indigeneity of particular settlers to the land, because early settlers are relatively more ‘native’ to the land. Equally important to the claim that settlers are from this land is the assertion “The majority of Canadians were born in this country and this has been true since the 1800s” (p. 12). Right after this comes the conjugation “however”, and an explanation of the reason of Canada is called “a land of immigrants.”

By contrasting people who are born in Canada as a descendent of settlers (emphasizing their ‘settlerness’, not the ongoing population inflow) with people who immigrated to Canada (but who were not born in Canada), they successfully claim their relative ‘nativeness’ and label people who came to Canada in the 1800s or after ‘newcomers’. Veracini (2010) argued that “the

sustained presence of exogenous Others confirms the indigenization of the settler collective” (p. 34). We have seen prevailing sentiments of settlers’ effort, sacrifice, and survival and the establishment of their ‘way of life’ repetitively throughout the guidebook, and in such a framework, the candidates for citizenship, true ‘newcomers’, are placed outside of this narrative, looking up to the settlers who are exalted by their own presence on the land. *Discover Canada* invites ‘newcomers’ to come in and to “help to write the continuing story of Canada” (p.3).

By entering the settler body, by trying to establish oneself in Canada, whether one likes it or not, one will be exalted by the Others’ presence, but can never reach the level of the ‘original’ people’s prestige. And by ‘original’ I mean the emphasis in the guidebook on settlers from the original British and French origins.

## **2. Erasure of Aboriginal Peoples**

The ‘original’ people here are not Aboriginal peoples, but early settlers, mainly English-speaking whites who are the heirs of 800-year-old British tradition and ‘Christian European civilization’. They are brave pioneers in an unknown world, and survivors of hardship. In the two parts examined above, there is no mention of Aboriginal communities, and they are not portrayed as contributing to Canada, unless the guidebook includes Aboriginal peoples as another group of immigrants (as discussed below). This complete erasure of Aboriginal peoples from the narrative is observable in the following as well:

Our institutions uphold a commitment to Peace, Order and Good Government, a key phrase in Canada’s original constitutional document in 1867, the British North America Act. A belief in ordered liberty, enterprise, hard work and fair play has enabled Canadians to build a prosperous society in a rugged

environment from our Atlantic shores to the Pacific Ocean and to the Arctic Circle – so much so that poets and songwriters have hailed Canada as the “Great Dominion.” (p. 10)

Although the guidebook emphasizes the continuity of the ancient European tradition of Canada, this text describes the founding document of, *the British North America Act of 1867*, which is rather recent. The erasure of Aboriginal peoples’ presence occurs in descriptions such as: “Canadians [built] a prosperous society in a rugged environment from our Atlantic shores to the Pacific Ocean and to the Arctic Circle” (p.10). This conveys that before the arrival of the settlers and the establishment of “ordered liberty, enterprise, hard work, and fair play,” there was just “a rugged environment,” which does not convey any presence of people – Aboriginal peoples whose communities were present and prosperous long before the European invasion started. In *Discover Canada*, Aboriginal peoples’ presence is lost in the harsh wilderness. Veracini (2010) explained this kind of erasure of the Aboriginal presence as “perception transfer”, and explains that through this transfer, “Indigenous peoples are disavowed in a variety of ways and their actual presence is not registered” (p. 37), especially with the image of an “empty landscape”. This is strikingly similar to the legal discourse *terra nullius*, by which, as Anghie (2005) explained, colonization of entire continents was legally justified by imagining the land as empty (p. 91). By eliminating the Aboriginal presence discursively, settler collectives gain their status as ‘Indigenous,’ or at least ‘from this land (native),’ and their legitimacy to be on the land is represented as unquestionable. Furthermore, in discussing the strategies of settler legitimization in Australia, Johnson and Lawson (2000) detected the same tendency:

The lands the settlers occupied were themselves given special discursive treatment. Wherever possible, the vastness of the land was emphasized and this was often precluded to or accompanied by an even more strategic emphasis on its “emptiness.” (p. 364)

With this notion, labelling Canada as “a land of immigrants” has to be problematized. The guidebook does not state it is “the *country* of immigrants”. There is a clear intention that some settlers should not be presented as mere immigrants, but something more, and being born on this soil erases their status as mere settlers or immigrants. They are made to be ‘natives’. Ahluwalia (2001) argued that in Australian settler colonial context, settlers labelled themselves as ‘natives’ when they are born on the land of the colony, and Aboriginal populations are added to the invented category ‘aboriginal native’ (p. 64). In *Discover Canada*, similarly, by not counting Aboriginal people as a ‘majority’ population in the nation’s pre-history, Aboriginal peoples, too, are excluded from the category of being born on the land. Or in other words, Aboriginal people in Canada were never ‘properly native’. Then what about people whose ancestors were actually born here? What about people who did not just barge in and aggressively colonize people protected by their own sovereignty brought from the metropole elsewhere? If the discursive process of indigenization helps to legitimize their presence on the land, what about people who do not need to be ‘indigenized’ to be truly Indigenous?

