INFORMATION TO USERS

Contrasting Identities / Competing Rhetorics:
Anglophones' Challenge to Québec's National Project

Arabella Bowen

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Communications Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts in Media Studies at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

May 1999

ABSTRACT

Contrasting Identities / Competing Rhetorics:
Anglophones' Challenge to Quebec's National Project

Arabella Bowen

This thesis explores the ways that Quebec's anglophones were constituted as national and political subjects by Quebec's national project and the manners in which these constitutions inform anglophone politics today. First, the policy papers tabled by the Parti Québécois and the Liberal Party of Quebec in advance of the 1980 referendum on sovereignty-association are analyzed to reveal the ideological effects these contained regarding the status of English-speaking residents of the province. Pursuant to which, the period following the 1995 referendum is analyzed. After a narrow vote for continued union with Canada, a new politics emerged from anglophones whereby they reappropriated the terms of their constitution to enact a performative contradiction which sought to challenge the Québécois nationalist discourse. Specifically, this thesis argues that the subject positions attributed anglophones by the national project are dualistic and dissimilar, prompting two distinct rhetorical claims in one public sphere. Conclusions are drawn with respect to the success of anglophones' reappropriations, and suggestions are formulated as to the ways in which anglophones might better optimize their performative contradiction in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Above all, I owe great thanks to my family: To my parents, who place a value on the educated mind that is unparalleled. and my grandfather, who knows the reason why.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
Shifting Identities / Enabling Politics

On returning to Montréal in the fall of 1996, Norman Spector, the former Canadian Ambassador to Israel, was highly critical of the politics he observed in his hometown. He claimed that in his 26-year absence, the symmetry he once saw between French-English relations in Québec and the rest of Canada had disappeared, and had been replaced with a "classic intercommunal conflict like the one [he had] observed in the Mideast". Spector viewed this shift with some concern, and he mounted his argument based on what he perceived to be the key difference between battles for minority rights and inter-communal conflicts: the first, he considers "genuine", while the second consist of "rivalries for wealth, status and power".[1] According to Spector, at the time of his return, Québec's anglophones were invested in the latter.

The commentary was meant to coincide with Howard Galganov's trip to Wall Street where he intended to denounce the "racism" of the Parti Québécois and its sovereignty project to an audience of potential American investors. The trip to New York was Galganov's second major initiative in his role as unelected anglophone leader of the province in the year following the 1995 referendum which saw a

---

[1] Norman Spector, "Cultures warring in the bosom of a single state," <u>Globe & Mail</u> 7 Sept. 1996: D3.

narrow vote for Québec's continued union with Canada.[2] His previous actions had involved mobilizing anglophones to boycott retail stores in Montréal that did not post English signs. This initiative had been successful: a number of stores in areas with a majority of anglophone residents had capitulated, and agreed to change their sign policy to include English.

The trip to Wall Street was a project of a different kind, however. While the first had been considered a healthy demonstration of minority politics, according to Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien[3], the New York initiative was an exercise of majority politics, a politics which caused federalist and sovereignist leaders alike to criticize Galganov's actions.[4] Accordingly, Spector's concerns regarding the polarization and conflict which were to ensue from Galganov's tactics were just, as the tensions that permeated Montréal during this volatile period were palpable. Nonetheless, what Spector failed to grasp is the fact that all battles over minority rights are about power, perhaps not about having it alone, but of sharing it. In reference to Québec's anglophones, and Galganov in particular, he wrote: "minorities ... have a role to play. Most

---

[2] 50.56% NO (2 360 714 votes), 49.44% YES (2 308 266 votes). Directeur Général des Élections du Québec, Rapport préliminaire des résultats du dépouillement des votes le soir du scrutin: Référendum du 30 octobre 1995 (Québec: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1995): 3.
[3] Jean Chartier, "Affichage: Chrétien approuve le boycottage anglophone," Le Devoir 2 Aug. 1996: A2. Chrétien went so far as to say that he "was not at ease with certain restrictions in the language laws."
[4] Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien drew the line at Galganov's "airing Canada's 'dirty laundry' on Wall Street". Howard Schneider, "Quebecer speaks out for English: Adman says language key to unity," Washington Post 4 Sept. 1996: A18.

fundamentally, they must accept that they are a minority, a loyal minority at that".[5] Yet he did not articulate how exactly such actors go about accepting their status as "minority", nor who they should be loyal to.

In doing so, Spector missed the essential element of Québec politics, in that it is all about the politics of minorities. Jane Jensen puts it most succinctly. "Everyday politics in Québec may be the politics of minorities," she writes, "but there is no single 'minority'. Whether and how claims are made depend on the concrete political situation as well as on the identity privileged by the claimants" (1996: 43). This is true no matter which linguistic group is speaking. In advancing particular claims, anglophones and francophones both play on their dual identification as *minoritaire* and *majoritaire*, although the source of these identifications differ between the two. For francophones, the minority status emerges when they look without the province of Québec, to the broader political jurisdiction of Canada and indeed, North America as a whole, where the population is largely English-speaking. According to Québec nationalists, the national project in which Canada is invested refuses to acknowledge francophones as equal partners, and relegates them to the status of minority both nationally and politically. Meanwhile, at 'home', in the geographically bounded province of Québec, francophones' regional and geo-political concentration, combined with their numerical superiority, render them *majoritaire*, and enable them to exercise

---

[5] Spector, "Cultures warring": D3.

democratic control of the provincial government where their sense as minority *à l'extérieur* informs the province's cultural and linguistic policies *à l'intérieur*.

The identification works in reverse for Québec's anglophones. Their sense of majority status stems from their identification with the Canadian political spectrum outside Québec's borders where, as noted, they share the language of the majority. However, once they look inside the province of Québec, they become *minoritaire*, as the boundaries of that province enable francophones to be the majority. Like their francophone counterparts however, anglophones often draw on their external constitution as majority subjects by the Canadian national discourse to inform their politics within the province.

Ultimately, these shifting allegiances and power positions over-determine the debate in Québec so that claims are advanced in certain ways depending on the identity privileged by the claimants, as well as the corresponding state structure the subjects claim loyalty to. Depending on which site is privileged as the constitutive source of power — Québec or Canada — a specific political language will emerge. As Jensen contends, if anglophones behave like a majority — drawing on their Canadian identity — they will adopt "tough talk". Conversely, if they act as a minority and focus on their inter-Québec constitution, they will seek to assure protections regarding language rights and cultural recognition (Jensen 1996:46).

The dual subject

The issue of privileging identity for political gain is at the heart of this analysis and of Québec politics as a whole. Indeed, when looking at the realities of Québec politics, what Spector ultimately failed to recognize is that minorities are political constructs and as such cannot be "genuine". In fact, the Québec case is exemplary of the notion that minorities must be constituted: They do not exist "naturally" — but must be made. In his critique of Karl Marx, Pierre Bourdieu faults him for making the same assumption when it came to the class system. He writes: "groups — social classes for instance — have to be *made*. They are not given in social reality" (1990: 129). For Bourdieu, the power to make and unmake groups is the "political power *par excellence* ... [it] is the power to make groups, to manipulate the objective structure of society" (1990: 138). From this we can surmise that, if the power to make groups is the political power *par excellence*, then the group created must have some power base innate to it.

Indeed, Québec offers a compelling case study of minority politics, as it clearly illustrates that power need not stem from numerical superiority, and that the very political status imbued a "minority" is always in question if one takes a reading of minority as meaning "powerless". According to Hannah Arendt, such a formulation is not necessarily true: a small, but well-organized group of men, she writes, can rule "almost indefinitely" over large and well-

populated empires. "The story of David and Goliath is ... metaphorically true: the power of a few can be greater than the power of many" (1958: 200). Thus, taking up the concepts of minority and majority and applying them to groups within the province of Québec is not a straightforward project, as anglophones, while a minority in numerical terms, behaved as a majority until 30 years ago, and were the dominant political group in Québec. Instead, as Gary Caldwell points out, an examination of group dynamics in Québec is more an analysis of:

> the relationship of a power disequilibrium between two entities which distinguish themselves, one from another, linguistically ... [T]he term majority denotes, in this context, a supremacy of political power, rooted in economic, military or other advantage, but not necessarily implying a numerical advantage. (1982:59)

Hence, when he and Eric Waddell argue that anglophones have gone from "majority to minority status" (1982), they are not pointing to a demographic shift that unseated anglophones from their dominant position in Québec. Rather, they argue that power struggles which began in 1960 as the Quiet Revolution was underway, and which culminated with the adoption of Bill 101 in 1977, led the province's anglophones to truly adopt today the minority status which their demographic numbers had always prescribed.

The small school of thought on Québec's anglophone politics has tended to privilege linguistic laws as the source of anglophones "minoritization" as political actors in the province. [6] Certainly, these

do play a role, as the repressing of the English language from the public face of the province and the National Assembly denies anglophones' language a public space in which to appear. But what this thesis will argue is that, above and beyond these linguistic policies, the national project in which Quebecers have been invested since the 1960s is the primary source of anglophones' constitution as minority subjects in the province. In other words, it takes as a starting point Etienne Balibar's argument that "[t]he very existence of minorities, together with their more or less inferior status, *was a state construct*, a strict correlate of the nation-form" (1995: 53).

While linguistic laws such as Bill 101 had been enacted three years prior to the province's first referendum on sovereignty-association with Canada, linguistic laws differ from the province's national project in that they are not invested in constituting national or political subjects. Rather, they are an outgrowth of, or response to, particular attributes of that subject — attributes that were, for the first time in the province's history, clearly articulated in the lead up to the 1980 referendum. Both governing parties tabled documents outlining a particular telos for the Québécois subject: the Parti Québécois authored a document entitled, *La nouvelle entente Québec-*

---

[6] Josée Legault refers to the minoritization process as a "valse à quatre-temps". She argues the shift took place thanks to four key events: Bill 22, which proclaimed French to be the official language of the province and mandated French language education for immigrant children; the majority election of the Parti Québecois in 1976; Bill 101, which made French the common language of the province and mandated unilingual French signs; Bill 178 which allowed signs inside commercial enterprises to include English so long as French predominanted. L'Invention d'une minorité: les Anglos Québécois (Montréal: Éditions Boréale, 1992): 33-59. See also Gary Caldwell and Eric Waddell, The English of Quebec, from Majority to Minority Status (Quebec: IQRC, 1982); Ronald Rudin, The Forgotten Quebecers (Quebec: IQRC, 1985); Rudin, "English-Speaking Quebec: the Emergence of a Disillusioned Minority," in Quebec State and Society, ed. Alain Gagnon, third edition (Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson, 1993).

Canada. Proposition du gouvernement du Québec pour une entente d'égal à égal: la souveraineté-association; The Liberal Party of Québec, *Choisir le Québec et le Canada.* These are compelling documents, as they constitute a political and a national subject simultaneously: those who were *Canadiens français* in the province became *Québécois*, a new national identity, at the same time as they became majority subjects, a political status. Of equal significance is that, while they contained arguments directed towards French speaking citizens of the province, and worked to majoritize them politically to determine their future, these papers also had effects on the English-speaking citizen of the province, positioning him as a national and political subject as well.

Even though anglophones were not the audience on whom the speech acts were to have direct effect, they experienced two indirect effects nonetheless. First, as a Québécois was understood to be a French speaking resident of the province and not an English-speaking resident, anglophones were left out of the province's new national signification, and thus maintained their Canadian signification as their national identity. Second, francophones' majoritization as political subjects was achieved by constituting anglophones as minority political subjects in the province. Yet, whereas the Québécois identity saw the merger of two similar identities, in that they became majority national subjects and majority political subjects at once, the anglophone became two different subjects simultaneously: Canadian national majority and Québec political minority.

Their dual positioning of anglophones as national and political subjects is ignored, however, if, as Ronald Rudin, Waddell, Caldwell, and even Josée Legault have done, one focuses only on linguistic laws as the source of anglophones' constitution as subjects. While this responds to their political positioning in the province of Québec, it fails to account for the import anglophones place on their national Canadian identity when making claims in the province. Indeed, these two identities come to compete with one another on the "territory of utterance" (Bhabha 1996: 58), depending on which state anglophones privilege as the source of sovereign power, and which nation they claim membership in. On the one hand, anglophone rhetoric is about being recognized by the Québec state, and encouraging government policy to that end; on the other, their discourse is aimed at "put[ting] an end to the threat of secession".[7] These two goals occasionally work to confuse the discourse, and it is only by reading anglophones' later rhetoric against or beside the national project of the province that their claims, almost two decades later, make sense.

This will be explained in two parts. First, we will address the ways in which anglophones in Québec were constituted by the Québec national project as national and political subjects simultaneously. Pursuant to which, the politics emergent from anglophone leaders following the third referendum[8] on the province's status within

---

[7] This dual goal was clearly articulated by William Johnson in his article "How I propose to put an end the threat of secession," Financial Post 20 Mar. 1998: 13. The kicker read, "Defending rights of English-speaking Quebecers is essential". The content outlined Johnson's platform for his run at the presidency of Alliance Québec.

Canada will be analyzed. What reexamining them through the light of their constitution by these documents will reveal is that anglophones' rhetorical claims reappropriate the arguments by which they were constituted as political subjects by Québec's national project, as well as those inherent to their prior constitution as Canadian national subjects. And thus, we can see how two contrasting identities can function simultaneously in one public sphere.

Chapter One elaborates theories of subject constitution and political insurgency. The following chapters attempt to apply these theories to Québec. Chapter Two examines the two policy papers tabled by the Parti Québécois and the Liberal Party of Québec in the year leading up to the 1980 referendum. It will demonstrate that a particular rendering of anglophones played an important role in constituting the Québécois as a majority national and political subject, and will illustrate the ways by which a subject can be constituted without being spoken to directly. Chapter Three examines the period following the 1995 referendum on Québec's status in the Canadian nation-state. After a narrow vote for a continued union with Canada, a new politics emerged from some anglophone quarters that emanated from two subject positions simultaneously. Not only were the elements of anglophones' constitution as political subjects by

---

[8] I refer to the 1995 referendum as the third referendum on Quebec's status within the federation as I consider the 1992 referendum on the Charlottetown Accord as the second, even while it was orchestrated by the federal government and the vote was put to the whole of Canada. The Charlottetown Accord sought to "include Quebec in the federation". In Quebec, the vote was 56.68% against, 43.32% for which, when combined with the Canada-wide totals, resulted in the failure to adopt the constitutional amendment. DGE Québec, _Rapport préliminaire des résultats du dépouillement des votes le soir du scrutin: Référendum du 30 octobre, 1995_ (Québec: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1995): 14.

Québec's nationalist discourse reappropriated in empowering and mobilizing ways, but the majority status imbued by their Canadian national identity also played a role in advancing particular claims. Finally, the conclusion will explore the ramifications of these two subject positions. Specifically, it will make use of Arendt's concept of visiting to explore how anglophone claims play out when standing in the position of the PQ. In other words, as Arendt contends, "political thought is representative. I form an opinion by considering an issue from different viewpoints..." (1968: 241). Québec has many competing viewpoints, and this thesis hopes to contribute another explanation for the source of these disputes.

CHAPTER ONE

The Nation-State: Power, Constitution and Insurgency

Sheldon Wolin might well have been thinking of Québec in his critique of Jean-François Lyotard and the post-modern project. He writes that, in their celebration of the incommensurability of language games, post-modernists "neglect[] the point that language games are life forms, that is, a lot of people's hopes, fears and very existence are implicated in their language" (1990: 23-24). Wolin then goes on to say that "their language is often not *the* language, and hence, they are inarticulate, which is of course, one definition of powerlessness in a society where The Thinkers declare certain language skills *de rigueur*" (1990: 24).

In this statement, Wolin touches on the main issue at stake in the battles over language and political positioning in the province of Québec. At first glance, the issue underlying the linguistic debates in Québec is that of being recognized by and within the state, as the claims and demands voiced by both francophones and anglophones centre on which language is allowed in public. The term public refers, in this case, to the public face of Québec: the language on signs, businesses, buildings and infrastructure.

When one looks deeper, however, it becomes clear that these debates are really about contesting the concomitant power ascribed he who speaks The Language. In Québec, The Language is French. But, as Wolin points out, speaking French is more than just a means of

communication. It equally means to be positioned as a political subject by a nationalist discourse in the province. In further support of Wolin, this national narrative is fueled by francophones' fear of losing their language in a country dominated by English-speakers, as well as a historical narrative which depicts English-French relations as one of domination and subjugation in Canada. Thus, while Québec remains part of the Canadian federation, another competing Language exists: the English language, which carries its own power game with it.

Two divergent ideological end goals emerge from Québec's national narrative. To preserve their culture and language, francophones are invited to choose their own state over the Canadian one in which they currently have membership; or maintain the current federal state structure but become a founding people alongside or in tandem with the Canadian national narrative. Yet, while different state structures are put forth to support these two national narratives, their substance is, in fact, quite similar. Both wish to supplant the Canadian narrative with one that empowers francophones — by majoritizing them to give them the political power to determine their future. And both do so by changing the signifier used to refer to francophones in Québec. Once called *Canadiens français*, they become *Québécois*, "a national identity for a new type of political subject" (Charland 1994: 213).