### **3. De-indigenization of Aboriginal Peoples, Aboriginal Peoples as Immigrants**

Even in the Eurocentric framework of rights and sovereignty, due to their long standing presence on the land and the establishment of stable polities, there is no doubt that the entitlement of Aboriginal communities to the land is the most legitimate. However, in silencing the colonial past and the oppression of Indigenous peoples in the narrative of Canada, *Discover*

*Canada* tries to further delegitimize Aboriginal people's presence on this land by de-indigenizing them, or in other words, by labelling them as 'immigrants too'.

Even though the section "Who We Are" explicitly declares that to understand "how to be a Canadian", one must understand three founding peoples, the section "Modern Canada" (p. 24-25) does not mention Aboriginal peoples at all except for one sentence in a part labelled "A Changing Society": "Aboriginal people were granted the vote in 1960" (p.25). Not only is the lack of representations of Aboriginal peoples problematic, but also the context of this one sentence shows the intention of the producers of this text. Specifically, this sentence comes right after the explanation of Asian-Canadians' gaining voting rights:

Most Canadians of Asian descent had in the past been denied the vote in federal and provincial elections. In 1948 the last of these, the Japanese-Canadians, gained the right to vote. Aboriginal people were granted the vote in 1960. Today every citizen over the age of 18 may vote. (p. 25)

Before going into the details of the wider strategy of de-indigenization, we should investigate the strategy of using passive verbs: Aboriginal people were *granted* the vote, while Japanese-Canadians, *gained* the right to vote. Here, Aboriginal people are depicted as passive while Japanese-Canadians are active. This can be linked to the notion of survival in that Japanese-Canadians fought despite oppression to "gain" voting rights, whereas Aboriginal peoples were passively waiting to be "granted" the same rights. At the same time, in calling "the Japanese-Canadians" as "the last of these" disenfranchised racialized groups and then describing Aboriginal person's voting rights without context somehow gives the impression of them being of less importance even in the hierarchy of Others. Furthermore, by the mere fact that they are placed together in this text, Aboriginal peoples are listed as if to be included into the category of

“Canadians of Asian descent,” reflecting discourse in the section “Who We Are” which describes First Nations people as coming from Asia thousands of years ago: “The ancestors of Aboriginal peoples are believed to have migrated from Asia many thousands of years ago” (p. 10).

This attempt to label Aboriginal people as one of the immigrant groups is not new in Canadian public policy. According to Bohaker and Iacovetta’s article (2009) on comparisons between social programs for Aboriginal people and for immigrants, by the late 1950s, the citizenship department started collaborating with Indian Affairs to “develop an expertise on Aboriginal peoples that could parallel their knowledge of immigrants” (p. 451). To form a clear sense of Canadian identity, the government started treating Aboriginal people as one of the immigrant groups by using the following reasoning: (1) Aboriginal people are “immigrants” from the reserves to urban areas and (2) the Bering Strait Theory, which *Discover Canada* also mentions in the beginning of the textbook. To strengthen a belief that Canada is an immigrant state, they called Aboriginal people immigrants, too.

This same rhetoric was used in the 1947 pamphlet, *How to be a Canadian Citizen*:

Canada is a new country. The civilizations of China, Persia, Egypt, Greece and Rome had come and gone nearly a thousand years before a white man had even seen the shores of North America. Canada is the result of immigration from other lands. Even the native Indian tribes descend from peoples who migrated from Asia (Canadian Citizenship Branch 1947, p. 33 as quoted in Chapnick, 2011, p. 102).

There is a popular conception that is utilized in both *Discover Canada* and *How to be a Canadian Citizen*: the Bering Strait Land Bridge Theory. It is commonly believed that during an ice age, the Bering Strait formed a land bridge between Asia and the Americas and that people migrated from East to West. In the section of “Who We Are”, as a founding people of Canada, the description of Aboriginal peoples starts with the sentence, “The ancestors of Aboriginal peoples are believed to have migrated from Asia many thousands of years ago” (p.10), quoted above. Why does this section start with the assertion that Aboriginal peoples are the descendents of people who are “believed to have migrated from Asia many thousands of years ago”? The important modality here is “believed to”, because this modality indicates that this description has not been proven to be true. In fact, many people are against this theory being treated as ‘truth’. Deloria (1995) argued that the Bering Strait Theory hasn’t been proven, saying, “almost every articulation of the Bering Strait theory is woefully deficient in providing a motive for the movement” (p. 76). In addition, Churchill (2005), described chronologically how there are disparities of time and detail in this theory which people continue to believe as a fact:

Despite such gross and ongoing disparities with respect to time frame and a range of related problems, many of them equally substantial, the premise that American Indians originated as a group of “displaced Asiatics” has increasingly been accepted as a “fact” over the past century. (p. 2-3)

Churchill (2005) further demonstrated many creation stories in Aboriginal communities which indicate that people have been here much longer than the Bering Strait Theory suggests, but because of the prioritized Western ‘scientific’ view, such explanations are not taken into account (p. 33-36). Norman Fairclough (2010) described the tendency of ‘truism’ as the presentation of things as believable facts without any solid evidence, and without any modality

(p. 286). Overall, *Discover Canada* has the tendency of presenting information without any evidence. Besides presenting the Bering Strait land bridge *theory* as a *fact*, the guidebook contains no citations. This guidebook is assigned a hegemonic role of disseminating ‘truths’ about Canada, and there is no need for references. In this example of the Bering Strait Theory, this description not only is an interesting factoid about the nation, but this statement actively de-indigenizes Aboriginal peoples as immigrants, while simultaneously strengthening the legitimacy of settlers’ presence with the logic of relativity.

Churchill (2005), speaking about the United States, connected the popularity and pervasiveness of the Bering Strait Theory with the fact that the United States is a settler colony. Churchill argued that making Aboriginal peoples migrants through discourse is an attempt to make the settler body more indigenous, quoting Memmi who said, “[i]n order for the colonizer to be a complete master, it is not enough to be so in actual fact” (as quoted in Churchill, 2001, p. 6).

Although Churchill’s critical essay was published in 2005, this belief of Aboriginal peoples migrating from Asia and regarding it as a fact is, if anything, even more pervasive today. This is observable in a recent incident of Twitter attacks on Barack Obama when he stated that “unless you’re one of the first Americans, Native Americans, you came from somewhere else, or somebody brought you.” Many people called him ignorant and some claimed that any educated person would know that Aboriginal peoples are migrants from Asia (Moya-Smith, Indian Country Today Media, 2013).

It is not the scope of my research to make an empirical judgment of whether the Bering Strait Theory is true or not, or even to give my personal opinion on the matter, but rather, the purpose of this analysis is to consider the reason why such information was selected to be put at the beginning of *Discover Canada*’s description and introduction of Aboriginal peoples as a fact.



There are many alternatives, such as not mentioning this at all, as many European people's original location is not expressed in the guidebook, or presenting creation stories from First Nation communities, or even the existence of different worldviews. But the producers of this textbook decided to present a migration theory even though it's not proven and often not supported by Aboriginal people. Veracini (2010) observed through this kind of discourse, "Indigenous peoples are not considered Indigenous to the land and are therefore perceived as exogenous Others who have entered the settler place at some point in time"(p.35). He further pointed out that this transfer is often paired with the erasure of Aboriginal peoples' presence with the image of an 'empty landscape', as previously discussed. In the end, in an application of Critical Discourse Analysis, one must draw the conclusion that the textbook's aim is to present Canada as an immigrants' country, erasing Aboriginal presence to legitimate this presence in their stead.

#### **4. Immigrants, More Settlers**

To be a citizen means one gets to stay on the land, and if one can obtain the land, one can settle. It is not a coincidence that in the description of the northwest movement in the guidebook with the disappearance of Métis and Indians through the RCMP's 'pacification' efforts, many immigrant groups are individually listed as incoming populations. In the descriptions of the construction of the railway, the first non-English or French groups came into Canadian history narrative, and whose labour "enabled the CPR's ribbon of steel to fulfill a national dream" (p. 20). In the narrative which depicts Aboriginal people as a hindrance to the 'national dream', immigrants are depicted as a force which allows for progress in Canada. Moreover, a word, "newcomers", is used here strategically:

Aboriginal and treaty rights are in the Canadian Constitution. Territorial rights were first guaranteed through the Royal Proclamation of 1763 by King George III, and established the basis for negotiating treaties with the newcomers – treaties that were not always fully respected. (p. 10)

Here, the word “newcomers” is used and a dichotomy is drawn between “newcomers” and Aboriginals. There are many word choices that the producers could use here instead of “newcomers”, such as settlers, pioneers, immigrants, explorers or even colonizers, but the usage of the word newcomers draws a suspicious parallel of inclusion to new immigrants who are reading this description in *Discover Canada* in order to become Canadian. It is written as if to include *all* newcomers and, of course, new citizens, too, and this part implicitly sides new immigrants with the settlers. As mentioned in chapter 3, all immigrants, new or old, however disadvantaged or marginalized they are, are by definition settlers. That’s an undeniable truth. Immigrants have been the colonizing force or balancing force of the settler colony Canada since the beginning of the settlement from Europe. However, this acknowledgement should not be taken acritically. It is crucial to question who is labelling whom a settler, when and where?

As Albert Memmi (1965) stated, the “colonial situation manufactures colonialists, just as it manufactures the colonized” (p. 56). This guidebook, which is produced by a settler colonial government for people who want to join their national polity, labels new immigrants as “settlers” as a strategy to prevent them from sympathizing with Aboriginal communities or working with them. And, in the context of the renewed movement of aggressive land exploitation for natural resources, the usage of the term, settler, should be carefully deconstructed. Along with this strategy of placing new immigrants closer to the settler political body, this guidebook gives the

illusion that Canada is an immigrants' country and exalts settlers even more by indigenizing their existence on the land discursively.