Thus, as Wolin points out, the debates over the status of francophones in Québec and Canada involve issues of power. They

seek to empower and disempower French and English linguistic communities, alternatively. Yet these are not the only competing languages in the Québec political spectrum. Rather, there are several: a nationalist / anti-nationalist discourse; a majority / minority discourse; a Canadian / Québécois constitutional discourse; and lastly, a debate over French and English, the very language used to articulate these claims. Each of these political languages needs the other to legitimize it — they are not naturally invested with authenticity or authority. Thus, what the Québec case reveals, most explicitly, is that no political concept is 'genuine', but hinges on being endowed with power by those who recognize it. Which is to say that:

> ... the power of a discourse depends less on its intrinsic properties than on the mobilizing power it exercises — that is, at least to some extent, on the degree to which it is recognized by a numerous and powerful group that can recognize itself in it and whose interests it expresses... (Bourdieu 1991: 190)

These inherent complexities of Québec politics mean that, in order to understand the power bases that drive it, one needs to adopt Stuart Hall's position whereby:

> Power ... has to be understood here, ... in broader cultural or symbolic terms, including the power to represent someone or something in a certain way — within a certain 'regime of representation'. ... Power ... always operates in conditions of unequal relations ... [and] includes the dominant and the dominated within its circuits. (1997: 259, 261)

Crucially, this power is manifested in and through language, through speech acts directed to, or against, specific audiences, organizing them into particular groups with intentional political directives. These not only proscribe identities, but political ends to those identities, and, in doing so, subscribe to Hannah Arendt's view that

identities cannot be formed prior to a politics, but must be given in public (1958: 180). It is also to endorse the argument that, contra postmodernists like Lyotard, language games *matter*, where "[p]ower is a good *for* which political groups struggle and *with* which political leadership manages things" (Habermas 1977: 21). As this power game is transacted through language(s), Québec speakers, whether anglophone or francophone, adopt a specific discourse to empower and disempower each other as actors:

> To empower discourse one must do what is always done to create power through discourse — consign someone to marginality — and this mutual defining of self and other as esteemed and marginal is a process of transformation ... (Hariman 1986: 46)

The national project

Attempts to marginalize the centre are the very thrust of Québec politics, no matter which linguistic group is speaking. But the status of the centre, and which group holds this position is highly contestable. In further support of Wolin's argument regarding the link between language and identity, linguistic claims are both the impetus behind and the outgrowth of the national project in which Quebecers have been invested since the 1960s. As the primary subject of that national project is French-speaking, the project subscribes to Benedict Anderson's view of nationalism, which he contends arises through the sharing a linguistic community: "The focus on language involves an attempt to uncover something deeper than citizenship," writes Gopal Balakrishnan. "For Anderson, mere

membership in a political community does not generate an imagined collectivity, a 'people' " (1995: 65).

But it does more than support Anderson. What began as a power move to unseat anglophones from their hegemonic position in the province and allow francophones to gain control of the province's political institutions became, in some quarters, a movement to secede altogether from the English federal state outside Québec's borders. Hence, it also points to a specific type of nationalism. As it is ideologically driven towards seceding from a broader nation-state outside Québec's borders, it subscribes to one of Anthony Smith's two nationalisms, in that it is ethnically based. As such, it conceives of the nation as "basically ethnic and genealogical [and] will seek to secede from a larger political unit; these are *secession* ... nationalisms" (1988: 82).

The sovereignty project was officially entered into Québec's political discourse in 1968, the year the Parti Québécois (PQ) was founded.[1] Article One of the party's founding principles states:

> le peuple québécois, composé de l'ensemble de ses citoyennes et citoyens, est libre de décider lui-même de son statut et de son avenir ... le Parti Québécois s'est formé à partir de la conviction qu'il y a urgence d'établir un Québec souverain. Le Québec suit ainsi la voie tracée par tous ces peuples qui ... se sont donnés tous les instruments pour devenir des sociétés pleinement responsables. (1996: 1)

---

[1] I say officially, because the PQ ran candidates in the 1970 provincial election, winning 7 of 108 seats. Three years later, they won 6 of 110 seats; and finally, in 1976, won a majority of 71 out of 110 seats. DGE Québec, Rapport des résultats officiels du scrutin Québec: Bilbiothèque nationale du Québec, 1994): 48.

By referring to the *peuple* Québécois in this way, the PQ offers a two-fold understanding of the nation. First, it is implicitly sociological: the nation is conceived as a form of kinship. As Anderson articulates it, the nation is a "deep, horizontal comradeship... [a] fraternity" (1991: 5, 7), and is comprised of individuals who imagine themselves to form a community. Second, the nation is overtly political. The Québécois nation as conceived by the PQ is clearly invested with an ideology: to become its own sovereign state from the Canadian federal state in which it currently has membership. And this ideological component is one of nationalism's most provocative elements: according to Anderson, "[I]t is the magic of nationalism to turn chance into destiny" (1991: 10).

To begin with Québec nationalism means to take issues of signification as a starting point: for nationalism is not simply something in which a people is invested, it also points to and identifies 'a people' within its limits. Hence, emphasizing the sovereignty question in Québec means to look first at who and what kind of people the Québécois are, who are to live out their "destiny" either by voting YES, or by voting NO.[2] While a great deal of academic interest has been focused on this question, the PQ's Article One glosses over the fact that the people of Québec were not always *Québécois*, nor were they necessarily a *peuple*. While it suggests that the *peuple* Québécois simply *are*, that they unquestionably exist, Maurice Charland notes that the term Québécois only entered into Québec's political discourse in 1967 with the declaration "Nous

---

[2] Whether Québec shall remain a province "like the others" or become sovereign is put to province-wide referenda, where the question is answered either in the affirmative (YES/OUI) or the negative (NO/NON).

sommes des Québécois". Made by the Mouvement Souveraineté Association — a political association whose goal was sovereignty for the province — the utterance of the term saw the birth of a new type of political subject. Used to denote those who had previously been called French-Canadians, "Québécois" writes Charland, created "a national identity for a new type of political subject" (1994: 213).

Significantly, despite the specific ideological end that prompted the birth of the term, the Liberal Party of Québec (PLQ) also adopted the term Québécois as the national signification denoting French-speaking subjects of the province; but it altered the ideological goal said to be inherent to the new subject. For the PLQ, to be a Québécois meant being a national subject of equal political power to English-speaking Canadians, while maintaining the federal state structure. Article One of the PLQ's constitution states:

> Il est, par la présente Constitution, formé un parti politique
> voué à la promotion du dévelopement économique du Québec
> et de la justice sociale au sein de la Fédération canadienne...
> Les objectifs du Parti sont de: a) promouvoir le progrès
> politique, économique, social et culturel de tous les Québécois
> et Québécoises... (1997:1)

Hence, for the PLQ, the federal state comes first, while the promotion of Québécois' economic, social and cultural progress comes second, as an outgrowth of their commitment to the federal system. Conversely, for the PQ, to be a Québécois meant being a political subject with a natural telos: "To be constituted as a Québécois in the terms of [the PQ's national] narrative is to be constituted such that sovereignty is not only possible, but necessary. ... true Québécois could not vote NON" (Charland 1994: 226).

The fact that one can pin-point a particular date at which the term Québécois entered the province's political lexicon reveals that 'a people' does not exist naturally, but must be created. In other words, while it is understood that nationalism requires "a people", a community of individuals who share a common set of values and a common history, this community is not innate to the nation-state, but must be constituted as such. Indeed, Homi Bhabha writes that "a people" does not exist "prior to a politics":

> ... 'the people' are there as a process of political articulation and political negotiation across a whole range of contradictory social sites. 'The people' always exist as a multiple form of identification, waiting to be created and constructed. (1990b: 220)

Thus, "the people" is a political entity, which is invested with the power to articulate its social position as different, unequal, multiple, and often antagonistic (Bhabha 1990b: 208). And once successfully created, the collective power of a united people will "warrant any 'reform' against any other power on earth" (McGee 1975: 241).

Significantly, the constitution of a national subject has important consequences central to this study. They stem from the fact that precisely because it is the embodiment of a national discourse, the *peuple* Québécois must be constituted against something, for a nation has limits. As Anderson argues, "The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, ... has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations" (1991: 7). Without these other

nations, conceiving of oneself as belonging to one in particular becomes completely devoid of meaning. According to Hall,

> ... meaning depends on the difference between opposites. We need 'difference' because we can only construct meaning through a dialogue with 'the Other'. ... the Other is fundamental to the constitution of the self, to us as subjects... (1997: 237)

Indeed, the locating of what we are *not* not only tells us who we *are*; it can also work to bind us together. Kenneth Burke contends that the "primary importance in the locating of what one *is*, is the locating of what one is *against*" (1969: 364). Significantly, he finds that this external enemy often works as a binding agent. In his case, the manifestation of popular antagonism during the feudal period was concomitant with an external agent: the monarch. As long as there was an external enemy against whom they could define themselves, the people had something in common; but as soon as the monarch was deposed, the popular essence lost its definition (1969: 364). By extension, this suggests that, as the Québec project is conceived in competition with English-speakers, a particular rendering of anglophones plays a role in binding francophones together in their national project.

Pointing to an agent as the "enemy" has further ramifications that are quite distinct from the external agent's ability to bind a community together. It also strips him of some, if not all, of his political power. This is especially true in cases where this attribution is used by the state to enact particular laws. This is a claim to which the Québec case bears specific witness, as the nationalist project has

been institutionalized twice over. Both political parties in the province promote Québécois nationalism — it is just the state structure which is to support it which differs between the two. Add to this the fact that the PQ is not a fringe party, but a party which has held, and holds today, governing power over the province of Québec,[3] and one starts to realize the extent to which its sovereignty dream can be promoted through state institutions and policy.

Thus, as the state acts as both the distributor of power and the basis for its existence, this too becomes an important site of identity production, especially as nationalism is maintained and promoted by state institutions through particular policies: state-sponsored commemorations (holidays, national days of remembrance); government rituals which reference national origins; official language policies; and state-sponsored media, among others. Accordingly, one has to look at how this exclusionary rhetoric is enacted in laws by the state, and consequently, how a particular rendering of the "Other" can become institutionalized, with its own specific effects. Granted, Butler argues that interpellation "need not take on an explicit or official form in order to be socially efficacious and formative of the subject" (1997: 153). In the Québec case it does, however, making way for counter-arguments to attack the state as well as the nation, because the "Other" is doubly positioned outside.

---

[3] The 1994 provincial election gave the PQ a majority of 77 seats to the PLQ's 47. DGE Québec, Rapport des résultats officiels du scrutin (Québec: Bilbiothèque nationale du Québec, 1994): 48. 1998 saw the PQ return to power with 76 seats to the PLQ's 48.

We (are not) the people

Secession movements add an extra dimension to the question of outsidership, however, as there are often people *inside* the state who do not agree as to the nation's origins, and who do not subscribe to the project. The PQ's Article One suggests that all Québécois are invested in this project, but that there are detractors is revealed by the voting results on both referenda on the question: 1980 — Yes: 40.44%; No: 59.56%; 1995 — Yes: 49.44%; No: 50.56% (DGE Québec 1995: 23, 2). Consequently, as the Québécois are constituted as part of a nationalist project that seeks to secede, the case problematizes the notion of the nation being contained within borders, outside which exist other nations against whom "we" define ourselves. Such arguments fail to account for secession movements, as they speak only to the final independent state, a status Québec has not yet achieved. Thus, the Québec case reveals an internal we/them logic, which stems from the drive for secession from an English nation without its borders, but which manifests itself within its borders as English-speakers reside there.

Interestingly, Bhabha and Michael McGee's arguments regarding the constitution of 'the people' confound Anderson's who, despite his significant contribution to our understanding of the rise of nationalist sentiment, contends that nationalism is neither an ideology nor "a form of 'false consciousness' " (Balakrishnan 1995: 61). Contra Anderson, McGee argues that 'the People' may be "a strictly linguistic

phenomena introduced into public argument as a means of legitimizing a collective fantasy" (1975: 239). If successful, it propels the people to act, to live out the collective fantasy by renouncing some of his/her individual sovereignty. Yet, McGee claims it is a myth, rather than a real identity, and is always in competition with objective reality, "because it is an attempt to redefine material conditions" (1975: 245). This suggests that there will always be some form of challenge to the myth, and indeed, he writes that "it is the central target for those who will not participate in the collective life ... because they are hostile to the myth ... " (1975: 243).

Arguably, this hostility stems from a disagreement with respect to the ways in which the material conditions are reappropriated to conform to a specific ideological goal. This challenge operates to contest the state's distribution of power and material goods. But challenge to the myth can also come from the margins — from the people who have been constructed outside this myth, but against whose existence the myth of the people is realized. In other words, a challenge can and does emerge from minority discourses, which "contest[] genealogies of 'origin' that lead to claims for cultural supremacy and historical priority..." (Bhabha, 1990b: 307). Nowhere is this more prevalent than in the case of nationalist discourses.

Assessing who the 'others' are involves looking at McGee's analysis from an inverted perspective, to examine 'the people' from the perspective of who it excludes, the reasons for their exclusion, and crucially, how they are nonetheless portrayed within and through

the myth of a 'united people'. For instance, McGee analyses Hitler's speeches to identify the means by which the Germans were constituted (1975: 240), but he does not ask himself how the Jews were constituted by the same speech acts. Charland, in his analysis of the *peuple* Québécois, also seeks only to explicate the articulation of a people from within (1994: 213); he does not ask how anglophones were portrayed by the same speech acts. In doing so, both ignore the fact that, at the same time as Hitler, or the PQ were speaking to their respective audiences, there were other audiences on which their speech acts had effects, even while they were not being spoken to directly.

Thus, while Aristotle points out that it is easier to praise Athens to Athenians then it is to Laecedemonians, what needs to be asked is what happens to Laecedemonians through these speeches. How does a particular rendition of their identity figure into them, and is concomitant to Athenians defining themselves as such? And how do they continue to identify as Laecedemonians? To ask these questions means acknowledging that every construction of "a people", while having direct consequences on those who are to be included, also has indirect, but no less important, effects on those excluded from the discourse.

Indeed, one of the limitations of rhetorical theory is that it only accounts for the audience present at the time of utterance, not that which is outside, but on which the speech act can still have effect. Meanwhile, Philip Wander contends that "[e]stablishing links

between what is said and those denied access to public space brings rhetorical theory back to earth" (1984: 210). Judith Butler equally argues for the importance of examining the effect on those excluded from an audience. "The linguistic constitution of the subject can take place without that subject's knowing," she writes, "as when one is constituted out of earshot, as, say, the referent of a third-person discourse" (1997: 33). Yet, Butler does not ask herself why, if a subject protests or refuses the interpellation by saying, " 'That is not me, you must be mistaken!' " that the interpellation continues, which she claims it does, "indifferent to your protests" (1997: 33). By repeating the hail, the missed and even refused interpellation can nonetheless succeed at positioning the subject. Hence, what must be asked is, if the subject refuses interpellation, and/or is constituted while not being spoken to directly, what happens to him in this process? To look at the question in this way involves framing the argument to account for the insistence upon such external (mis)interpellation, and the rhetorical requirements of nationalism serve as an ideal point of departure for such an analysis. Due to the fact that nationalist discourses seek to erect "symbolic boundaries [to] keep categories 'pure', giving cultures their unique meaning and identity" (Hall 1997: 236), we need to ask how they do this, and what the repercussions are.

But Québec adds another element to this formulation. While it remains part of the Canadian federation, yet another national narrative is at work in constituting the subject: the Canadian

narrative. The nationalist discourses of both provincial political parties attempt to supplant the Canadian one, but they focus on only one subject: the francophone, or Québécois, but not the anglophone. In leaving anglophones out, however, both parties reaffirm the power of the Canadian narrative to constitute anglophones as national subjects. Thus, not only do we need to ask about the consequences to the anglophone subject who is *not* spoken to directly by Québec's national discourse; but also, what repercussions play out of his being spoken *to* by another, the Canadian one, which constitutes him as a different national subject? Furthermore, as the Canadian national narrative portrays anglophones as majority subjects, a point the Québec national project equally promotes in order to advance its own claims regarding francophones' status, how does this political positioning equally play a role in anglophones' counter-actions?

Outside the state: power and insurgency

Significantly, despite arguments claiming that identity is foreclosed through spoken/written acts, Butler sees positive possibilities in the limited ability of language to "do what it says". She writes that, while "language constitutes the subject in part through foreclosure ... agency is derived from limitations in language, and that limitation is not fully negative in its implications" (1997: 41). Instead, what it says and who it is said to, is always contestable, even when the

"divine effect" of naming is backed by state power, "there does sometime exist recourse to refute that power" (Butler 1997: 32).

Indeed, Hall's examination of representations of blacks in Caribbean cinema highlights that preconceived identities are mutable over time. While he argues that these meet roadblocks in the (re)formation process, most specifically when coming up against power-brokers who have defined the identity in advance, he contends that, although it is tempting to view this as a power from which Afro-Caribbeans are excluded, this power becomes, in fact, one of the "constitutive element[s] in our own identities" (1990: 233). As a result, a concept of "blackness" predetermined by white people, can be reappropriated in new ways, with empowering political repercussions. Speaking as a black man, Hall articulates the process as follows:

> You have spent five, six, seven hundred years elaborating the symbolism through which Black is a negative factor. Now I don't want another term. I want that term, that negative one ... I want to take it out of the way in which it has been articulated in religious discourse, in ethnographic discourse, in literary discourse ... I want to pluck it out of its articulation and re-articulate it in a new way. (1991: 54)

In rearticulating terms which have (pre)recognized currency within a particular political and/or national jurisdiction, the speaker thus empowers himself as a political subject, by "reworking the force of the speech act" (Butler 1997: 40).