In this chapter, the four discursive strategies have been discussed: (1) separate new immigrants from the settler body in an arbitrary point 200 years ago, (2) indigenize settlers by erasing Aboriginal people's presence, and, (3) de-indigenize Aboriginal peoples through the use of the Bering Strait Theory as a truth and listing them as one of the immigrants groups, and (4) secure new immigrants as settlers by discursively including them (extensively, but not fully) into the settler body. Each group is assigned ambiguous traits, but to be a subject is in itself an ambiguous and ambivalent concept, in both the sense of being a subject and being subjugated. It must be remembered that new immigrants are invited to join the settler polity discursively through this guidebook, and when they become citizens, they also become subjects. While just by the fact that they are from elsewhere is enough reason to label them as "settlers", it is important to critically assess this subjective process. In a step in that direction, I have examined how while representations of Aboriginal peoples are clouded by colonial discursive strategies, new immigrants are trapped in the place where they are in-between or 'incomplete' settlers while nevertheless encouraged to exploit Aboriginal communities, and may do so knowingly or unknowingly.

In the concluding chapter, discursive strategies of *Discover Canada* will be summarized, and the influence of this discourse will be examined.

## Chapter 8 Conclusion

This project has analyzed *Discover Canada*, a highly hegemonic government publication issued by Citizenship and Immigration Canada in 2009, using Critical Discourse Analysis. This analysis has gone beyond the scope of partisan bias or positivistic approaches to citizenship examinations, instead seeing *Discover Canada* and the citizenship test together as a tool for the integration of immigrants into the settler state. This research has focused on the essential fact that Canada has been and remains a settler colonial state, and *Discover Canada* and the citizenship examination are mandatory for people who wish to become national subjects of Canada. The main question that has driven this research is the question of how *Discover Canada* discursively constructs the three-tier relationship of subjects in the settler colonial state (Settlers, exogenous Others, and indigenous Others), and what kind of effect this may have on immigrants who are willing to or have no choice but to become citizens of Canada. Through this process of subjugation, *Discover Canada* and the citizenship test must be treated as a discourse which ‘modifies’ national subjects and manages their relationality with the Canadian population.

The form of the examination changed in 1996 from an interview to a multiple choice examination, which set the role of the guidebook as a definite source of the information one needs to become a Canadian. This change institutionalized and hegemonized what Canada is and what Canadians should be. In addition, with the diversified forms of distribution with the development of the Internet, *Discover Canada* is now established as the single most distributed government publication in Canadian history (Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC], 2013). Using Foucault’s notion that power is pervasive and is produced and reproduced everywhere,

producing ‘reality’, we might understand this guidebook as a powerful tool that is forced upon people who want to become Canadian national subjects.

In order to reveal discursive strategies used throughout *Discover Canada* and their effects, this project has utilized the methodology of Critical Discourse Analysis. CDA was developed by scholars such as Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak. This methodology is suitable for this project because of its focus on power and discourse, and tries to look at social wrongs by situating social practice and discursive practice in critical theories. Not only does this methodology allow this project to look at a variety of discursive strategies and their impact together, but it also allows me to explore the role and position of discourse in a more macro-level analysis, which in this case is settler colonialism. In order to construct methods which are effective and suitable for this subject matter, I have focused on linguistic elements and thematic content analysis of the discourse of *Discover Canada*. In the end, such content incorporates specific linguistic strategies, so thematic analysis and linguistic analysis have been examined together and analyzed through theories of subjectivity and settler colonialism.

In a process of national subject making in settler colonial Canada, that people who are subjugated by state power are not passive actors, but are more active than often thought. They are actively engaging in this citizenship narrative in order to become Canadians. Their willingness ‘to be’ Canadian citizens entails a willingness to put themselves in the position of ‘yet to be’. Such a status itself comes with great vulnerability, including the ever present threat that they may be placed in the position of ‘never-to-be’, forever to be excluded from the Canadian polity and cast away as outsiders, or in Veracini’s words, as abject Others. This practice of forming subjects who are willing to/have no choice but to enter this system to maintain or improve their status as residents in Canada with the promise of ‘secured permanent

residency' and political enfranchisement sustains the three-tiered population management. The collective settler body is maintained by discursively constructed relationships and images of Canada in the guidebook. In settler colonial Canada, the candidates' status of 'yet-to-be' can be taken advantage of by the collective settler government whereby candidates are sided with the settler body, not with the Indigenous body. *Discover Canada* plays a crucial role in the national subject making, serving as the one and only official information disseminator for citizenship candidates.

In the guidebook, Canada is depicted as the storyteller through the use of the pronoun "we" when collectively addressing newcomers, "you". I have identified three traits that Canada is given in the guidebook, and these traits are a recurring theme throughout the guidebook. These three are: Canada as (1) inherently good, (2) traditionally European, and especially British, and (3) a great force of civilization and progress. To realize these representations, past injustices and atrocities such as internment camps for Ukrainians or Japanese, the practice of head tax collection and the wholesale exclusion of Chinese, residential schooling of Aboriginal children, were used to demonstrate Canada's ability to apologize and move forward, with a definite division of the past and present, by using the word "today". In this regard, *Discover Canada's* description of the residential schools is especially problematic, because the legacy, trauma, and inter-generational trauma still haunt Aboriginal communities across Canada, as can be clearly seen in the ongoing controversy around the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Reconciliation discourse is not intended to redress past wrongs, but to heighten the sense of the benevolence of Canada.

The second trait, that Canada is traditionally European and especially British, is made clear in repetitive descriptions of British law and customs, and to include French traditions, the

text sometimes uses the phrases, “European” tradition or civilization. Although the text includes Aboriginal people in descriptions of Canada’s “three founding peoples”, Aboriginal traditions are not explicitly counted among Canadian traditions.

The third trait, that Canada is a force of civilization and progress, is clearly observable in descriptions of the Métis rebellion led by Louis Riel and the events surrounding the rebellion in the 1880s. Even though the rebellion involved not only the Métis, but a number of white settlers, it is depicted in the guidebook as a dichotomy of the Métis and Canada. This is paired with an assertion of a railway “from sea to sea” as the “national dream”, symbolizing the quasi-Biblical notion of “the Dominion from sea to sea”. Métis are depicted as an obstacle for such national development, progress, and the spread of civilization. With the appearance of the RCMP, however, Indians and Métis disappear from the depictions of the history of Canada altogether, and with that disappearance, non-English or French immigrants, what in this thesis are referred to as exogenous Others, enter the narrative of Canada.

In this analysis, the three tier population model, indigenous Others, exogenous Others, and Settlers, developed by Veracini, works better in dividing the settler population body and establishing hierarchical difference, because French Canadians are not given the same quality of representations as the British. The analysis of the three actors was done through the criteria of ‘Canadianness’. Canadians are given the pronoun “they”, and are represented separately from Canada. Canadians are depicted as ideal citizens who are “law-abiding”, “traditional”, “survivors”, and as people who have “sacrificed” their lives for the sovereign state in wars. These traits are not given equally to each group, and indigenous Others are particularly excluded from such criteria. With complex webs of discursive strategies, the population hierarchy is made through inclusions and exclusions in/from an idealized image of Canadianness. At the same time,

new immigrants, “you”, are expected to acquire such Canadian traits, including enduring hardships and potentially sacrificing their lives for the state, even though such ordeals are unfairly inflicted upon them, until their own “today” moment comes when they are fully Canadian.

The most significant strategies employed in this guidebook is de-indigenization of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada and the indigenization of Settlers by discursively erasing Aboriginal people’s presence, and demonstrating the settlers’ polity as having more legitimacy to be on the land. The presentation of the Bering Strait theory as a ‘truth’ gives more legitimacy to the settlers to be on the land through the pretence that Aboriginal peoples represent waves of immigrants, too. The settlers bring with them their traditions and superiority from their ‘home’, Europe, while simultaneously trying to assert their ‘home’ as Canada by erasing Aboriginal peoples or by relativistically imagining Aboriginal people as immigrants, too. New immigrants are invited to join this bright, shining ‘home’ that settlers have created discursively, a home whose light casts shadows on the homes of Aboriginal people— homes that Aboriginal people nurture, are deprived from, but continue to fight for and protect.

Although Stephen Harper stated publicly that Canada has “no history of colonialism” (Ljunggren, 2009), it is obvious that this very sort of discourse is part of the practice of settler colonialism. Foucault states that discourse is a practice, and *Discover Canada* is a brief version of a grand narrative that Canada has created.

Where representations of Aboriginal people do appear in this guidebook, they are included simply for the sake of neutralizing potential criticisms of a purely Eurocentric narrative or a lack of representations of collective past wrongs. As proof of this tokenism, I would point to a chart on the CIC’s website with comparisons of which groups are on which pages in



comparison with the older publication, *A Look at Canada* (“Backgrounder — Substantial Changes to the Citizenship Study Guide: How *Discover Canada* Differs from *A Look at Canada*”, CIC, 2014). However, reflecting my criticism of Chapnick, if we look at the texts and discourse holistically and critically, as I have attempted to do in this project, it is clear that these representations are only a tokenistic façade. If we dis-cover this snow white façade, we can clearly see the underlying structure of settler colonialism, institutionalized racism, and a willingness to maintain and even expand this settler colonial structure in Canada (or elsewhere) into the future.

This project began with my own personal experience immigrating to Canada, and when I started thinking about becoming a citizen of Canada. There are three occurrences that stirred me into this project. The first is Idle No More. I participated in a circle dance which took place at Toronto City Hall in early 2013 on World Action Day. In the circle, there were not only Aboriginal peoples who were there to fight, dance, discuss, or pray, but non-Aboriginal Canadians and many new immigrants, including myself. The second is the experience of encountering a large number of racist remarks aimed at Aboriginal peoples. What shocked me about these encounters was not just the ignorance of such remarks, but that the majority of people who made them were new immigrants like me, including refugees, permanent residents, international students, and people who are already naturalized citizens. These two things made me really think about the possibility of new immigrants’ political power in Canada. They can work with Aboriginal peoples or can be swallowed up by the existing structural racism without even having a chance to learn about it.