Hall's text reveals an important dynamic; it illustrates that when a particular subject is defined as the "Other", he is deprived of power, but when he takes up that definition by choice, and uses it to

define himself, he regains some of the power that has been stripped from him. Hence, he points to a power play between the defined and the definer. In doing so, Hall reminds us that all political institutions must be supported by 'the people' in order to maintain legitimacy. As Arendt points out:

> It is the people's support that lends power to the institutions of a country ... All political institutions are manifestations and materializations of power; they petrify and decay as soon as the living power of the people ceases to uphold them. (1963: 41)

A secondary, but no less important issue of relevance within his work points to the fact that this power can be contested by using the very language and terms that allowed it to materialize. This is especially true in cases where common convictions are instilled and maintained through foreclosing or restricting the communication of those who might disagree. This particular type of communication, on which claims to nationalism rely, allow

> those involved [to] form convictions subjectively free from constraint, convictions which are, however, illusionary. They thereby communicatively generate a power which, as soon as it is institutionalized, can also be used against them. (Habermas 1977: 22)

Indeed, Hall and Butler's texts offer empowering recourse to the subjugated subject. Butler writes that, "within political discourse, the very terms of resistance and insurgency are spawned in part by the powers they oppose" (1997: 40). As a result, a site of resistance can and often does work by reappropriating constitutive elements and endowing them with new agency, and consequently, new power. This appropriation of old discursive trends, tropes and symbols and

endowing them with new meaning is the very essence of language itself as a life form. Rather than simply fixing a subject and foreclosing his means of expression, it can be inverted, appropriated and spoken to foreclose the identity of he who speaks first. To this end, Butler writes:

> Consider ... that situation in which subjects who have been excluded from enfranchisement by existing conventions governing the exclusionary definition of the universal seize the language of enfranchisement and set into motion a 'performative contradiction,' claiming to be covered by that universal, thereby exposing the contradictory character of previous conventional formulations of the universal. (1997: 89)

Nationalism's "remainders"

I highlight this dialectical nature of language to bring to the fore Bhabha's claim that if one starts by realizing that the people is a construction, "[y]ou also begin to see how this 'general will', this consensual bloc could be *disarticulated*" (1990: 221). The process of disarticulation can occur by using the same language used to articulate it in the first place. In other words, it follows the same logic which created the 'myth' from which subjects were excluded, by (re)appropriating a culture's historical elements and rewriting them in new ways. As McGee explains in his construction of 'the people',

> The duty of a champion is to 'find an old longing' and 'help it to victory' ... The advocate is a 'flag-bearer' for old longings, and by transforming such longings into a new idea, he actualizes his audience's predisposition to act ... (1975: 241)

As a result, "new language games are piled on top of old ones, not simply superseded ... but sedimented ... The consequence is ... the eternal recurrence of cultural and political archetypes" (Wolin 1990: 24).

Yet, while Bhabha, Hall and Butler's arguments regarding the ability of fringe, or disenfranchised groups to (re)enfranchise themselves — through adopting the very language used to remove their power in the first place — go a long way to explaining the discourse of anglophones in Québec today, they are ultimately limited due to their underlying assumption that the sovereignty of the state structure which enacts the national narrative will remain uncontested, and that the nation itself exists in the first place. Their minority discourses work to find recognition by and within the state, to share in the national identity and political sphere outside of which they have been constituted. That this is the impetus behind such claims is underscored by Hall's foregrounding the example of black runner Linford Christie's experiences regarding questions relating to his national identity. While he was born in Jamaica and lived there until the age of seven, having lived in Britain for 28 years, Christie claims, "I can't be anything other than British." Hall contends however, "that most definitions of 'Britishness' assume that the person who belongs is 'white'. It is much harder for black people, wherever they were born, to be accepted as 'British' " (1997: 230).

In Hall's account, Christie seeks inclusion in the British national signification, to put an end to his outsider status. Hall's contribution

is his ability to see the subject as being doubly national — British and Jamaican — and his allowing him to be both at once. It speaks to the notion of hybridity, so prominent in Bhabha's work, whereby the agent can speak from two voices simultaneously. As per Mikhail Bakhtin, the hybrid:

> ... is not only double-voiced and double-accented ... but is also double-languaged; for in it there are not only (and not even so much) two individual consciousness, two voices, two accents, as there are [doublings of] socio-linguistic, consciousness, two epochs ... that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of utterance ... (in Bhabha 1996: 58)

Indeed, Hall argues that "modern people ... have had, increasingly, as a condition of survival, to be members, simultaneously, of several, overlapping 'imagined communities'..." (1993: 359). Québec's anglophones are exemplary of this hybrid subject. Positioned as they are by both Québécois and Canadian national narratives, two subject positions, two articulations, two politicized individuals "fight it out on the territory of utterance". But where they differ from the hybrid is that, whereas Bhabha claims that "[h]ybrid agencies find their voice in a dialectic that *does not* seek cultural supremacy or sovereignty." (emphasis added, 1996: 58), many of Québec's anglophones do: Constituted as subjects by a province that seeks to secede, they aim to call into question the very sovereignty sought by Québec nationalists. In other words, while they contest "genealogies of origin" by using the constitutive elements of their own subjectivity, numerous anglophones, unlike Christie, do *not* wish to share in the national

project articulated by Québec's national movement, but instead place primacy on that of Canada's national narrative.

Thus, what needs to be addressed is what happens when two national narratives work on subjects simultaneously and produce particular claims, in a case where one of those narratives emerges from a state that is not indisputably sovereign. Arguably, what this means is that McGee's dormant arguments can come from two sources simultaneously: the Canadian sphere as well as the Québec one. And it suggests, as Bhabha has done before, that two identities can function simultaneously in one political sphere. But where it differs is that the resignification sought by Bhabha's hybrid is dual and even multiple, when it comes to a state which is not yet sovereign, and whose desire for sovereignty is questioned, a dual consciousness can function with the aim of producing a single, or overriding one.

Indeed, despite great efforts on the part of Québec's nationalist discourse(s) to do so, political spheres, no matter how stable, are always sites of contestation. The discourse of the Québécois would like us to think that only one national narrative is at stake, and has been quite successful in promoting this end, but it is not the case: Québec has not yet succeeded in its national project, and thus remains part of another nation-state. The notion of remainders thus becomes important to this project as, ultimately, no political space can be perfectly foreclosed. Bonnie Honig argues that "remainders" are the outcome of the "always imperfect closure of political space... [where] if those remainders are not engaged, they may return to

haunt and destabilize the very closures that deny their existence" (1993: 15). Hence, we need to look at the remainders of the Québec secession project in order to foresee sites of future struggle. In pointing out the interplay of national narratives emanating from Canadian and Québécois public spheres simultaneously, and combining this with the argument that all identities are political, what I am arguing here is that, at the same time as the national and political Québécois subject was born, something equally happened to anglophones which was both national and political. Taking up Honig's contention regarding the pervasiveness of remainders, however, is to contend that these constitutive elements have the potential to "return to haunt and destabilize" the closure Québec's nationalist discourse sought to create.

CHAPTER TWO

Constituting the Scapegoat: the Third Persona

Cultures attempting to understand their past and foresee their path for the future often rewrite ground-breaking historical events as a continuum in the grand narrative of the nation, or obliterate them altogether from the nation's memory. In looking at Québec today, for instance, one is easily led to believe that such demonstrations of manifest destiny have always been part of the Québec fabric, as the nationalist narrative of the province has been so successful at constituting the Québécois as a sovereign subject. The usage of the term Québécois to denote francophones residing in the province has gained such wide currency among Quebecers and even Canadians outside the province that it is hard to imagine a time without this signifier. Yet, as Maurice Charland discovered, the term only entered into Québec's political lexicon in 1967 (1994: 212). Thus, it has only been in use for 30 years.

The term "anglophone" has a similar history: it too signifies, and corollaries specific "peoples" under its umbrella. More than this, it appears to have been "born" the same year as the term Québécois, but of a different source: the federal government of Canada. Prior to this date, English-speakers were defined in a variety of ways in the province of Québec, among them: Anglo-Canadians, Anglo-Protestants, Anglo-Saxon (Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems, 1953), and English-Canadians (Commission of Language of Education in the Province of Québec, 1963). Meanwhile, the year following its

birth saw Québec's English-speakers defined as the *minorité Canadienne anglaise* (Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and Language Rights in Quebec, 1968).

The first "official" reference to English speakers as "anglophones" is found in the report of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, a federal commission charged with recommending the steps to be taken "to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races [sic]" (Innis 1973: 185). Therein, the authors state: "To avoid constant repetition of clumsy expressions such as 'those who speak English' and 'those whose main language is French,' we shall often replace them with the simple terms 'anglophones' and 'francophones' " (1967: footnote, xxiv). But the term anglophone is far from simple. Since 1967, for instance, it has shifted in terms of the identity it signifies. Norman Spector makes the point that in his 26-year absence from Montréal, the term has grown to include Jews. He writes:

> When I left Montréal, people spoke of the French, the English and the ethnics, and the appellations were as blunt as the divide was clear. I thought back to the language struggles of the 1960s. At the time, Jews were still considered ethnics ... now we are called anglophones.[1]

---

[1] Spector, "Cultures warring in the bosom of a single state," Globe & Mail 7 Sept. 1996: D3. This tendency is illustrated by L. Ian MacDonald, in "Top Quebecers list balanced," Montreal Gazette 5 Feb. 1999: A4. Therein, in reference to the top 100 Quebecers of the century list compiled by francophone magazine L'Actualité, MacDonald writes, "One of the striking things about it is that it contains the names of 13 anglophones." One of the names he cites as "anglophone" is that of Sam Bronfman.

Thus, while English-speaking residents of the province were once distinguished from one another ethnically, now they are all identified as "anglophone", a term that rids them of ethnicity altogether, and signifies them only by the language they speak as subjects.

Indeed, terms tend to take on a life of their own outside the context in which they were originally constituted. But what is significant is that, while the terms "Québécois" and "anglophone" were coined by different political bodies, the impetus prompting their emergence was the same: the nationalist movement in Québec, the narrative of which " 'make[s] real' coherent subjects" (Charland 1994: 218). Yet, while it was being articulated as early as 1967, the narrative of Québec's nationalist movement was only officially institutionalized in 1979, the year prior to Québec's undertaking its first referendum on the question of whether it should develop a new sovereign partnership with Canada.

The 1980 referendum on sovereignty-association in Québec marked a specific turning point in the history of the province that would-be nation-state. It required the approval of the people of the province, and hence, a historical narrative to lead the Québécois who would decide the question to this point. To vote OUI to sovereignty association required an understanding of oneself and one's province as being or belonging to a separate nation and state structure than Canada; to vote NON meant identifying as one of two founding peoples of Canada, and choosing to remain part of the Canadian nation-state.

In keeping with George Dionopoulos and Stephen Goldzwig's theory regarding the causes prompting revisionist narratives, the 1980 referendum produced two contrasting stories which competed in a dialectical struggle for the "possession of Québec's history" (1992: 61). Published in the same year, the Parti Québécois (PQ) tabled the White Paper entitled *La nouvelle entente Québec-Canada. Proposition du gouvernement du Québec pour une entente d'égal à égal: la souveraineté-association,* on November 2, 1979. The Liberal Party of Québec (PLQ) also tabled a document entitled *Choisir le Québec et le Canada* on February 15, 1979.

That this was a significant historical moment was not lost on the authors of the White Paper. They were, in fact quite self-aware of it. The opening lines of the document, under the title "L'avenir d'un peuple" — The future of a people — read as follows:

> Dans l'histoire des peuples comme dans la vie des individus, surviennent des moment décisifs. ... Ces moments décisifs sont rares. Heureusement, pourrait-on dire, car ils s'accompagnent presque toujours d'une certaine angoisse... Nous voici tous, Québécois et Québécoises, arrivé à un moment décisif, à un carrefour. (1979: vii)

Given this beginning, the story which unfolds in these pages also follows the rhetorical strategy laid out by Dionopoulos and Goldzwig as its "struggle to possess the past is actually a struggle to possess the future" (1992: 61). Nowhere is this more clearly illustrated than by juxtaposing the titles of the first two chapters: the introduction speaks of the future, chapter one, the past — aptly titled, "Je me souviens" — I remember — it equally speaks of struggle. Variations

on the word "lutter" are found repeatedly in the nine pages that make up the first chapter.

Significantly, the PLQ expressed a moment of self-awareness of its own: it went so far as to agree that Québec's nationalist sentiment had foundation. In a sense, the party borrowed from Fred Appel's treatise on nationalism, wherein he writes that "before nationalism can be exploited in this instrumental fashion, ... there must first be something deeply rooted to exploit" (1993: 140) — it needs a foundation from which to emerge. Citing historical grievances based on inequalities between the English and the French, the PLQ claimed:

> Peu importe que ces souvenirs ou ces impressions
> [d'infériorité] procèdent d'une vision plus ou moins contestable
> de la réalité concrète. Elles ont existé et existent encore dans
> une mesure assez répandue pour que ce fait soit en lui-meme
> une des données importante du problème que nous devons
> aujourd'hui résoudre. (1979a: 23)

In this statement, the PLQ can be seen as recognizing that the facticity of such lived experiences is contestable. But at the same time, their admission supports Pierre Bourdieu's claim that, "[t]he power of the ideas that a leader proposes is measured not, as in the domain of science, by their truth-value ... but by the power of mobilization that they contain, ... by the power of the group that recognizes them" (1991: 190). Hence, while the PLQ recognized that these may not be have been "valid" points of reference, the party agreed that they were nonetheless effective in instilling nationalist sentiment, and therefore, real or not, had mobilization power.

Consequently, from the PLQ's perspective, these historical experiences became uncontestable — they became, in a sense, real. Yet, their awareness as to the subjectivity of such accounts allowed others to be opened to scrutiny, which the party did by disagreeing with the PQ's narration of the history of the *peuple* Québécois. In a separate document produced as "part of the information campaign to make Quebecers aware of the stakes in the referendum," the PLQ countered the PQ's historical account of Quebecers' trajectory with the statement that:

> This way of telling the history of our people is profoundly false and unjust ... Based as it is on a morbidly distorted vision of historical reality, it leads to conclusions bearing so little resemblance to the truth of our evolution as a society that the Parti Québécois studiously refrains from talking about them. (1979b: 15)

These words testify to the subjective nature of history, whereby "the process of reconstructing and deeming one segment of the past appropriately analogous for some present circumstance, occludes — or indeed, delegitimates — other options" (Dionopoulos and Goldzwig 1992: 61). It follows Kenneth Burke's argument that, through the use of what he calls "terministic screens", the speaker "necessarily directs attention into some channels rather than others" (1966: 45).

Indeed, the most provocative aspect of these documents is that, despite their different views on Québec's history, both direct our attention from one channel to another. Both share the objective of replacing the original Canadian constitution with a new one, one that attempts to constitute a new national subject. Yet, because they

contain arguments which impute a new national identity, they make use of metaphors which "draw the boundaries of national existence so sharply, they invite speculation about what is *not* included in national life, as well as about what is" (Robinson 1998: 113).

In pointing out this nuance of public argument, the intention is to turn these papers on their heads and look at the channels the respective authors direct our attention from in their attempt to constitute the identity of the Québécois. Of specific interest are the binary oppositions that advance their claims allowing for the birth of this new national subject. Even while they present different arguments regarding the state construct that is to support their national identity(ies), both papers advance their respective arguments by way of "binary opposition" and "sacrificial principle" in order to "develop a dramatic theme for creating narrative order" (Robinson 1998: 113). In the White Paper, the opposition was constituted as being outside the province, as the emphasis was on establishing the sovereignty of a Québec state: "[C]onceived in these terms the federal government and English Canada became the 'other' because they interfered with Quebecers' choice-making" (Robinson 1998: 113). Meanwhile, because the PLQ agreed that there was foundation for the nationalist sentiment, it needed to address it. But, as the party wanted to continue relations with the federal system outside its borders, it had to constitute an oppositional force within its borders that had to be undermined. Thus, contra the White Paper, the

Liberals indicate that the opposition to the progress of the French province is not without, but within.

The substance, however, of the opposition identified by both parties is identical: English-speakers. Thus, it is of no small significance that, while the authors disagree on the historical narrative of the Québécois and the solution to current grievances, the substance of both parties' oppositional strategies is extremely similar. It is only the geographical location of the English that differs. For the White Paper they are extra-Québec, for the Liberals, within the province. Hence, even while English-speakers have lived in Québec since 1763, both papers do not include them as subjects of the Québec nation articulated therein.

Even so, anglophones are given prominence within these articulations. As a result, the nationalist rhetoric of Québec offers an engaging case study as this is not an example of *tacit* exclusion from the *tacit* consent, as was the case, for instance, of the civil rights movement in the United States (Arendt 1972: 90). As anglophones are the opposition against whom the Québécois identity is constituted as *majoritaire*, they are visible and thus, the Québec national discourse can be seen to consist of an *explicit* exclusion, and one which entails specific ideological effects.

What these constitutive rhetorics achieve in ascribing a particular role to the anglophone as actor, is the constitution of a Third Persona. According to Philip Wander, the Third Persona is

> the 'it' that is not present, that is objectified in a way that 'you'

and 'I' are not. This being not present may, depending on how it is fashioned, become quite alien, a being equated with disease, a 'cancer' called upon to disfigure an individual or a group; ... or an organism, as a people might be transformed through a biological metaphor, into 'parasites'. (1984: 209)

The essential factor enabling his constitution as such is his not being able to assemble to hear the discourse, or protest against it. Such is the case of the anglophones constituted by these speech acts. Accordingly, a rhetorical analysis of these texts reveals that a third persona can be constituted by a speech act intended for the second, and that constituting that persona has three ideological effects. While it initially works along the same lines as found by Charland in his analysis of the constitutive rhetoric of the *peuple* Québécois, where he argues that the first ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric is to create a collective subject (1994: 218); it breaks down with the second. While Charland writes that the second effect is to constitute a trans-historical subject by collapsing time (1994: 219), the third persona is portrayed as anti-historical — an aberration in the progress of history. Finally, the third ideological effect of providing the illusion of freedom is equally inverted. Whereas Charland asserts that "[w]hat is significant in constitutive rhetoric is that it positions the reader towards political, social, and economic action in the material world and it is this positioning that its ideological character becomes significant" (1994: 221), the ideological character of anglophones' constitution by these papers is that they are positioned to *not* act. It is the Québécois who are called on to act by voting May 20 1980 in favour or against sovereignty association, not anglophones. Hence,

while Charland argues that the third ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric is to provide the illusion of freedom (1994: 220), as we will see, in the case of the third persona, it produces quite the reverse: while it may also be illusionary, the effect is to constrain his action.

Constitution against the "Other": Scapegoating the *anglais*

Stuart Hall writes that the discourse of a written text fixes meaning, whereby:

> people who are in any way significantly different from the majority — 'them' rather than 'us' — are frequently exposed to [a] binary form of representation... Represented through sharply opposed, binary extremes — good/bad, civilized/primitive [and so on]... (1997: 229)

Indeed, Kenneth Burke argues that constitutions are "agonistic instruments. They involve an enemy, implicitly or explicitly" (1969: 357). While his text refers to Constitutions, capital C, the same applies to the constitution of a people. In order to have a "we" there must be a "them". Here, the constitution of the Québécois follows the same logic found by Burke when examining the "ideals" or "principles" endemic to constitutions — namely, the contrasting of that which is evil and hence, unwanted, with that which is virtuous and obviously, desired (1969: 360).