The third occurrence was at a graduate class at the University of Toronto that I attended in the summer of 2013. One of my classmates, who was from the United States, pointed to all

non-Aboriginal students in the class and aggressively announced that we were all ‘settlers’. Some of my friends in the class had come to Canada to escape war or genocide and were furious with such accusations. At the time, I was confused: I am Japanese and I came to Canada to possibly permanently settle here. However, my thought did not stop there. I am Japanese, and my grandmother was raised in Korea as part of a settler colonial family during the Japanese colonial occupation of Korea. Where I come from, people rarely talk about it, but similarly, many people from my hometown went to Hokkaido, the northern part of Japan, and deprived the indigenous Ainu of land, and in many cases, their lives. My family eventually came back from Korea and as far as I know, my family members never went to Hokkaido, but it is true that like Canada, modern Japan was established through colonialism. Through that thought process, for the first time in my life, I acknowledged myself as a settler. And like my classmate, *Discover Canada* also labels me as a potential settler, as a traditional, good-natured, pioneer-spirited settler, and it invites me to help write the continuing story of Canada.

Yes, I am a settler, but *Discover Canada*’s labelling of my settlerness is not the same as the silent shame and fury and confusion that I felt when being labeled as a settler by my classmate in the highly equal environment of a graduate school seminar. *Discover Canada*’s interpellation of readers as settlers is highly exploitative in the sense that they are not giving us any choice. They are not giving us the whole story. They are hiding their core intention in their discursive strategies, subtle phrasing, verb tense, well chosen symbols, and arbitrary inclusion and exclusion of people. More than anything else, the story of *Discover Canada* is treated as ‘reality’: mass produced and widely distributed, and reproduced by candidates on their examination sheet in order to be part of the Canadian polity.

One might say, though, that even when people know about this guidebook as a tool of settler making, they will still take this test and pass it. Probably that is true. If it is a choice of becoming a citizen and personally benefitting, or choosing *not* to be a citizen and disbenefitting, whatever the ideological motivation of the government in producing the test may be, people will still choose to read the guidebook, memorize the information, and take the test. Still, at least, there is a struggle, there is conscious understanding that you're both exploited and exploiting, that you're not entering a perfect pioneer world, and with such a realization, one can choose *how* to be a settler in this new country, or at least, what kind of relationship you want to have with other populations in the settler colonial state. Or even more radically, one can choose to refuse to take the test and demand a new way to become a citizen. Or one can refuse to become a citizen altogether. As Judith Butler (1997) wrote, there can also be a willingness "not to be" in order to lessen the effect of such interpellations (p. 130).

As a new immigrant from a far away country, as a descendant of a settler colonial family, and as a settler in Canada, I cannot speak for any other populations or other people, but I would like to speak at least to people who are newcomers to Canada or people who are thinking about reading this guidebook to become a citizen. We need to think of where we stand. The government approves or disapproves of our status and our place in Canada, but they are not the ones who 'welcome' us. It is ordinary people who welcome us, and it is our relationships with them that matter to us. This guidebook, *Discover Canada*, constructs an image of Canada for us, a convenient story for settlers. They invite us to tell the same story with them, and they tell us to live in accordance with their values. They tell us that this is a "land of immigrants", but they don't tell us whose land they are calling so.

Lorenzo Veracini (2010) argued that the action ‘to discover’ itself rightly refers to people who go and see things someplace and then come back home to report what they saw. To discover is for people who are going to return home. Veracini argued that by this logic, “settlers don’t discover” (p. 98), because they move with their sovereignty as citizens and they don’t go back again – or, that they never leave ‘home’. People who take this guidebook, who are willing to become national subjects of Canada under whatever circumstances, are only to ‘discover’ what Canada is ‘officially’. They are placed in an in-between space where they have two homes: one you possibly return back to or are increasingly forcibly sent to ‘report back’ to, and the other which stays and doesn’t have to ‘report back’ what they ‘discover’, because what they ‘discover’ is a norm of Canadian citizens.

What is discovered is what *Discover Canada* produces: settler colonial discourse of Canada. Whether one believes it or not, this discourse is establishing the official ‘reality’ of Canada, setting norms, drawing the line of what can be said or not said, framing what kind of information is to be learned. This ‘discovery’ loses its spark once you become a citizen. You won’t need to speak about it again, but it will stay in you unspoken, silently shared among people who made the same discovery.