Both texts focus on the Québécois, who is defined as a French-speaking citizen residing in the province. They advance his identity by way of Burke's "scapegoat mechanism" — whereby the scapegoat

"is profoundly consubstantial with those who, looking upon it as a chosen vessel, would ritualistically cleanse themselves by loading the burden of their own iniquities upon it" (1969: 406). The vessel is the English-speaker which, like Burke's scapegoat, is a concentration of power that motivates those who are opposed to it. It serves to unite the people, thanks to "a foe shared in common" (1969: 408).

The documents follow the trajectory outlined in Burke's three stages of atonement. He writes that at the outset, both parties share "the iniquities" (1969: 406). This is true in so far as both the English and the French were considered Canadians — each with their own qualifier, whether they be *Canadiens français* or *Canadiens anglais*. According to the White Paper, however, the French-Canadian undergoes a transformation to lose his Canadian-ness altogether. He becomes, instead, a Québécois, a rhetorical address which, as Charland points out, "illustrates [that] particular subject positions can undergo transformation: 'Canadien français' can become 'Québécois,' an identity permitting claims for a new political order" (1994: 228). While the term Québécois comes to signify French-speakers, the term 'Canadian' becomes, through this process, the signifier for those whose language is English, and hence, need no more be qualified by "English".[2]

---

[2] This trend is highlighted by the White Paper when it states: "The institution of the Canadian federal regime thus sanctioned, and favored as well, the hegemony of a Canada become English" (PQ 1979: 11).

The PLQ makes a similar distinction when it writes that before 1960, Quebecers considered themselves as Canadians. Some described themselves as *Canadiens d'expression française*, others as French Canadians. However, since the 1960s, the party writes,

> très nombreux sont les Québécois qui tendent à se définir simplement comme des Québécois, c'est-a-dire comme membres d'une communauté nationale ayant son siege et son centre naturel d'intérêt au Québec, et nulle part ailleurs. (1979a: 26)

Interestingly, the paradoxical element of the PLQ's paper is that it hopes to restore the Canadian attribution of Quebecers identity. This is not based on a reading of "Canadian" as being "English" however, but by restoring its primacy of historical ownership to the French, for it was the French who were *Canadiens* first:

> ... les Québécois n'en continuaient pas moins de se considérer comme des Canadiens à part entière, voire à considérer que nul autre groupe de Canadiens ne méritait plus que le groupe francophone de se réclamer du titre Canadien. (1979a: 25)

The writers later state that:

> [Le Canada] fait désormais partie de notre héritage historique, de notre culture, de notre personnalité, de notre existence quotidienne, de notre experience vécue. ... Loin de bouder cette dimension canadienne, le Parti libéral du Québec l'assume au contraire comme une partie essentielle de l'être Québécois. ... Partie intégrante et vitale de l'ensemble canadien, le Québec a joué un rôle de premier plan dans cette émergence graduelle du Canada. (1979a: 92, 100)

Despite the attempt to restore a sense of Canadian-ness to Quebecers' identity, and imputing a shared sense of destiny, the PLQ still sets up a division between the Québécois and the Canadians by declaring francophones to be a founding people of Canada. Thus,

Canadians and Québécois are portrayed not as one, but two separate "peoples" who have worked together to build Canada. The party further separates the peoples by locating the Québécois within the boundaries of Québec, and Canadians as outside it, although the writers argue that this geographical division was not always the case. Rather, their history attests that, at one time, the two people shared the same Canadian territory, but that the denial of French-linguistic rights outside the province forced francophones to "replier" towards Québec, deemed the only location where the flourishing of their culture could take place. The PLQ claims that language laws in other provinces prompted this demographic shift,[3] in order to conclude that:

> À toutes fins utiles, les provinces à majorité anglophone concurent et appliquèrent l'Acte de 1867 comme s'il leur avait accordé le droit incontestable de faire au Canada et des autres provinces un pays et des sociétés anglophones. (1979a: 14)

Hence, the separation of the two peoples is attributed to the desire of anglophones outside the province wishing to purge French foreignness from their territory. As a result of these laws and historical context, the writers claim it is not surprising that Quebecers learned to consider Québec as their "première patrie" and the rest of Canada as English and thus, foreign to them as well.

---

[3] The forbidding of French language education in New Brunswick (1870); the banishment of Catholic religion and French language instruction in PEI schools (1877); the suppression of French rights in Manitoba (1890); the reduction of French scholastic rights in Saskatchewan and Alberta at the beginning of the century; the prohibition of French language instruction in Saskatchewan (1930); and "réglement" XVII imposing English as the only language of instruction in Ontario (1915) (PLQ 1979a: 14).

Later on, however, the PLQ articulates a problem inside the province itself when it comes to anglophone dominance:

> ...la condition économique des francophones a historiquement été inférieure à celle de leurs concitoyens anglophones. À l'instruction et à qualifications égales, l'anglophone, même unilingue anglais, vivant à Québec a joui, du moins jusqu'à ces derniers temps, d'un revenu supérieur à celui de son concitoyen francophone. (1979a: 21)

In the economic sector, the separation between French and English became more pronounced when one looked to the hierarchy of responsibilities: in the command posts of Québec enterprises, one found a greater proportion of anglophones than in the population as a whole. These positions were then passed on to other anglophones, which meant, consequently, that the language of work was mostly English, and French speakers were relegated to a secondary position:

> Cette longue et pénible experience d'infériorité et de soumission dans le domaine économique est une donnée majeure du problème Québécois contemporain. Rares sont au Québec les familles francophones où l'on ne conserve pas le souvenir amer d'un père, d'un fils, d'une mère, d'un oncle, d'une tante, d'un cousin ou d'un ami, qui eurent a se plaindre à un moment ou l'autre d'avoir été traités de manière injuste ou inégale à cause de leur langue ou de leur origine française. (1979a: 23)

Consequently, the Liberal Party's rhetoric adheres to Burke's second principle — that of division — in that, "the elements shared in common are being ritualistically alienated" (1969: 406). And in both cases — Canadian territory and Québécois economy — the elements shared in common are portrayed as being alienated due to anglophone decisions. The PQ is more divisive, however. Their purging of that which is "foreign" amounts to constituting a

nationalism that eradicates any sense of fraternity between anglophones and francophones. Indeed, the PLQ claims that the PQ:

> ...interprètent [les griefs] à leur manière, ... et vont même jusqu'à évoquer l'image sinistre des deux scorpions qui s'entre-dévorent dans une même bouteille pour montrer que la coexistence des deux peuples francophones et anglophones est indésirable et impensable au sein d'un même pays. (1979a: 11)

This is a reversal of Anderson's argument that national histories (re)construct battles (such as the American wars of 1861-65 and the French "massacres du Midi") as meetings on the battlefield, "if not as dancing partners, at least as brothers" (1996: 201). But this reversal is not surprising given that the PQ wants to exacerbate the conflict rather than gloss over it. Instead, it over-emphasizes the notion of surviving against all costs against a foreign ruler. The title of the Introduction's third section reads, "Le Désir de survivre" — the desire to survive. The next reads, "La volunté de lutter" — the will to fight. Therein, the writers state that after the "implantation" of the British in 1763 (1979: 3), the colonized Quebecers wanted to affirm themselves. Thus, "nos ancêtres entreprirent de résister" against the controls placed on them by the English (1979: 4). And they did so in the regions and villages left them, where "the revanche des berceaux" eventually affords them a greater population than Upper Canada, which was majoritarily English (1979: 7). Yet, they continue, even this was insufficient to render francophones *majoritaire*. Despite a greater population base, under the 1840 Act of Union which merged Upper and Lower houses, they were only allowed to elect the

same number of representatives to Parliament as was Upper Canada (1979: 6). In sum, "[t]he story the White Paper offers is of a besieged *peuple* that has always continued to struggle in order to survive and to assert its right to self determination. Nevertheless, ... each advance is blocked by colonial power" (Charland 1994: 224). By inverting Anderson's paradigm and eliminating all notion of "brotherly love" shared by the two peoples, the PQ renders the choice of severing the relationship more sensible.[4]

In scapegoating the English, whether outside or inside the province, both parties allow for the third principle to materialize, that of merger, which sees "the unification of those whose purified identity is defined in dialectical opposition to the sacrificial offering" (Burke 1969: 406). Indeed, the purpose of the White Paper writ large, is to unify the Québécois into a collective subject, which provides an "ultimate identification permitting an overcoming or going beyond of divisive individual or class interests and concerns (Burke 1962: 194). That the Québécois are to unite as one is made abundantly clear by the repeated use of "nous" (our) to parlay this history. And one sees them come together repeatedly against the British, "united by a foe shared in common" (Burke 1969: 408),

---

[4] Anderson posits that had the Confederacy succeeded in maintaining its independence in 1865, "this 'civil war' would have been replaced in memory by something quite unbrotherly" (1991: 201). What will be worth observing are the ways in which Québec's battles with the English will be portrayed if Québec does secede — perhaps years from now, these will be rewritten as an amicable divorce between to peoples who remained friends.

which has the effect of imbuing the francophone population with virtue.

The PLQ makes a similar rhetorical address, although it never uses the word "our" to write their history. Instead, the party constantly refers to the Québécois as "les Québécois", a writing practice which also has the effect of rendering them into a collective unit. The word "they" has similar grouping qualities to that of "our", even while it puts distance between the Liberal Party and its subject — perhaps an intentional distance in order to render the history more "objective" than the PQ's and hence imbue it with greater "truth value". Like the PQ, however, the Liberals also imbue the Québécois with virtue. They are portrayed as good and just people who have been unfairly treated by English-speakers either within or without the province. The party achieves this end with the claim that the treatment francophones receive outside of Québec is vastly inferior to that which francophones give the anglophone minority within the province:

> Tandis qu'ils faisaient au Québec une place plus que convenable à leur minorité anglophone, les francophones du Québec découvraient avec un amer désenchantement qu'on ne leur reconnaissait guère de droits en dehors de la <<réserve Québécoise>>. (1979a: 15)

Significantly, Burke argues that "the goat, as the principle of evil, would be in effect a kind of 'bad parent'. For alienating the iniquities from the self to the scapegoat amounts to a *rebirth* of the self ... *it amounts to a change of parentage*" (1969: 407, italics added). Burke probably meant this to be read metaphorically but, in our case,

it can be taken quite literally. What the White Paper hopes to see accomplished on May 20 1980 is a majority Yes vote in favour of sovereignty-association — meaning that the Québec state would become the new parent, having overthrown the old one. This would constitute a final and certain victory for of the Québécois: The people would finally have complete control over their government, taxes, immigration, culture, defense, whereas the federal government of Canada would have none. To this end, the White Paper denies any possibility of the Confederation being advantageous.

> The will of the *peuple*, as instantiated in historical practice is shown to be undermined in the federal regime. The White paper describes various defeats of the will of the *peuple* in Confederation: Louis Riel fought for "survival" and climbed the scaffold; rights to French language education outside Québec were denied; Québécois were forced to participate in British wars. (Charland 1994: 226-7)

The Liberals also project a change of parentage, however, they claim that it has already taken place with the election of Jean Lesage in 1960 — a Liberal himself. Hence, the fruits of the new parent are underway:

> Le Parti libéral du Québec a été l'artisan principal au plan politique du mouvement contemporain de changement et d'affirmation qui a fait passer le Québec au rang de société vigoureusement tournée vers les valeurs modernes de culture, de développement et de prise en charge de son destin. (1979a: 91)

Thus the PLQ suggests itself as the arbiter of change: it is the party under whom the Québécois gained "new parents", and who are responsible for making Québec truly French.

Constituting the Scapegoat: Ideological effects

Charland points out that the first ideological effect of these respective rhetorics is to bind the francophone population of Québec into a collective subject (1994: 218). Aside from the use of collective signifiers to achieve this end, the primary reason that francophones are made a collective is due to their being pitted against the British/anglophones, a negative force which must be abrogated, or evicted altogether. In the White Paper, anglophones are portrayed as an external force which, by voting YES to sovereignty-association, will be evicted forever. For the Liberals, the process of undermining anglophones' control of provincial institutions has already begun with the Quiet Revolution and Liberal parentage. Thus, all that differs between the two papers is the solution to the English problem — one envisions a new state structure; the other, changes to the current structure which are already in place.

Something significant happens to anglophones through these papers, however. They undergo a transformation which is as political in intent as that which happens to the province's francophones. Interestingly, for all of his interest in the role of the scapegoat in fusing identities among those who ritually alienate it, Burke does not address what these discourses do to the scapegoat it/himself. Philip Wander claims that he is negated, and silenced (1984: 210). But Wander's examination deals with a text where, quite literally, the

third persona — in his case, the Jew — does not appear at all.[5] As anglophones *do* appear here, one can discern, in explicit terms, what the texts do to negate or silence them. The ideological effects are revealed to be threefold: one, it excludes them from the national signification; two, constrains their political freedom; and three, binds them into a collective on the fringes.

First, it treats anglophones as "other", not "us", which has the effect of excluding them from the national life articulated by these documents. What the White Paper glosses over in the process of setting up its dialectical opposition, is the fact that Québec has an anglophone population *inside* the province. They are only mentioned twice in the document, but much later on. The first, under "Une nouvelle entente", asserts that "the anglophone minority" will continue to enjoy the rights presently accorded it by law (1979: 61). In the second, "Québec, terre de l'avenir", the document makes reference to the fact that, over the years, the Québec population has diversified: "en font partie les Québécois de langue anglaise et ceux qui, de toute origines, participent, avec leurs compatriotes francophones, à la construction du Québec" (1979: 102). In this

---

[5] Wander makes use of Martin Heidegger's "Poetry, Language, Thought", given in Frankfurt on November 17, 24 and December 4, 1936. In this speech, however, Wander writes, "No mention of Jews, Communists or Labor organizers, for example, appears ..." Even so, Wander claims that if such subjects were to have heard Heidegger's reflections on peasant life, among other topics, they "would have, in political context, and, given this context, should have taken on meaning quite different from what Heidegger intended and from the response of his primary or actual audience" (1984: 210-211).

second point, one sees anglophones reduced to one among many, and thus, dislodged from their hegemonic position in the province.

This second reference is the only time the writers allude to the fact that Québec has become, over the years, a non-homogeneous society. Were one to read only the first chapter, which is the most rhetorical part of the document, one would be lead to believe that the Québec society of which they speak consists only of francophones, even while somewhere between 700, 000 and 800, 000 anglophones[6] resided in the province in 1979. Aside from the two exceptions noted above, the White Paper refers throughout to Québec's English-speakers as "British", while those who speak English outside the province are called "Canadian". Both attributions have the effect of portraying Québec as being francophone by nature, and leave English-speaking residents without any roots to the province — to be "British" means to have Britain as one's homeland, to be "Canadian", also rooted in a territory outside the borders of the province. In contrast, the term Québécois to constitute French-Canadians residing in the province ties them to the bounded geographical area in which they live.

---

[6] This figure is gleaned by averaging 1981 and 1976 Census figures. In 1981, 694, 915 residents of Québec claimed English as their mother tongue, and 809, 145 claimed English as the language most often spoken at home. Statistics Canada, 1981 Census of Canada. Population: Language, ethnic origin, religion, place of birth, schooling. Québec (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1984): 1-7, 1-9. 1976 statistics state 800, 680 residents claimed English as their mother tongue. Statistics Canada, 1976 Census of Canada. Population. Demographic characteristics: Mother Tongue (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1978): 2-1. No study was done that year of language most spoken at home.

The Liberals are less clear on this exclusion, but they externalize anglophones nonetheless. While they are, at least, shown to exist in the province, this does not mean that the party considers anglophones as Québécois. The Québécois remain, in their eyes, francophones: "Foyer principale de la vie française au Canada, le Québec est à ses yeux une société distincte où vit une communauté nationale formant une véritable entité originale..." (1979a: 91). Instead, in harking back to the federal government that coined the term, Québec's English-speakers are defined 'simply' as anglophones throughout. But in doing so, the PLQ equally rids them of a national identity, for they are signified based only on the language they speak, rather than any place of origin. While Anderson claims that shared language is of utmost importance in imagining a shared national community, language alone is insufficient. There must be also be a shared political-historical destiny, as well as an understanding of a bounded territory inside which "they" live — none of which are explicitly granted anglophones. Rather, by signifying them simply as "anglophones", the PLQ renders them extra-national. They are never referred to as Québécois "d'expression anglaise", British or Canadian and, thus they can be anybody, and nobody at once — a point further emphasized by the fact that the word 'anglophone' is not capitalized. It is not even a title. As a result, anglophones remain utterly undefined as national subjects within the Liberal party's nationalist discourse.

Both papers further the exclusion of anglophones from the national signification by denying their trans-historicism in the province. Instead, they treat anglophones as an aberration in the telos of the Québécois. This contrasts sharply with the constitution of the second persona whose constitution takes place through the collapsing of time. In the White Paper, Quebecers today are identified with French-Canadians of the past, "members of their community [who] have discovered, claimed and occupied the land" (Charland 1994: 219). Conversely, the third persona's time is figured as an anomaly, an unnatural perversion of history. The White Paper contributes to this effect by proclaiming that:

> En 1760, le long du Saint-Laurent, notre communauté formait déjà une société. Nord Americaine par la géographie, française par la culture, la langue et la politique, elle avait une âme, des habitudes de vie, des traditions, des institutions et des comportements qui lui étaient propres. (1979: 3)

By articulating the genealogy of Québec society in this way, the PQ suggests that in 1760, the Québécois already formed a society meaning, by extension, that they were already there — almost as though they emerged naturally from the soil, innate to the land. In contrast, the British arrival can be pinpointed to a specific date, 1763, when they "implanted" the territory. That anglophones are not Québécois by nature is additionally made clear by the PQ defining the Québec soul as consisting of a particular religion, language and customs — none of which are shared by the British (who are Protestant and English-speaking).