## References

- Ahluwalia, P. (2001). When Does a Settler Become a Native? Citizenship and Identity in a Settler Society. *Pretexts: literary and cultural studies*, 10(1), 63-73.
- Anghie, A. (2005). *Imperialism, sovereignty, and the making of international law*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Althusser, L. (2008). *On ideology*. London: Verso.
- ARCHIVED Forging Our Legacy: Canadian Citizenship and Immigration, 1900-1977. (n.d.). *Government of Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Communications Branch*. Retrieved August 15, 2014, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/legacy/chap-5.asp>
- Bill C-24. (n.d.). *Parliament of Canada*. Retrieved May 4, 2014, from <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&DocId=6410225&File=30#2>
- Bloemraad, I. (2002). The North American Naturalization Gap: An Institutional Approach to Citizenship Acquisition in the United States and Canada<sup>1</sup>. *International Migration Review*, 36(1), 193-228.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bohaker, H., & Franca I. (2009). "Making Aboriginal People 'Immigrants Too': A Comparison of Citizenship Programs for Newcomers and Indigenous Peoples in Postwar Canada, 1940s–1960s." *Canadian Historical Review* 90: 427-62.
- Boyden, J. (2010). *Louis Riel and Gabriel Dumont*. Toronto, Ont.: Penguin Group.
- Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: theories in subjection*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford

- University Press.
- Butler, J., & Athanasiou, A. (2013). *Dispossession: the performative in the political : conversations with Athena Athanasiou*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- CBC Digital Archives - Mackenzie King: Public Life, Private Man - Mackenzie King is Canada's first citizen. (2013, December 6). *CBCnews*. Retrieved March 26, 2014, from <http://www.cbc.ca/archives/categories/politics/prime-ministers/mackenzie-king-public-life-private-man/canadas-first-citizen.html>
- Churchill, W. (2005). About That Bering Strait Land Bridge: A Study in the Falsity of 'Scientific Truth.' *Social Theory as Politics in Knowledge Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, 23, 3-68.
- Chapnick, A. (2011). A "Conservative" National Story? The Evolution of Citizenship and Immigration Canada's *Discover Canada*. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, Volume 1(Issue 1), 20-36.
- Citizenship Act: (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-29). (2014, February 6). *Legislative Services Branch, Government of Canada*. Retrieved June 21, 2014, from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-29/page-3.html#docCont>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (1996). *A Look at Canada*. Ottawa. Citizenship and Immigration Canada.
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (March 2014). *Backgrounder: Substantial Changes to the Citizenship Study Guide: How Discover Canada Differs from A Look at Canada*. ( March 14). Retrieved May 10, 2014, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/backgrounders/2011/2011-03-14a.asp>
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2012). *Discover Canada*. (Ci1-11/2012E).Ottawa: Citizenship and Immigration Canada.

- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2013). *Discover Canada citizenship test guide now available as an audio eBook*. Retrieved June 20, 2014, from [http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=754109&\\_ga=1.196645420.1259486027.1404050806](http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=754109&_ga=1.196645420.1259486027.1404050806)
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (February 2011). Operational Bulletin 244B (2011, February 25). *Government of Canada*. Retrieved June 21, 2014, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/manuals/bulletins/2011/ob244B.asp>
- Deloria, V. (1995). *Red earth, white lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact*. New York: Scribner.
- Edwards, J., & Calhoun, L. (2011). Redress For Old Wounds: Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper's Apology For The Chinese Head Tax. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 4(1), 73-89.
- Elias, B., Mignone, J., Hall, M., Hong, S. P., Hart, L., & Sareen, J. (2012). Trauma and suicide behaviour histories among a Canadian indigenous population: An empirical exploration of the potential role of Canada's residential school system. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74, 1560-1569.
- Etzioni, A. (2007). Citizenship Tests: A Comparative, Communitarian Perspective. *The Political Quarterly*, 78(3), 353-363.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge; and, the Discourse on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Francis, D. (1992). *The imaginary Indian: the image of the Indian in Canadian culture*.  
Vancouver, B.C.: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Furniss, E. (2006). Chapter 9 Challenging the myth of indigenous peoples' 'last stand' in Canada and Australia: public discourse and the conditions of silence. *Rethinking settler colonialism: history and memory in Australia, Canada, Aotearoa New Zealand and South Africa* (pp. 172-192). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Grant, A. (1996). *No end of grief: Indian residential schools in Canada*. Winnipeg: Pemmican Pub.
- Henderson, J. & Wakeham, P. (2009). Colonial Reckoning, National Reconciliation?: Aboriginal Peoples and the Culture of Redress in Canada. *English Studies in Canada*, 35(1), 1-26.
- Hobsbawm, E. (2013). Introduction. *The Invention of tradition* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1992)
- Johnson, A., & Lawson, A. (2000). 18 Settler Colony. *A companion to postcolonial studies* (pp. 360-376). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Joshee, R., and Derwing, T. (2005). The unmaking of citizenship education for adult immigrants in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Volume 6(Issue 1), 61-80.
- Kenny, J. (2014, June 12). Jason Kenney on Strengthening Canadian Citizenship Act. *Openparliament .ca*. Retrieved June 21, 2014, from <http://openparliament.ca/debates/2014/6/12/jason-kenney-1/only/>