Furthermore, the very thrust underlying the PQ's argument for sovereignty-association is the reestablishment of historical continuity. Previous enactments such as the Québec Act of 1791, which allowed the colony to live in French and to be ruled by French civil laws, are seen as reestablishing historical continuity, and constituting an indispensable foundation for all ulterior progress (1979: 4). Yet, the PQ asserts that these and other policy initiatives were still insufficient in the long term to give francophones the majority voice they needed to control their destiny. Rather, the victories against the British are always parlayed as involving a cost. Hence they are not "true" victories, but only partial ones.[7] Only a vote in favour of sovereignty-association will consist of a certain victory.

The PLQ response to the anglophone phenomenon is more complex, not only because they wish to maintain federal relations which are perceived as "English", but because they also treat anglophones as residents of Québec throughout their paper. Yet, as noted, they do so without ascribing them any national identity to speak of, nor does the party attribute anglophones a positive role in the development of the province. Instead, their residency appears to be a reality that must be accepted, although the political influence they hold is changeable. This conclusion is implied by the comment

---

[7] Such is the case, for instance, with the decision made by London to split the territory into Upper and Lower Canada. While it meant that the French could elect their own representatives to their own parliament, the split came with the cost of cutting Québec off from the Great Lakes — "la plus riche parties de l'Ontario aujourd'hui". The writers describe this cut as an "amputation" (1979: 5).

that, in the higher posts in commercial enterprises, "on trouvait une proportion d'anglophones beaucoup élevée que dans la population en générale" (1979a: 21). It suggests unfairness at the level of proportional representation — that such a small population would have such large share of power is an unnatural state of affairs. But, by suggesting themselves as the arbiter of change in the province, Québec's becoming truly French under Liberal management infers that English control has, and will continue to be, mitigated.

Indeed, what is at stake for the Liberals, as for the PQ, is ridding the province of this aberration. Both parties achieve this end by denying anglophones any sense of Québec's being their home/nation. Being homeless has significant repercussions on he who experiences it, according to Hannah Arendt, whose experiences as a German Jew had the effect of exiling her from her country. For her, "homelessness is the loss of a sense of place that is not just geographic, but also moral and cultural" (Disch 1996: 173). As Michael Walzer argues, home is "a dense moral culture within which [one] can feel some sense of belonging" (1987: 36-37). Given the historical thrust of these papers, anglophones are clearly denied a sense of belonging in the Québécois "moral culture", for it is constituted against their very existence in the province.

Arendt suggests that exclusion from a national project transforms he who is excluded into a pariah and puts him on the margins of society. The difference between the political actor and the pariah is that the former has a public space in which to act,

whereas the pariah is excluded from public life (Ring 1991: 443). Thus, to be a pariah is to be denied a space of publicity, the sine qua non of human life. The crucial element of pariah-dom is that "his outsider status is not of his own making" (Ring 1991: 441). This is certainly true of anglophones' status, given that both of these papers are authored by and for French speakers in the province, and not by one of anglophones' own linguistic group.

In rendering them pariahs, the papers constrain anglophones' freedom, which is the second ideological effect of such rhetoric. Whereas the Québécois are portrayed as a people free to choose their future, and are politically empowered by the narratives contained in each paper, anglophones' ability to act is utterly denied. Francophones are the political subjects on whom the arguments are focus, and the ones who must be invested with the political power to choose their future — a right so long denied them by anglophones. One sees the province's francophones undergo a transformation from weakened, minority subject, to empowered, majority subject. Both histories initially portray francophones as a subjugated people. The words "subordination," "assujettir," and "powerlessness" figure strongly in the White Paper, with the British portrayed repeatedly as a foreign colonial power attempting to control the French. The Liberal Party speaks of "survival," "subordination," and "inferiority". In this we not only see the role played by francophones' minority identification in the Canadian — read English — jurisdiction to fuel what will become a majoritarian identity in Québec but also, by

focusing on their subordination, both parties inspire feelings of bitterness among francophones towards their anglophone counterparts. The transformation to empowered subjects culminates with the PQ proclaiming that "we believe that we are mature enough, and big enough, and strong enough, to come to terms with our destiny" (1979: 109-110). The PLQ does so by emphasizing the change of attitude Quebecers have experienced since the 1960s, with the coming of the Quiet Revolution:

> ... une série de changements ... traduisent le passage d'une perspective de résistance et de survivance à une perspective d'affirmation et de développement. Le Québec d'aujourd'hui ne veut plus se contenter de survivre. Il veut vivre et s'épanouir. (1979a: 28)

Thus, in both statements, we see Quebecers change from being inferior political subjects, to empowered subjects with the will to determine their future by themselves.

These rhetorical claims have the effect of imbuing francophones with strength; but it is an act of empowerment which can only be fully achieved by stripping power from anglophones who, from both parties' perspectives, have controlled the province's francophones, whether from without or within the province. The rhetorical addresses contained in both of these papers counter anglophones' power by not speaking to them at all, which disallows them a voice or a place from which to speak against it. That anglophones are silenced in this process is a significant power move intended to majoritize francophones politically — no matter which way they ask the people to vote. There is a power move at stake here which, as

Chantal Mouffe points out, constructs identities along axes of power, where the power works "not [as] an external relation to preconstituted identities, but rather as constituting the identities themselves" (1991: 42). They achieve this transformation through the attribution of status: an attribution which is, according to Robert Hariman, "perhaps the quintessential social act ... One's status is everything — people will kill for it — and nothing — other people may never acknowledge it" (1986: 43). Because any society is conceived as "having a centre, a periphery and a beyond, ... the conception of the periphery — or margin — of the society is essential to the conception of the centre" (Hariman 1986: 44). The attribution of marginality to anglophones, so necessary to francophones' achieving their centricity, is achieved through these discourses, and is political: "it inevitably establishes relations of dominance and subordination. ... it produces conditions of empowerment which also become conditions of knowing" (1986: 45). In this case, the political inferiority experienced by francophone subjects in the Canadian and Québec spheres at the hands of anglophones is used as the condition of knowing. Following which, the experience becomes the condition of empowerment, as made clear by both parties eventually establishing a new political status for francophones.

A plurality of "Others":
Establishing a foundation for collective action

The primary reason that the constitution of the third persona succeeds in this case is that anglophones are not being spoken to directly. Contra Judith Butler, whose subject refuses the interpellation by saying "that is not me, you must be mistaken" (1993: 33), anglophones are not even given the opportunity to challenge the interpellation contained in these documents. They are not directly hailed. They are spoken of, in a sense, behind their backs — hence, no challenge can be forthcoming. This has two effects, the first of which is that, in not being spoken to by the Québec nationalist discourse, anglophones still see themselves as constituted as national subjects by the Canadian national narrative. The Québec nationalist discourse seeks to supercede the Canadian one among francophones only, and is largely successful in this regard as both political parties treat him as a distinct national subject, and the term Québécois now signifies all francophones residing in the province regardless of ideological purpose. But the same supplanting does not occur with the anglophone population of the province. Undefined as national subjects in Québec, they maintain their national signification as Canadians.

By excluding them from Québec's history, the nationalist discourses of both parties produce a second effect among anglophones: they collectivize English-speakers, albeit without

anglophones' initial awareness of it. To tell the story of the Québécois," writes Charland, "is implicitly to assert the existence of a collective subject, the protagonist of the historical drama, who experiences, suffers and acts. Such a narrative ... negates individual interest" (1994: 219). Just as the Québécois are constituted as collective subjects by the discourse, anglophones' history is equally told here, although they are the anti-protagonists, whose experiences and actions cause the Québécois to suffer.

In becoming an "Other" anglophones also become plural, and their individualism is equally negated — it is anglophones in toto who have caused the Québécois such grief. This is underscored by the fact that neither paper mentions a single anglophone who has contributed positively to Québec's development.[8] In doing so, however, the nationalist discourse risks "reproducing the foundationalist power move it purports to resist by establishing a subject or subjects who claim to speak ... on a claim to critical understanding conferred by oppression (Disch 1996: 7). The effect of oppression can be central in mobilizing political action. According to Iris Marion Young,

---

[8] The fact that neither party makes mention of the remarkable alliance between Louis-Hyppolite Lafontaine and Robert Baldwin, francophone and anglophone Members of Parliament respectively, is an important omission in these histories. In 1842, Lafontaine became the first prime minister of a responsible Canadian government thanks to Baldwin's intervention. Lafontaine had lost his Lower Canada seat because the governor's gang blocked the polls, but Baldwin gave up one of his two Upper Canada seats so that his friend and ally might enter the legislature. Baldwin wrote to his constituents about his decision: "The return of Mr. Lafontaine by an Upper Canada constituency will be a substantial pledge of our sympathy with our Lower Canada friends and form the strongest of bonds between us." And thus, Lafontaine became the first prime minister thanks to the intervention and voting support of anglophones outside the province. John Ralston Saul, Reflections of a Siamese Twin: Canada at the End of the Twentieth Century (Toronto: Viking, 1997): 334-5.

"[m]any group definitions come from the outside, from other groups that level and stereotype certain people. In such circumstances, the despised group members often find their affinity in their oppression" (1989: 259). Based on the constitution inherent to these discourses, anglophones are given an opportunity to claim exclusion and hence, oppression by Québec's national narrative(s).

Accordingly, the corollary to anglophones being constituted as collective subjects is their being given a political cause to articulate. Arendt contends that what engenders political action among men and women is a sustaining *inter-est* — an "agreed purpose ... an in-between, which varies with each group of people and serves to relate and bind them together" (1958: 241, 158). This *inter-est* overcomes such distinctions as class and gender differences to provide a common political goal, though not a common denominator identity. By focusing on the anglophone as the negative "Other", both parties provide him with *inter-est* where before there might have been none, aside from his language — the sharing of which is, on its own, insufficient to create a community, or a group of like-minded individuals. In the Québec case, however, the English language is treated as a great deal more than a means of communication. It becomes over-determined with political baggage. The power of the English language becomes not only the primary element against which francophones' constitution as empowered subjects takes place, but it equally serves as the defining attribute allowing anglophones to be constituted as minority political subjects in the province. In

addition, the failure of both papers to constitute anglophones as Québécois national subjects means that they continue to identify as Canadian nationals. This too provides a political cause, especially when it comes to the Parti Québécois, which wants to change the federal state structure.

Indeed, it is no small irony that the national dreams articulated by both parties create a collective of anglophones through the very discourse which sought to deny their power, if not their very existence as political subjects. Add to this the fact that the discourse which constituted anglophones as disempowered subjects actually provides them with two inter-ests to articulate, and one starts to glimpse the power base from which anglophones can advance future claims, once they *hear* the interpellation and experience its effects. Power, according to Arendt, emerges when people "gather together and act in concert" (1958: 244). It needs to be actualized, however:

> What first undermines and then kills political communities is loss of power and final impotence; and power cannot be stored up and kept in reserve for emergencies, like the instruments of violence, but exists only in its actualization. (1958: 200)

Thus, while the power base is there, it is up to anglophones to actualize it. Then, their constitution as minority political subjects within the province, combined with their continued identification as Canadian national subjects will have the potential to produce a counter-mobilizing effort which surely both parties must have unanticipated.

CHAPTER THREE

Revision and reappropriation:
Anglophones challenge the sovereignty project

During the years in which she was living in the United States, Hannah Arendt kept up a correspondence with Karl Jaspers in which the two discussed her conflicting identification as a Jew and a German. In these, she asserts that, above and beyond sharing a language and a culture, having a sense of membership in a nation also requires sharing a historical-political destiny. This last was the crucial element on which she based her sense of exclusion from the German national project. While Arendt identified as a German, she stressed that this identification could only be partial, because she was a Jew. Jaspers attempts to convince her that she is a German nonetheless based on the fact that she shares the language and culture. He tells her, "all you need add is historical-political destiny and there is no difference left at all" (Kohler & Saner 1992:18). But Arendt refuses his assertion, and returns the importance of a shared historical-destiny to the forefront in her response: "there is all the difference in the world between the German language and culture in which she can participate and the manifestly dangerous course of Germany's historical-political identity" (Disch 1996: 195). [1]

---

[1] After the war, Jaspers came to share her sense of homelessness, as he felt that Nazi Germany had betrayed the "traditions by which he identified himself as a German." In Lisa Disch, Hannah Arendt and the Limits of Philosophy (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1996): 195.

Arendt wrote these words in 1933, several years before the "manifestly dangerous course" of Germany's destiny was realized. Almost twenty years after the first referendum in Québec, a similar argument emerges from Québec's anglophones regarding the province's sovereignty project, which equally has not yet been realized — the province remains part of Canada. Yet, Québec's anglophones add another dimension for, unlike Arendt, they do not "officially" share the language of Québec's majority, who speak French.[2] Hence, anglophones can be understood as doubly excluded from participating in the national life which constituted the Québécois as a French-speaking political subject.

How does one challenge practices which have become norms? Arendt left Germany altogether and contested the nation's exclusionary practices from the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. Québec's anglophones, meanwhile, vie to contest the Parti Québécois's practices from within the province itself. Michael McGee suggests that "the first principles of all public argument appear to lie in the society's collective judgement of its past," where lines of argument drawn from ideological views of history "collectivize" a community so that crises may be overcome (1977: 28). McGee outlines this premise to argue, contra professional

---

[2] In 1996 there were 586,435 anglophones in the province of Québec (mother-tongue statistics). If one takes into account language spoken at home, that number increases to 710, 970. Both taken from Statistics Canada 1996 census results online, www.Statcan.ca:80/english/pgdb/people/population/demo18b.htm and demo29b.htm. 25 Feb. 1999.

historians who condemn such histories for their lack of "truth" and accuracy, that "such rhetoric might be an accurate reflection of elements inherent in the episode" (1977: 29). The Québec case both confounds and supports this claim simultaneously — depending on the perspective of he who assesses it. For French-speaking nationalists, the histories as told by the Liberal Party and the Parti Québécois are, more or less, "an accurate reflection", and the previous chapter saw this collectivize them so that "the crisis" regarding their status in the Canadian nation-state might be overcome. For the anglophones who claim subjugation as a result of it, the discourse is inaccurate, but it too helps collectivize them into a group where "the crisis" is anglophones' status in the province of Québec, as well as the province's status in the Canadian nation-state.

Consequently, what needs to be asked is what happens in cases where the collective judgement of a society's past is not shared? What principles of public argument does this disagreement allow? In Arendt's writings on Jewish identity, she illustrates three possible responses to discrimination: assimilationism, separatism, and collective action. Each of these has a particular topos associated with it: to assimilate is to be a *parvenu*; to separate, a *schlemihl*, and to adopt collective action means being a conscious pariah. The conscious pariah is the modus she supports, for it involves accepting that one is "not at home in the world", and requires:

> being ill at ease with what is taken for granted there, and especially to be uncomfortable with the discontinuities between the ways you wish to appear and the identities you

animate in that world. (Disch 1996: 186-87)

In Arendtian politics, only the conscious pariah is a political actor; it requires the "emancipated Jew [to] awake to an awareness of his position and, conscious of it, become a rebel against it — the champion of an oppressed people" (Arendt 1944: 108). Those who accepted their outsider status unconsciously and automatically met with her disparagement. She scorned the *parvenu* who attempted assimilation: "On has only to remember how zealously assimilated Jews avoid the mention of a Hebrew word before gentiles, how strenuously they pretend not to understand it if they hear one ..." (1944: 106). Arendt is equally critical of the *schlemihl* who decides to remain in the company of his kin. While the parvenu exhausts himself in the process of making himself fit to be seen in public, the *schlemihl* opts out of public life altogether.

In the intervening years since the PQ and the Liberal Party of Québec articulated their respective positions on the political status of the Québécois, and the third persona of the anglophone, some English-speaking citizens of the province have come to resemble Arendt's ideal of the conscious pariah. At no time was this more apparent than in the year following the 1995 referendum on sovereignty in the province of Québec. While anglophones had mobilized politically before this period, in response to language Bills 178, 101 and 22, John Gray writes that "[t]here had been bad times before, but seldom as bad as in the months since the NO side

emerged with a hair's-breadth victory... The No side won, but it could not stop a morbid fixation on how close the No had come to losing".[3]

According to Jane Jensen, the close results of the referendum,[4] forced anglophones "to confront their willingness to comply with a democratic decision that would leave them no longer part of the anglophone majority in Canada but simply a minority in Québec". It was a confrontation which "obviously evoked matters of identity" (1996: 46). It did so as the results demonstrated the real possibility that the PQ might succeed in fulfilling its sovereignty dream. Recalling the night of the vote, Howard Galganov, the dominant anglophone leader in the immediate post-referendum period, claimed, " 'That's it, this is finished.' We decided we'd survived this and we'll never let it happen again, ever."[5]

What one discerns in this period is that anglophones were reacting to a moment of danger. According to McGee, "[a] 'moment of danger' is eminently present in everyday life conditions. It could be the trauma of war or depression. It could be mere discomfort ..." (1984: 6). In this case, the danger was the potential alteration to

---

[3] John Gray, "Anglophones find a folk hero," Globe & Mail 4 Nov. 1996: A4. Monique Jerome-Forget, now a Liberal Member of Quebec's National Assembly made a similar argument: "The close vote left Anglo-Quebecers in a state of shock. For the first time in decades of tense debate, Québec independence actually looked achievable, perhaps even likely. The response has been a renewed preoccupation with the role the anglophone community ought to play within Québec and Canada." In "Québec's Anglos are a 'reluctant' minority," Financial Post 9 Mar. 1996: 21.
[4] 50.56% NO (2 360 714 votes), 49.44% YES (2 308 266 votes). Directeur Général des Élections du Québec, Rapport préliminaire des résultats du dépouillement des votes le soir du scrutin: Référendum du 30 octobre 1995 (Québec: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1995): 3.
[5] Hubert Bauch, "Galganov's goal is to 'isolate the bigots'," Montreal Gazette 17 Aug. 1996: A12.

Canadian sovereignty posed by Québec's sovereignty movement, and it prompted the birth of anglophone champions who attempted to " 'find an old longing' and 'help it to victory' " (McGee 1975: 240).

The year immediately following the referendum saw the "birth", to use Arendt's terminology, of a number of new leaders whose strength lay in their ability to "set something into motion", and whose authority came not from bestowed hereditary power, but rather to "the things they d[id] and sa[id] at the scene" (Arendt 1958: 222, 223). The dominant leader of the period was not an elected official, but the aforementioned Galganov, an advertising executive by occupation. Galganov took charge of defending what became known as "anglophone rights", and was a man McGee would call a Leader with a capital L, for he defined "for a moment in history the identity of a whole people" (McGee 1975: 241, footnote 27). For his actions, Galganov was labeled a 'messiah', a prophet, a 'folk hero', and a 'genuine anglo star'[6] — a standing he achieved by contesting the status attributed anglophones by the sovereignty project and the party which spearheaded it.

Specifically, Galganov enacted McGee's claim that "dormant arguments ... represent the parameters of what 'the people' of [a] culture could possibly become" (1975: 243). In this case, however, two "old longings" presented themselves: one, that the province

---

[6] Eric Trottier, "<<It's over! Plus jamais les menaces et l'intimidation," La Presse 24 Aug. 1996: A17; Gray, "Anglos find": A4; Don MacPherson, "A genuine anglo star," Montreal Gazette 27 Aug. 1996: B3.

might secede in the future without anglophones' inclusion, and two, that they did not want the province to secede at all. Thus, what emerges post-1995 referendum is a two-pronged rhetoric: one aimed at restoring English to the public face of the province so as to be included and visible in Québec's public life, and another which sought, in Galganov's words, "[t]he death of the Parti Québécois, the end of the reactionary, bigoted, exclusionary party".[7]

These disparate aims emerged from two separate constitutive spheres. Restoring English responded to anglophones' constitution intra-Québec, where their status as a linguistic minority was in question; the 'death of the PQ' emerged from their identifying with an extra-Québec constitution — the Canadian nation whose sovereignty was threatened by the PQ's sovereignty dream. Accordingly, the first challenged the actions of the Québec state, while the second contested the very composition of the Québécois as *peuple*. In other words, it sought to challenge the very existence of a Québec nation.

The significance of these rhetorical claims is the echoes they contain of the ideological effects discerned in the PQ's sovereignist discourse 20 years prior. The minority rhetoric articulated by Galganov reappropriated the political status ascribed anglophones in the PQ's 1979 White Paper, and the Canadian national rhetoric responded to the White Paper's failure to constitute anglophones as

---

[7] Howard Schneider, "Quebecer speaks out for English: Adman says language key to unity," Washington Post 4 Sept. 1996: A18.

Québécois national subjects. Equally significant, the point of his rhetoric was not to see anglophones included in the sovereignty project, and hence, make the welcome of the province "as wide as sorrow" (Arendt 1972: 90). Quite the reverse, because Québec was not yet officially sovereign, Galganov's main goal in these political initiatives was the destruction of the project that would enable the province to secede. Not only was his minority rhetoric intended to trouble the province's national equation, it was also meant to call into question the credibility of a democratically chosen and governed sovereign Québec state.

This chapter will unfold in three parts. First, we will examine the rhetoric adopted by Galganov and other spokespeople who followed his lead in the post-1995 referendum period, to demonstrate that the constitutional terms circulating in the PQ's 1979 White Paper are revisited and reappropriated to mobilize anglophones as a political minority. Second, we will assess what these rhetorical counter-measures vie to do to the nationalist project. Third, we will assess what these actions do to the state. Finally, given the interplay of power in the province, where claims are advanced depending on the identity privileged by the claimants (Jensen 1996: 43), the two goals will be shown to stem from the privileging of two constitutive sources, and thus, indicative of the ways in which two identities can function in one public sphere.

Throughout, the focus is placed on the rhetoric directed by Galganov and his followers towards the PQ. Not only was it the party in power at the time of the 1995 referendum it orchestrated, but it remains in power today. Furthermore, its tying of the national narrative to a particular (re)constitution of the state apparatus is what provokes the counter-arguments seen here. Were the Liberal Party of Québec (PLQ) to be in power, one would not see this kind of rhetoric — for it takes the existence of the Canadian state for granted. Consequently, the PLQ does not have a mandate to hold referenda on removing the province from the federation. In contrast, it is precisely because the PQ has such a mandate that Galganov's rhetoric emerges.

I   The Reassertion of the Subject

The year following the 1995 referendum saw a marked change in anglophone political activity. Previously considered moderates, many anglophones became known as "Angryphones".[8]   Galganov was central to this change in attitude. He, like Arendt's pariah, became "a rebel against [the PQ majority] — the champion of an oppressed [anglophone] people" (1944: 108); and he did so by arguing that the way that anglophones appeared in Québec and the identity they wished to animate in that state were discontinuous. In doing so,

---

[8] Sandro Contenta, "How angry man became English rights crusader." Toronto Star 24 Aug. 1996: A18.

Galganov challenged the constitutive effects of the PQ's White Paper in three ways. First, he contested the homelessness and anti-historicism ascribed anglophones by the PQ. Second, he challenged the actions of the French majority by reappropriating the minority status attributed anglophones and making use of arguments traditionally understood to emanate from minorities seeking recognition from the majority. Last, like the PQ had done in 1979, Galganov attempted to empower anglophones by attributing status.

Galganov's first rhetorical move was emblematic of Arendt's pariah: he denounced the *parvenu.* Anglophones who had kept silent about their "oppression" now met with the same disparagement voiced by Arendt's conscious pariah. Speaking to an anglophone moderate on CJAD, an anglophone radio station in Montreal, Galganov denounced him as the enemy:

> I think of you as the enemy. I think of you as a person who is willing to negotiate away my rights ... For twenty five years I have listened to ... people like Alliance Quebec, people like Greta Chambers, who have sent absolutely every wrong signal to the French community where they think, hey there is not a problem, the Anglos are the best ... treated minority in the world ...[9]

In this, he echoes the speech of the ideal pariah, as he charges "every pariah who refused to be a rebel [with being] partly responsible for his own position and therewith for the blot on mankind which it represented" (Arendt 1944: 109). One particular speech of

---

[9] CJAD, The Tommy Schnurmacher Show, 20 Aug. 1996.

Galganov's was more exemplary, however. Speaking in a Jewish synagogue, he explained his determination to fight the PQ:

> [He] recalled that Jewish mothers are forever telling their children *schveig*, which is the Yiddish word to be quiet, to not make a fuss. But half a century ago, *schveig* led six million Jews to their deaths ... "*Schveig?* Not me. Not today. Not now. Not ever. Never."[10]

The significance of this rhetorical moment lies in the fact that Arendt's conscious pariah was first and foremost a Jew, and the national project out of which he was "born", that of Nazi Germany. While Jews are now signified as anglophones in Québec,[11] both constitutive elements of Arendt's pariah are in evidence in this rhetorical moment of Galganov's. He uses the Yiddish language associated with his audience's Jewishness, and the referent that was the ultimate symbol of their oppression as Jews. Both of these are meant to encourage them to speak out against their oppression as anglophone subjects. By equating the two political situations, in a synagogue no less, Galganov magnified the situation by exacerbating the potential repercussions of keeping silent — death — and hence, called on his audience to act. Given their prior political history, it is perhaps not surprising that his audience responded to this ideologically charged code with, "a moment of stunned silence and then a burst of applause".[12]

---

[10] Gray, "Anglos find": A4.
[11] Spector, "Cultures warring": D3.

Both of these rhetorical moments work to motivate anglophones to act and rebel against the PQ. From this, Galganov's first target becomes the party's national history. As noted in Chapter Two, the PQ all but erased the anglophones who lived in the province at the time. Twenty years later, we now see Galganov attempt to restore his, and other anglophones', sense of home in the province. He does so by contesting anglophones' exclusion and calling attention to their residency.

The outgrowth of this new focus on 'being at home in Québec' and restoring that home publicly, is the claim that English-speakers have been made invisible by language laws and the constitution of the Franco-Québécois. One sees the sedimentation of the scapegoating effect of the constitutive rhetoric of the *peuple* Québécois through calls that anglophones leave the province, or die, expressed in spray-painted slogans across Montréal, where the majority of the province's anglophones live. Among others, they say "Anglo go home" and "Get out of our Country".[13] These echo the argument inherent to the White Paper, wherein anglophones are portrayed as living elsewhere,

---

[12] Gray, "Anglos find": A4. Significantly, numerous members of Montreal's Jewish community objected to Galganov's comparing anglophones' status in Québec to that of Jews in Nazi Germany. In one instance, Jack Jedwab, executive director of the Quebec branch of the Canadian Jewish Congress responded with, "If you're going to use ... analogies, please don't diminish what happened in the Holocaust. I really, really disrespect that. I think it's an insult to Holocaust survivors. I think you should be ashamed of yourself." In Joel Goldenberg, "Galganov, Jedwab battle over citizenship week," Suburban 12 Nov. 1997: A24.
[13] See photos of spray-painted slogans in Robert Lecker, "The Writing's on the Wall," Saturday Night Magazine Jul.-Aug. 1996: 16-24. One also features a hangman, with an arrow pointing to it with the word "Anglo". It has been crossed out, however.

outside the province. Galganov and his followers, however, now challenge this by asking, "but where was home if it wasn't the place you lived in?"[14]

It is a negotiation of place which bears similarity to that expressed by Ien Ang when trying to come to terms with her own nationality. She writes that, during her early youth, in Indonesia,

> I was first yelled at, "Why don't you go back to your own country?" — a remark all to familiar to members of immigrant minorities anywhere in the world. Trouble was, to my best knowledge as a young girl, Indonesia *was* my own country. (1994: 9)

The reason Ang saw Indonesia as "her own country" — in spite of her being Chinese by ethnicity — stemmed from civic lessons, which provided an arena for "the discourses and rituals of Indonesian nationalism" and the singing of the national anthem. Both of these made her feel "intensely and proudly Indonesian" (1994: 9). Paradoxically, anglophones cannot rely on such instilling of national sentiment to explain the rise of their own. The teachings of history in the province's English school system taught them a different one altogether from that instructed in the French school system. To give but one example, while French schoolbooks put enormous emphasis on the British conquest of 1763, English texts give it but a cursory mention. A 1941 elementary school Canadian history book, 472 pages in length, summarizes the British conquest of North America in three brief paragraphs:

As time went on, these neighbours [French and English

---

[14] Lecker, "The Writing": 24.

colonists] were continually quarreling. Sometimes the quarrel was about the fur trade with the Indians; often they quarreled because their kings far across the sea were at war.
Finally came the long Seven Years' War, which in Canada ... ended with Wolfe's great victory on the Plains of Abraham ... When Canada passed from French to English hand no great change took place in the lives of the majority of the people. (Dickey 1941: 214)[15]

From these distinct histories and lack of inclusion in Québec's "national" commemorations emerges a different response than that articulated by Ang, whose national identity has sources she can pinpoint. As the two linguistic groups do not share the province's history and national symbols, Galganov expresses his sense of place in Québec in murkier fashion. Such is the case with his statement that: "J'aime ma province, j'aime ma ville, et je n'ai aucune autre raison de demeurer ici que le fait que j'aime demeurer ici".[16] In the same interview, he asserts that:

> Je vais au théâtre Saint-Denis, j'applaudis le Canadien, je mange de la poutine, j'écoute Céline Dion dans les deux langues, je lis La Presse. Je lis aussi Le Devoir ... Mais les séparatistes me font sentir de moins en moins chez moi ici.[17]

The actions related in this citation can be understood to demonstrate that Galganov, as an anglophone, is able to overcome the cultural and linguistic divide said to separate him from French-speakers. While he does not claim to support historic provincial symbols like former French President Charles de Gaulle (who publicly asserted "Vive le

---

[15] Thanks to Doreen Preville for her elementary school textbook. "Authorized by the Catholic Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, Québec. September 1941." This was the textbook used at St. Domenic's Girls' Academy in Montreal.
[16] Jean Dion, "Les insolences d'un Galganov." Le Devoir 13 Nov. 1996: A2.
[17] Ibid.

Québec libre"), or the celebration of St. Jean Baptiste (Québec's "national" holiday), Galganov still cites participation in common referents of Québécois life — though on a more popular level. Indeed, Benedict Anderson suggests that reading the same newspapers produces a sense of shared community through the "extraordinary mass ceremony: the almost precisely simultaneous consumption ... of the newspaper as fiction (1991: 35). Accordingly, Galganov's reading of Québec's French newspapers, La Presse and Le Devoir, allows him to say that he participates with the province's francophones in the "mass ceremony". He furthers this participation by citing his listening to Céline Dion[18], Québec's greatest pop star, his attending Québécois theatrical productions; his eating poutine, a dish that Quebecers are renowned for; and his applauding the Canadiens, a reference to Montréal's hockey team. Thus, with this statement Galganov suggests that, even though his primary language is English, he still shares the French language and culture of the province.

From this foundation, Galganov, like Arendt before him, moves to claim that the only thing threatening his full participation is the province's historical-political destiny. He asserts that the PQ's sovereignty project consists of an explicit exclusion — one which

---

[18] Céline Dion's "true" national identity was the topic of some debate in the House of Commons in the spring of 1999. Bloc Québécois Member of Parliament Suzanne Tremblay claimed that "Céline Dion has become an American or universal performer... In her soul, she is neither a Quebecer nor a Canadian. Her songs reflect nothing of what Quebecers experience." Terrance Wills, "The politics of culture. Is Céline Dion a Quebec performer? Commons committee needs to know." Montreal Gazette 3 Apr. 1999: B1. Dion has received both the Order of Canada and the National Order of Québec, and always refuses to answer any questions regarding her political leanings.

takes place despite his ability to integrate and participate in Québec's culture and language: "[Les séparatistes] nous excluent depuis 20 ans," he claims.[19] Thus, one witnesses Galganov and his followers calling on the PQ to rewrite the history articulated by the nationalist project to include them — not simply as citizens of the province but, crucially, as positive contributors to its development. It is a call that reoccurs in the years post-1980 referendum. In one case, following the passing of Bill 178 in 1988, which employed the notwithstanding clause to override the Canadian Supreme Court decision regarding the unconstitutionality of Bill 101's banning of bilingual signs, a number of anglophones signed an open-declaration, in which they stated:

> Québec is our home. We, all of us who sign this statement, are residents of this province. Some of us are from families who have lived here for generations, some of us have come to Québec in our lifetime. We all want our children to be able to find their homes in Québec, and to be an integral part of the future of Québec.[20]

Later in the document they wrote, "The anglophone minority has founded schools, hospitals and universities. These serve all segments of the population and have made a great contribution to Québec life".[21]

---

[19] Jean Dion, "Galganov n'a pas vraiment abandonné," Le Devoir 10 Jan. 1997: A3.
[20] -----. " 'We are also Quebecers ....' " Montreal Star 23 Apr. 1977: D2.

Post-1995 referendum, we again see claims establishing anglophones' historical roots to the province. According to one anglophone, "When you say 'Anglo go home, English get out of my country', that's evil, especially since the English have been here (in Quebec) since 1759".[22] With this claim, the speaker demonstrates that English-speakers have lived in the province for over two hundred years, thus implying that they have real bonds to the territory. Moreover, by suggesting that anglophones' residency in Québec began in 1759, he undermines the White Paper's claim that francophone Quebecers were the only subjects residing in the province in 1760, at which point they argue that they already formed a society (PQ 1979: 3). By this account, anglophones reclaim their right to share the territory of Québec, and undermine the White Paper's account that the British conquered Canada by stressing presidency.

In articulating these claims, Galganov and his followers hope to reinscribe anglophones as equal and positive actors in the province's history, which is a way of rendering themselves visible within the national narrative. It is also a way of restoring the trans-historicism denied anglophones by the White Paper's historical narrative which

---

[21] Ibid. Significantly, the notwithstanding clause was invoked by Robert Bourassa, whose Liberal Party of Québec was the governing party at the time. Previously seen to be an ally on the issue of English rights, whether anglophones could rely on the party in the future was seriously called into question. As Reed Scowen, then-President of Alliance of Québec asserted, the invocation of the clause, prompted "a population that had traditionally had no 'collective identity to speak of,' now due to force of circumstances, ... [became] a 'minority' ". Cited in Ronald Rudin, "English-Speaking Québec: the Emergence of a Disillusioned Minority," in Alain Gagnon, Québec, State and Society, 3rd edition (Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada, 1993): 347.
[22] Luann Lasalle, "Even graffiti becoming part of Quebec's language debate," Montreal Gazette 12 Sept. 1996: A12.

portrays them as an aberration in the nation's history. Galganov contributes to this by claiming that: "pendant 250 ans, nous avons vécu ensemble comme égaux et amis. Il y a eu des injustices des deux côtés. Mais nous n'avons jamais eu une sitation où on se détestait".[23] In this, Galganov can be seen to restore the fraternity between "brothers" removed by the White Paper in its exacerbation of the conflict between the two language groups. Contra the White Paper, which pits the two linguistic groups against one another as enemies, Galganov glosses over the inequalities and battles to portray French-English relations as more of a family squabble, pointing out to the listener that, "we have lived together as friends for 250 years".[24]

Having restored the fraternity between the two linguistic groups, the challengers move to argue for full inclusion in the state. In order for this to happen, they claim that changes must be made to language laws and practices. Anglophones' difference is based on their spoken language, hence they are what Arendt calls an "audible minority" (1959: 47). But, while Arendt contends that "audibility is a temporary phenomenon, rarely persisting beyond one generation" (1959: 47), Québec's anglophones have maintained their audible distinction throughout the course of Québec's history, even while many of them have become bilingual. What this means is that they do

---

[23] Dion, "Les insolences": A2.
[24] Another instance of this occurs in a speech given by Galganov in New York City. He claimed that the PQ "cannot destroy the bonds that have been forged between our communities in blood and spirit for over two hundred and fifty years. The blood of Natives. French speaking. English speaking and immigrant Canadians who have together created Canada." "Speech to Algonquin Hotel." New York City. 12 Sept. 1996.

not appear as anglophones in public until they open their mouths to speak. Furthermore, because their identity as political subjects in the province involves a spoken language, not seeing themselves in the state leads to calls for reinscribing English onto its physiology, as it were.