- Kenny, J. (2009, November 12). Speaking Notes for The Hon. Jason Kenney, P.C., M.P. Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism at the launch of the new Citizenship Study Guide, *Discover Canada. Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Communications, Government of Canada*. Retrieved March 12, 2014, from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/department/media/speeches/2009/2009-11-12a.asp>
- Keung, N. (2013, September 18). Canadian-born man faces deportation | Toronto Star. *thestar.com*. Retrieved March 22, 2014, from [http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2013/09/18/canadianborn\\_man\\_faces\\_deportation.html](http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2013/09/18/canadianborn_man_faces_deportation.html)
- Kinew, W. (2012, May 19). Inclusion Works' 12 Keynote Address. *Wab Kinew*. Retrieved June 26, 2014, from <http://wabkinew.ca/inclusion-works-12-keynote-address/>
- Kirmayer, L. J., Brass, G., Holton, T., Paul, K., Simpson, C., & Tait, C. (2007). *Suicide among aboriginal people in Canada*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- King, T. (2012). *The inconvenient Indian: a curious account of native people in North America*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada.
- Knowles, V. (2007). *Strangers at our Gates Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2006* (Rev. ed.). Toronto: Dundurn.
- Lawrence, B., and Dua, E. (2005). Decolonizing Antiracism. *Social Justice Race, Racism, and Empire: Reflections on Canada* , Vol. 32(No. 4 (102), 120-143.
- Lee, C. (1999). Part I 1 Modernity. Legality, and Power in Korea Under Japanese Rule. *Colonial modernity in Korea* (pp. 21-51). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Ljunggren, D. (2009, September 25). Every G20 nation wants to be Canada, insists PM. *Reuters*. Retrieved June 26, 2014, from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/09/26/columns-us-g20-canada-advantages-idUSTRE58P05Z20090926>

- Löwenheim, O., & Gazit, O. (2009). Power And Examination: A Critique Of Citizenship Tests. *Security Dialogue*, 40(2), 145-167.
- MacDonald, D. (2007). First Nations, Residential Schools, and The Americanization Of The Holocaust: Rewriting Indigenous History In The United States And Canada. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 40(04), 995-1015.
- Maynard, S. (2012, November 7). Swimming Against the Current: Sexual Citizenship After Harper and Homonationalism. *ActiveHistory.ca* . Retrieved June 10, 2014, from <http://activehistory.ca/2012/11/swimming-against-the-current-sexual-citizenship-after-harper-and-homonationalism/>
- McNabb, L. (2014, May 16). Disproportionate number of women killed in Canada aboriginal: RCMP. *Global News*. Retrieved May 20, 2014, from <http://globalnews.ca/news/1335731/live-the-RCMP-news-conference-about-murdered-missing-aboriginal-women/>
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. New York: Orion Press.
- Mills, C. (2012, June 29). How applicants are stumbling on the final step to becoming Canadians. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved May 1, 2014, from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/how-applicants-are-stumbling-on-the-final-step-to-becoming-canadians/article4382633/>
- Moya-Smith, S. (2013, January 30). Obama's 'Native American' Reference During Immigration Speech Sparks Bering Strait Twitter Surge . *Indian Country Today Media. com*. Retrieved January 13, 2014, from <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2013/01/30/obamas-native-american-reference-during-immigration-speech-sparks-bering-strait-twitter>
- Myers, J. (2013). *The Institution of becoming Canadian: a view from the margins* (Doctoral

- dissertation). Retrieved from University of Toronto Library Database on May, 2014.
- Paquet, M. (2012). Beyond Appearances: Citizenship Tests in Canada and the UK. *International Migration and Integration*, 13, 243-260.
- Quinn, A. (2007). Reflections on Intergenerational Trauma: Healing as a Critical Intervention. *First Peoples Child & Family Review*, 3, 72-82.
- Sakai, N. (1997). *Translation and subjectivity: on Japan and cultural nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Scharper, S. B. (2012, August 12). Canada's peacekeeping tradition is worth defending | Toronto Star. *thestar.com*. Retrieved June 26, 2014, from [http://www.thestar.com/opinion/editorialopinion/2012/08/12/canadas\\_peacekeeping\\_tradition\\_is\\_worth\\_defending.html](http://www.thestar.com/opinion/editorialopinion/2012/08/12/canadas_peacekeeping_tradition_is_worth_defending.html)
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose Text? Whose Context?. *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165-187.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Toron, L., & Raney, T. (2013). Building a Conservative Nation: An Examination of Canada's New Citizenship Guide, *Discover Canada. International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 47, 201-219.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles Of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.
- Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler colonialism: A theoretical overview*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Warry, W. (2007). Chapter 3 Ending Denial: Acknowledging History and Colonialism. *Ending denial: understanding Aboriginal issues* (pp. 53-67). Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press.

- Widdowson, H. (1995). Discourse analysis: a critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157-172.
- Winter, E. (2011). *Us, them and others: pluralism and national identities in diverse societies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wodak, R., Cillia, R., & Reisigl, M. (1999). The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse and Society*, 10(2), 149-173.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE.
- Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of anthropology: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event*. London: Cassell.
- Young, M. (1998). *Canadian Citizenship Act and current issues (BP-445E)*. Government of Canada Publications. Retrieved June 15, 2014, from <http://publications.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp445-e.htm>