Indeed, two decades after the PQ and LPQ narrated their versions of Québécois history one sees their sedimentary effects, for instance, in the status given the English language on the public face of the province. If English is to be seen on signs, French is to predominate (at twice the size). Moreover, even though stores are allowed to post English signs, thanks to Bill 86, passed in 1993, many stores have not done so. The act of maintaining French-only signs, even while entitled to do otherwise, will prompt Galganov to claim that, "Merchants are either willingly or unwillingly aiding in the destruction of the non-francophone culture in Québec. This is unacceptable".[25]

We see in this example the tangible effects of a discourse: the ways in which a story, once told, can affect practices and instill behavioural patterns, where "the rules of the game" are "quite literally, *incorporated*, made into a second nature, constituted as a prevailing *doxa*" (Butler 1997: 154). Meanwhile, Galganov and his followers now ask that the *doxa* be changed. Anthony Housefather, a

---

[25] William Johnson, "Anglo-Quebecers finally speak up over French-only signs," Financial Post 26 Jul. 1996: 11.

city councilor for the Town of Hampstead, does so in an op-ed piece for the *Globe and Mail*:

> [U]ntil the referendum the English speaking community was complacent. We walked into the Fairview Shopping Centre and the Cavendish Mall, into stores where more than 80 per cent of the shoppers were English-speaking, and accepted unilingual French signs.
> But no longer. We want respect in the places where we spend our money. *We want to be visible again.*[26]

The use of 'again' is important to these rhetorical demands for reassertion as they are intended to "remind" us that anglophones were once visible political actors, and underscore the claimants' arguments that they, and their language, have been made invisible as a result of the sovereignty discourse. Galganov furthers this perception that English has disappeared by "remembering" the days when Montréal was an English city. He "remember[s] when Rue St. Jacques was St. James St., ... when Rue St. Catherine was just St. Catherine, ... when Montréal used to have a street named Dorchester. Now it's named after a [s]eparatist" (1998: 200).

The call to restore English to the public face of the province, and especially to commercial signs, equally exemplifies the action the conscious pariah should undertake. Having been denied a place of appearance, he must "focus attention on the unacceptable invasion of politics into his private life" (Ring 1991: 442). And the idea of a shopping mall being a public space would be a contentious claim for Arendt:

---

[26] Anthony Housefather, "Where are the bilingual signs in Montreal's stores?" <u>Globe & Mail</u> 5 Aug. 1996: A15. Emphasis added.

> Shopping malls are not public spaces in Arendtian terms because nothing truly public has ever transpired at a shopping mall. Side by side, but not collectively, people there purchase consumer items for their private dwellings and their private bodily needs. (1991: 439)

Accordingly, the method adopted by Galganov to restore English to these sites was equally emblematic of the pariah: he encouraged public protests.[27] In doing so, participating anglophones enabled the private claim to become public — as the group protesting did so collectively, rather than individually. While this may at first appear to contradict Arendt's conception of the existence of the mall as a private space, this action too is exemplary of that which the conscious pariah must undertake, for "conscious pariahdom invites the mingling of public and private concerns" (Ring 1991: 441).

Inequality and Marginalization: Enabling political action

Having contested the ways in which anglophones appear in Québec by restoring the fraternity between the two linguistic groups and making public demonstrations to render themselves visible actors in the state, Galganov and his supporters move to challenge the second effect of the White Paper's constitutive rhetoric — its constraining their action. In this regard, they play on the minority status attributed anglophone subjects by the PQ. In essence, the claimants now say to the

---

[27] 2,500 anglophones showed up to protest the lack of English signage Fairview Pointe Claire. Karen Seidman, "2,500 rally for bilingual store signs," Montreal Gazette 19 Apr. 1996: A1.

- 86 -

francophone majority: "fine, you claim that I'm a minority, well then, I'll act like one", and in doing so, appropriate the rhetoric and demands traditionally associated with minority cultures seeking rights and recognition in the public sphere. In this, we see the challengers echoing Stuart Hall's subject transformation, whereby they take the negative factor and rearticulate it in a new way (1991: 54).

Galganov does so in an interview with the *Toronto Star* in the summer of 1996, when at the height of his popularity. Asked to explain the goal of setting up his political group, the Québec Political Action Committee (QPAQ), Galganov responded with:

> Our strategy was to confront separatists where they live and breathe and to demonstrate in the most meaningful possible way that because [anglophones are] a minority, it doesn't mean that we don't have strength.[28]

In this declaration, Galganov redefines the terms of the debate — he adopts the status attributed to anglophones, and articulates it as an empowered position. Putting "minority" and "strength" in the same sentence resignifies what it means to be a minority and challenges the conception of "minority" as being a weak political position. And by uttering it, Galganov's statement endowed the group with strength. As Iris Marion Young points out, "[w]hen the assertion of group identity is a self-conscious project of cultural creation and resistance, it can be positive and empowering" (Young 1997: 391).[29]

---

[28] Contenta, "How angry man": A18.

Given today's political climate, where the protection of minorities has taken on heightened significance, even calling oneself a minority sets an ideological system in motion. Which is to say that, "a number of ideologically charged connotational codes could be set in motion by the mere mention of a word" (Hebdige 1981: 213). Indeed, as Charles Taylor has argued, in today's political sphere, "what is to be avoided at all costs is the existence of 'first class' and 'second-class' citizens" (1994: 37). While in this case the "second-class" citizens he was referring to were francophone Quebecers, Galganov and others now adopt the same argument to articulate their political status within Québec.

As other disenfranchised groups have done before them, the American civil rights movement and Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) among them, anglophone challengers argue that English-speakers are second-class citizens in Québec. Galganov paid for an advertisement which asserted: "English is not a dirty word ... We are not second-class citizens...".[30] William Johnson, when still a columnist for the *Montreal Gazette*, also made a detailed argument for the subservience of English to French:

---

[29] In this paper, Iris Marion Young makes reference to Québécois as a categorization, but goes on to say that, as a category, "it founder[s] as soon as [someone] tries to define it." Later, she writes, "Many French people deny the existence of a French identity and will claim that being French is nothing particularly important to their personal identities; indeed, many of these would be likely to say that the search for French identity that constitutes the personal identities of individual French men and women is a dangerous form of nationalism." This secondary reference refers to the Québécois, despite Young's use of the signifier French, and she offers no supporting evidence to back up her generalization regarding what French men and women might think of Québec's nationalism (1991: 387).

[30] Johnson, "Anglo Quebecers finally": 11.

The law on signs is symbolic: it projects the intent of the PQ government to reconstruct the society so that English, if it exists at all, is kept in a state of subservience, is gradually reduced, and can be made to disappear altogether at the pleasure of the Québec government.[31]

Adopting the stance that anglophones are second-class citizens means using an ideological code that immediately calls attention to anglophones as political subjects and contributes further to overcoming their invisibility in the state. Given the currency of power relationships in liberal theory, claiming second-class status in a province that attests to be democratic immediately calls attention to the actions of the majority, and the "sufferings" of the minority.

That said, Yves Chauvin de Callières writes, in "La problème des minorités," that "une communauté cohérente et statistiquement minoritaire ne devienne une minorité que si elle a conscience de l'être" (1980:158). In fact, that conscience is dialectical, for it depends on the majority treating it as such for it to materialize. Moreover, one needs do more than simply call oneself a minority to be one; certain arguments are endemic to being recognized as such. From his perspective, these are two-fold: one involves asserting economic and social oppression, the other, the overriding of human and collective rights (1980: 154).

---

[31] William Johnson, "Time to stand and fight on language: PQ seeks to ghettoize English," Montreal Gazette 22 Nov. 1996: B3. Johnson is now President of Alliance Quebec, the federally funded body which is to defend the interests of the English-speaking minority in Quebec, and those of minorities outside the province.

As though taking cues from de Callières's treatment of minority rights claims, each of these challenges is apparent in Galganov's post-1995 referendum discourse. He argues that the secondary status given the English language in Québec contravenes his human rights and affects his economic potential:

> Dire à un homme d'affaires qu'il ne peut pas afficher dans une certaine langue, ... c'est restreindre le commerce. Dire aux publicitaires qu'ils ne peuvent pas s'addresser à une clientèle eventuelle dans sa propre langue est une pratique aussi mauvaise sur le plan économique que sur le plan des droits humains.[32]

And he proclaims the treatment of anglophones to be racist, that the PQ is 'ethnocentric', endorses 'fascist' ideals of 'racial purity' and 'linguistic dominance':

> linguistic and racial subordination characterizes its treatment of minorities who are persistently treated as *les autres*, as second-class citizens who are hampering the status of French and stalling the separatist agenda.[33]

More than attributing racism to the PQ's actions, the speakers also cite comments made by its members that they then argue support this perception, such as "Ethnic Quebecers shouldn't vote" and former-Premier Jacques Parizeau's blaming the 1995 loss of the sovereignty option on "money and the ethnic vote". They further point to specific government policies which they claim equally supports the image rendered by these statements, such as the proposal to dramatically reduce the number of immigrants accepted

---

[32] François Norman, "Galganov veut que Bouchard declare que tous les Québécois sont égaux," Le Devoir 24 & 25 Aug. 1996: A5.
[33] Joel Goldenberg, "Howard 'Galganizes' audience of 700 in West Island," Suburban 29 Aug. 1996: A9.

into the province and the closure of four hospitals serving mostly English and other minority communities in Montréal. Both of these initiatives were effected shortly after the referendum and are said to further support the PQ's ethnocentric position.[34] To these, Galganov adds,

> Quand moins de 1% des non-francophones sont embauchés par la fonction publique du Québec, c'est du racisme. Quand à peine 2% des effectifs de la Ville de Montréal, pour 45% de la population, sont non-francophones, c'est aussi du racisme.[35]

Thus not only words, but also policy decisions enacted the government, are said to confirm the claimants assertions that the PQ is a discriminatory party.

By claiming human rights violations Galganov, and those sharing his position, take on the rhetorical stance of those who claim oppression at the hand of the majority. Like the proponents of the ERA, their cause becomes a "struggle of justice and equality against tyranny and oppression ... [and is thus] aligned with notions of justice and equality — democratic ideals..." (Foss 1979: 278). In other words they make use of a strain of argument emblematic of those associated with minority rights talk. One notes, for instance, an uncanny similarity between Galganov's rhetorical arguments and those used by the leaders of the civil rights movement. There are distinct echoes of the "Black Power" phase. Like the leaders of the civil rights movement, Galganov claims that the reason for the denial of

---

[34] Lecker, "The Writing": 20, 22.
[35] Dion, "Les insolences": A2.

anglophone rights is "racist, and the true issue of the crisis becomes a racist moral issue", the justification of the denial "therefore illegitimate" (Burgess 1968: 126). Accordingly, Galganov's claims contain the argument that the anglophone is viewed as substance, and that "the culture segregates him on this basis, drawing procedural and organizational lines around him — lines he seldom can cross" (Burgess 1968: 130). It suggests that "since [anglophones] must certainly be considered 'citizens' then the only ground on which the denial could be based is that these 'citizens' are [anglophones]" (Burgess 1968: 126).

Significantly, Galganov mimics the civil rights movement even further by appropriating Rosa Parks, the woman who refused to give up her seat on the bus, and sparked a boycott of the bus line. As Parks became the symbol of blacks' oppression in the United States, she comes to stand for anglophones' oppression in Québec and the symbol mobilizing anglophones to act. To achieve this, Galganov equated anglophones' political reality in Québec to that of Parks':

> When Rosa Parks refused to get to the back of the bus, the black civil rights movement didn't negotiate for her to win a seat in the middle of the bus; they fought with all they had; they gave of their hearts, blood and soul for her and every other citizen in America, regardless of color to have the same rights to sit anywhere they wanted on the bus.[36]

---

[36] Howard Galganov, "Rights group has drawn line in the sand," Montreal Gazette 15 Aug. 1996, B2. This portrayal of anglophones as analogous to the black civil rights movement has been contested by John MacArthur, the publisher of the US based Harper's Magazine. "An English-speaking minority in Québec saying it's oppressed is not going to play very well in a country that's still trying to overcome the civil war and slavery and the oppression of black people." Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, The National, 12 Sep. 1996.

He further made use of her to encourage boycotts of stores that did not post English signs. Speaking to a crowd in front of Fairview Mall in the West Island, he proclaimed: "Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat [and sparked the U.S. civil rights movement]. ... That's what this is all about. ... You can't negotiate over rights."[37]

Significantly, whereas the boycott of the bus company sparked by Parks's experience closed down the operation altogether, the boycotts Galganov spearheaded succeeded at returning the English language to signs in retail stores in the West Island. Hence, on a symbolic level, these spaces were opened up for everyone's use. "The revocation of the ban and now the posting of English signs," wrote *Gazette* Editor-in-Chief Joan Fraser at the time, "are, on an important symbolic level, a recognition that anglophones are legitimate citizens here".[38] Thus, not only was English made visible in these sites but, equally significant, such actions, on their own, conferred visibility on the actors. A decidedly militant strategy, boycotts, according to Herbert W. Simons, "confer visibility on the movement; [whereas] moderate tactics gain entry into decision centers" (1970: 8). Thus, in this too, we see the conscious pariah at work.

---

[37] Schneider, "Quebecer speaks out": A18.
[38] Joan Fraser, "Time for hard compromises," <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 10 Aug. 1996: B5.

II   Minority Identification:
Undermining the credibility of a democratic Québec state

We have seen Galganov move from proclaiming anglophones' visibility to adopting political action meant to challenge the actions of the French majority. In this, Galganov seeks to restore anglophones' lost power. As such, Galganov is exemplary of Hall's theory that, "the only game in town worth playing is the game of cultural 'wars of position' " (1993: 107). The attempt at cultural repositioning is furthered in the third stage, where Galganov attempts to rebuild / reclaim anglophones' political status within the province.   Here, he marginalizes the centre — in this case the PQ as governing party — with the hope of undermining its power base to establish his own position of power.

Here again, we see echoes of the precedents set by earlier movements like the ERA, as "members of the opposition [are portrayed as] tyrannical monsters who consciously and deliberately turn their backs on [anglophones and their rights]" (Foss 1979: 279). Galganov depicts members and leaders of the PQ as monsters of an odious nature, by referring them alternatively as "racists", "fascists", "tribalists", and "bastards".   Each label carries its own ideological code with it: to be "racist" reminds one of the white majority against whom the civil rights movement was waged, while to be a "fascist" immediately calls Nazi Germany to mind.   Both cases being the historical situations to which Galganov equates anglophones' current

political position and oppression in the province of Québec. Meanwhile, "tribalists" and "bastards" are names ascribed people who are considered utterly uncivilized. Thus, the binary opposition contained in the White Paper is inverted and Galganov makes sovereignists out to be the primitive "Other".

> This transformation by insult is meant to marginalize the party: Insult is the subversion of one's status and it works by identifying one with the signs of marginality. ... In every case the insult reveals the expectations of the social order, often with more economy and force than any positive declaration. In fact, by locating marginal behavior by insult, the social order receives implicit justification: it is superior to what is scorned. (Hariman 1986: 44)

This process of subversion is political, for "the argument over status is important to the arguers: they are competing for the powers of argument, the powers that they then can transfer to their own thinking" (Hariman 1986: 45). Galganov wishes to regain political power through this process, which can, however, only be granted at the expense of the PQ's own. As Hall contends, "[c]ultural hegemony is never about pure victory or pure domination; it is never a zero-sum cultural game; it is always about shifting the balance of power in the relations of culture" (1993: 106-7).

Indeed, Galganov's words on the subject are telling: "It's not about language," he says, "... and it has never really been. It's about control, power..." (1998: 128). But what precisely does he wish to do with that power? According to Michael Walzer, when people who are already citizens protest against exclusion, the goal is a redistribution and redeployment of power. Specifically, this power is

not redistributed simply for possession and enjoyment, but also use, "to open all other spheres to these same hitherto excluded men and women" (1993: 63). It would be tempting to view Galganov in this light, given his recreation of arguments traditionally associated with actors seeking such inclusion. Like those before him, he has called for inclusion in the nation's history; focused on the majority overriding his civil and human rights; and used boycotts to publicize his cause as he claims disenfranchisement from the halls of power. Yet, having portrayed anglophones as being a typical minority through making claims to oppression, and calling the majority "tyrannical" and "undemocratic", it would be erroneous to think that Galganov's end goal is the widening of the sovereignty project within the province of Québec; for it is not. While each argument is aimed at restoring the political power denied anglophones in the White Paper's attempt to majoritize the provinces' francophones, the power shift Galganov seeks is that which would allow him, and others like him, to define the basis, rationale, and constitutive elements of the Québécois sovereignty discourse. In other words, the power he hopes to abrogate is that which constituted the Québécois as a sovereign national subject in the first place.

Ultimately, Galganov's minority rhetoric is aimed at gaining the power to define the terms of the debate over Québec's membership and status in the Canadian confederation. To this end, he contests the very existence of Québec as nation: "Have I missed something? Is Quebec now a nation? What happened ... that made Quebec a

nation?" (1998: 172). This is where the rights movement diverges sharply from those before it, as the goal is not the widening of the franchise within the province, but the destruction of the sovereignty project which created the crisis in which anglophones currently find themselves. As Don MacPherson explains:

> ... the real objective of Galganov's campaign isn't more English on signs, it's to prevent another referendum on sovereignty. And the campaign's real targets aren't the sign law, but Bouchard, his government and his party. Galganov hopes to distract and destabilize the government...[39]

Hence, when it comes to the second *inter-est* driving Galganov's use of minority rhetoric, the challenge undertaken is really that witnessed by the opponents to such rights movements. As Sonja K. Foss explained in her analysis of the rhetoric used by opponents to the ERA, they argued against it based on its threat to the nation. As such, they worked "to defend an old superior tradition and tr[ied] to prevent the disastrous consequences that would result should this tradition be disregarded" (Foss 1979: 284).

For Galganov, the superior tradition is the Canadian constitution, rather than the Québec one. Hence, like opponents to the ERA, "the battle against [the PQ's oppressive policies] is not simply a battle [to save English], but is instead a crucial battle in the war to save a great nation that is wavering on the brink of destruction" (Foss 1979: 284). In this regard, Galganov argues, "The future of the country pivots on

---

[39] Don MacPherson, "Convenient bogeyman: Galganov may not get results he wants." Montreal Gazette Aug. 14 1996: B3.

our success or failure. I win, the country stays together"[40] Since the nation he reveres is not Québec but Canada, his minority rhetoric within the province seeks to challenge the sovereignty project in three ways. First, because it is not yet sovereign, it aims to undermine the PQ's claim to achieving sovereignty through democratic means; second, to challenge the homogeneity of the sovereignty discourse; and last, restore the primacy of subject constitution and power to the Canadian nation-state.

First, Galganov challenges the sovereignty project at the level of state representation by asking that:

> ... the premier of Québec ... come out and show his colors as being a true separatist and the hell with everyone else in this province, or to state unequivocally that he's the premier of all Quebecers, regardless of their language and their race or their culture.[41]

The very act of asking for such public recognition suggests that the inclusion and representation of anglophones at the state level needs to be affirmed — it is not to be assumed de facto. As a result, he undermines the PQ's claim, as inferred by Article One, to propose a project that includes all Quebecers. Meanwhile, a year later, Galganov will proclaim that the premier has failed to acknowledge that he governs all Quebecers: "[t]he premier of Québec has refused to publicly declare that Québec is an inclusive society where all citizens are equal"[42]

---

[40] Schneider, "Quebecer speaks out": A18.
[41] Joel Goldenberg, "Galganov, Jedwab": A24.

Galganov equally contests the PQ's claim to uphold democratic values by making reference to the undemocratic practices which occurred in the 1995 referendum itself — the final arbiter of whether Québec shall remain part of Canada or separate from it. He claims "[t]here were at least 800,000 destroyed ballots and voter fraud that would be the envy of any third world nation, plus a referendum law that prohibited freedom of speech".[43] By attributing fraudulence to the 1995 referendum outcome, Galganov undermines the virtual success of the sovereignty project. While the YES vote was only narrowly defeated according to ballot box numbers, to argue that 800,000 more NO votes should have been included in the tally depicts the split between YES and NO as being much greater.

In making this argument, Galganov equally contests the PQ's claim to achieving sovereignty through democratic means. This challenge has significant ramifications given the importance Québec places on its claim to democratically achieving separation from Canada. Indeed, Stéphane Dion has written that the Québec secession movement is "the most documented and also a crucial [case], as [it is] the most likely to lead to a democratic state breakup

---

[42] Ibid. In fact, Bouchard did publicly assert that he was the premier of all Quebecers: "both my government and I are responsible for each and every Quebecker, regardless of his or her language, religion, origin, color or belief." "Living Together Before, During and After the Referendum." Speech to Centaur Theatre, Montreal, 11 Mar. 1996. Yet, Michael Hamelin, when president of Alliance Quebec asserted: "On the one hand, Bouchard talks of inclusion. He has made all sorts of interesting overtures to the community, all of which have been contradicted. ... What we are really left with is a situation where the frustration in the community is strong." Schneider, "Quebecer speaks out": A18.

[43] Ibid. This may be read as inferring that all anglophone ballots were destroyed, as the number of anglophones usually said to reside in the province is 800,000.

in the near future" (1994: 270-71). More than this, to claim that the sovereignist party endorses undemocratic practices in advance of a future referendum also has consequences on a YES vote's being recognized, as Québec's potential sovereign status must be recognized by already sovereign states upon a successful YES vote.

Hence, to highlight the party's undemocratic acts immediately calls into question its legitimate right of secession, and by claiming that the PQ is undemocratic, Galganov immediately calls attention to the party's practices. Young argues that the relationships that most matter in political theory are those which are structured along hierarchical or unequal lines, where "hierarchical social structures denote differential relations of power, resource allocation, and normative hegemony" (1997: 389-90). These are especially provocative in democratic societies which "profess[] a fundamental moral commitment to the freedom of self-determination (liberty, equality before the law, equality of opportunity) without which it is not democratic" (Burgess 1968:124).

Thus, to call attention to inequality, undemocratic practices and unfairness cuts to the very core of a society's true sense of self. Indeed, there is more at stake for Galganov than questioning the PQ's democratic practices. His rhetoric of inequality, racism and oppression vies to change Quebecers' minds about their governing party, their sovereignty project, and the linguistic laws he claims are its outgrowth. In his words, he wants to "attirer l'attention des Québécois francophones sur le caractère injuste et ridicule d'une loi

[linguistique] qui crée deux catégories de citoyens".[44] Hence. it becomes an issue of "disarticulating" the consensual bloc (Bhabha 1990b: 221). Galganov articulates this in part by highlighting policies which, he claims, most Québécois, as "good citizens". would not support. Galganov claims, "Most Quebecers are not Racists." on a poster entitled "Wall of Shame" which featured photos of the graffiti cited at the outset of this chapter.

In doing so. Galganov equally contests the national history's genealogy of origin and its claim to homogeneity by forcing recognition of "Others" within the same territory in the form of, in Homi Bhabha's words, a supplementary question.

> It is a question that is supplementary to what is put down on the order paper but by being 'after' the original, or in 'addition to' it, gives the advantage of introducing a sense of 'secondariness' or belatedness into the structure of the original. (1990: 305)

According to Bhabha. the supplementary question "may disturb the calculation" of the first. Its force lies in its ability to renegotiate terms of reference. like history. which the first rhetorical argument directed to reclaiming anglophones' right of home and historical contribution to the province clearly seeks to do. Galganov pushes this rhetorical challenge further by repeatedly contesting the sovereignty project's claim to homogeneity: In one instance. he claims that the PQ government is mounting "a relentless drive towards ethnocentric

---

[44] Dion. "Les insolences": A2.

nationalism".[45] In another, he argues, "[t]he only issue that can bind and keep the PQ together is ethnic nationalism, and the glue of ethnic nationalism is the language...".[46] Thus, by proclaiming the existence of "Other" citizens who do not speak French in the province, he hopes to undermine the project's claim to represent all Québécois, by making it clear that the concept of Québécois, as defined by the sovereignty project, doesn't include English-speakers.

By showing up the "true" nature of the sovereignty project as endorsed by the PQ, Galganov hopes, not to bring more people into the nationalism fold, but rather, to distance those within it from their constitutive source. In other words, he seeks to make Quebecers *not* see themselves in the sovereignty project outlined by the party, because as good and just citizens, a racist policy would be abhorrent to them. This consists of a complete reversal of Bhabha's argument that the supplementary question *adds* to the original equation (1990b: 311); for what Galganov envisions is a *subtraction* from the original equation. More than that, the goal is outright division.

Finally, Galganov attempts to contest the very power accorded French subjects by the sovereignty discourse by taking part in francophone protests outside the province, where the reverse political hierarchy exists. In the fall of 1996 he, along with 150 francophones, protested the lack of bilingual commercial signs in

---

[45] Barbara Yaffe, "Montreal anglophone leading fight to keep Quebec in Canada" <u>Vancouver Sun</u> 12 Sept. 1996: A3.
[46] Bauch, "Galganov's goal": A12.

Canada's capital city. He explained, "Je ne peux pas être hypocrite en demandant de l'anglais à Montréal et en disant de l'autre part que les Canadiens dans d'autres parties du pays doivent être laissés à eux-mêmes".[47] Participating in this protest contained two ideological messages. The first challenged the argument put forth in the White Paper that English speakers want to keep francophones in a position of submission in the Canadian federation. The second increased the visibility of the French language in the Canadian sphere, hence making it difficult for francophones in Québec to continue claim "subjugation" by the Canadian project, and be forced to *replier* to Québec as *première patrie*.

Both of these messages contest the very foundation of the sovereignist narrative, which depicted the British as harsh colonizers who subjected the francophones against their will. They portray Galganov as a good and just English-speaker — one who seeks the equality of "all citizens" no matter what language they speak. He articulates his virtue in a Letter to the Editor of the *Montréal Gazette*: "This has nothing to do with victory for English rights groups," he writes, "but everything to do with victory for the rights of everyone".[48] In this, Galganov blurs the boundaries between the

---

[47] Julie Richer, "Galganov défile avec les francophones d'Ottawa," Le Devoir 5 Sept. 1996: A4. Interestingly, a Federal Liberal Member of Parliament, Jean-Paul Marchand is quoted as saying, "Je trouve que c'est dans l'intérêt du Québec que la langue française soit respectée au Canada [...] parce qu'on fait partie du même parenté, d'une même famille." This statement, like Galganov's before him, is meant to restore the fraternity and familial bonds that exist between francophones and the rest of Canada.
[48] Galganov, "Rights group ...": B2.

power-granting states — Québec and Canada — so that the Québec state is not the only locus where francophones can exert power as a demographic group. If francophones outside the province can be made "equal" to English-speaking citizens, then the issue of francophones being an oppressed minority in the Canadian federation outside Québec's borders will lose its illocutionary force within the province. Equally significant, the status of Québec as the sovereign power giver for francophone subjects will also be demoted.

III   Majority Identification / Undermining the Québec Nation

What emerges from this strategy is that Galganov is not simply aiming to reassert anglophones as political actors in Québec, but (re)create a Canadian home where democratic ideals prevail. Indeed, Galganov says he wants "to recreate [a] society where everyone is equal and included; where the promotion of the French language is of everyone's concern".[49] As such, a greater goal is illustrated which goes beyond the re-establishment of English as a legitimate language in Québec to one which ultimately seeks to demote the sovereignist option based on the notion that all citizens, no matter what language they speak, are equal within the Canadian jurisdiction.

As Galganov claims membership to the Canadian nation, not the Québec nation as articulated by the PQ, sovereignists become the

---

[49] Galganov, Speech, 12 Sept. 1996.

enemy against whom anglophones as Canadian national subjects must fight, and against whom anglophones now define themselves as a virtuous people. To this end, Galganov reverses the attribution of status central to the White Paper and instead constitutes sovereignists as the negative factor that needs to be abrogated so that Canadians may see their full flourishing as political subjects. According to Galganov, "Bouchard et les autres séparatistes n'ont encore rien vu. On ne sera pas intimidés. Les séparatistes sont nos ennemis. Ils sont les ennemis les plus odieux que le pays ait jamais affrontés."[50] Thus, the "separatists" become the anti-protagonists in the Canadian nation's history. And in a further reversal of anglophones' prior constitution as scapegoats, for Galganov, the sovereignists become the internal enemy requiring eviction: "On October 30, 1995," he says, "Canada almost died. Not because we faced an enemy from abroad — but because we faced an enemy from within."[51]

When one moves outside the Québec public sphere, and takes the Canadian sphere as the source of power, the application of Walzer's argument regarding the redistribution of power and the opening of spheres to excluded men and women starts to make sense. Yet doing so has a paradoxical effect: it turns the minority rhetoric of leaders such as Galganov on its head. For what a shift in

---

[50] Mario Fontaine, "Le fédéraliste Rock Demers chauffe les oreilles de Galganov," La Presse 11 Oct. 1996: B14.
[51] Galganov, Speech, 12 Sept. 1996.

focus reveals is that his minority rhetoric inside Québec glosses over his national identification which comes from the nation outside the province. It becomes a battle over which public sphere, which nation, and which constitutive source is privileged as sovereign.

Significantly, one sees a different political language emerge when the Canadian national signification is prioritized. With Canada as the source prompting Galganov's rhetorical counter-claims, one discerns a majority rhetoric at work which is quite distinct from the minority rhetoric adopted when anglophones contest their constitution as linguistic political subjects intra-Québec. The extent to which Galganov's national identity is that of a majority subject is revealed when one re-examines his claims through the lens of the rhetorical strategies outlined by Andrew King in his survey of the rhetorical strategies used by groups whose hegemony is being threatened by new, emergent groups. He identifies three "coping mechanisms, the potential war material of a given situation", among groups who "are still actively fighting": Ridicule; crying anarchy; and setting impossible standards (1976: 128-131). These are distinguished from those used by groups who have effectively lost their position of power, "but are still tormented by the need for resignation or the hope of revenge" (1976: 128).

Ridicule, writes King, is "a weapon which strikes against an opponent's very sense of identity". Epithets such as 'Afro-engineering' are intended as "savage ridicule that attempts to undermine the new and hard-won identity of blacks" (1976: 129).

Indeed, calling sovereignists "racists", "tribalists", "fascists" and "bastards" can equally be understood as an attempt to undermine the "hard-won" identity of Quebecers by associating it with negative attributes which are not redeemed or respected by others. Hence, it works to demote their claim to cultural superiority. Moreover, King contends that ridicule "will strengthen the club spirit of the old group by flattering its weakened sense of superiority; it will cause third parties outside either group to see the emergent group as an aggregation of social clowns" (1976: 129). Galganov follows this logic when he claims "Les séparatistes deviendront, des lors, ... la risée du monde entier et la meilleur blague du pays...".[52] Claims such as these serve to empower, however falsely, those uttering the ridicule, while ensuring that others outside the power game view sovereignists as "social clowns", which means their claims can be ignored or downplayed.

Secondly, crying anarchy ups the stakes. As Galganov has a stake in the existing Canadian order, to cry anarchy is "to do more than ... brand the challengers as merely criminal and sinister. As destroyers of society they strike at everyone. They are downright devilish" (1976: 129). One sees Galganov repeatedly portray the PQ as "destroyers". In this, like the example used by King of former French President Charles de Gaulle, who claimed "France, indeed, is threatened by a dictatorship ... totalitarian communism" (1976: 129),

---

[52] Luann Lasalle, "Galganov engage la lutte finale pour sauver le Canada contre <<ces bâtards là>>," Le Devoir 9 Sep. 1996: A2.

Galganov argues that Canada is threatened by a group of "tribalist, ethnocentric nationalists". Thus, the choice to be made is between order and chaos. Galganov points to the blood-shed that will take place upon a successful YES vote:

> What happens if we come to the wall?   We're going to have a nightmare of a time, and there will be blood in the streets, there's no question...
> If there's partition there's going to be civil war. If there's separation there's going to be civil war.[53]

Hence, while the vote for Québec sovereignty may be achieved democratically, Galganov predicts that the ramifications will be far from peaceful — they will be anarchic.

Finally, the very act of calling for English to be restored as a legitimate language within the province constitutes the setting of an impossible standard. King argues that setting such standards "shuts out or intimidates the interlopers", by ensuring that their recognition hinges on attributes which they cannot possess or enact.   He cites examples of old families using "their badge of prestige" to block out new immigrants, who "need not apply" (1976: 131).   To recognize the English language on the public face of the province would undermine the very thrust of the sovereignty movement, which hinges on its need to protect the French language from assimilation. Hence, Galganov's demand is one that ties the hands of the sovereignists. On the one hand, if the PQ does not restore English to

---

[53] Timothy le Riche, "Quebecers outraged by predictions of violence: Activist foresees 'blood in the streets'," Edmonton Sun 14 Nov. 1996, online at www.edmontonsun.com, 16 Nov 1996: n.p.

the province, it will be seen as restricting minority rights, and abusing its political power. On the other, if it does allow English equal status, it would suggest that the French language is no longer threatened. Most crucially, it would destroy the PQ's sovereignty dream. Based as it is on the inequality of linguistic citizens and the inability of French and English-speakers to work together, extending equal linguistic rights to anglophones would abrogate the very dream promoted by the PQ, for it would demonstrate that both linguistic *groups can be equal and cooperative* in Québec.

Thus, when one shifts the focus to the Canadian sphere, Galganov's rhetoric can be seen to consist of the kind of communication deemed *majoritaire* by Jensen (1996: 46). Despite adopting arguments associated with minorities, the thrust behind them is a kind of "tough talk" inherent to those in a majority position. This should not however, be read as supporting Josée Legault's claim that Québec's anglophones long to return to their former status as "conquerors" and hence, have developed an ideologically charged rhetoric portraying themselves as victims, and a down-trodden minority to achieve their goal (1992: 30). Whereas Legault believes this rhetorical positioning to be fraudulent based on anglophones' identification as conquerors — a majority position — her claim is contestable on two points. One, she associates anglophones as being the sons of British conquerors (1992: 17), whereas leaders such as Galganov, who is Jewish, cannot possibly identify as the son of a conquering people, but rather, like Legault

herself might do, as the offspring of a conquered people. That said, Galganov identifies as a Canadian citizen, hence the outgrowth of his majority rhetoric. Rather than reading this as just another way of identifying with "the conquerors", this identification can be seen to stem from the sovereignist project's failure to constitute anglophones as Québécois. People are eager to affirm their identities, and the national identity granted anglophones by the White Paper itself was that of Canadian, or British, but not Québécois.

That the PQ's sovereignist discourse failed to constitute anglophones as Québécois leads to the second point of contestation. What Legault evacuates in her thesis is the existence of another public sphere outside of Québec that has an impact on that within it. Whereas Québec sovereignists have attempted to portray Québec as the only space of public appearance for the Québécois, there are, while Québec remains part of the Canadian union, in fact two spheres from which national consciousness can emerge, and in which political action can take place. Thus depending on which sphere Québec anglophones privilege as The Constitutive source, a different rhetoric takes shape: if Québec is the focus, one sees the emergence of minority rhetoric; if the Canadian jurisdiction is privileged, a majority rhetoric takes shape. Hence, the Québec case is exemplary of the fact that one can "always already" be *two* subjects simultaneously — each identification prompting a different rhetoric — where two identifications and two ideologies can work on the subject at once, and prompt two differing rhetorical strains within one public sphere.

Indeed, English-speakers are Canadian national subjects and Québec political minority subjects simultaneously: both identities attributed them by the PQ's sovereignist narrative. Thus, it is not surprising to see these two identities merge to haunt and destabilize the very discourse which constituted anglophones as disenfranchised subjects by using its constitutive terms against it. The initial goal of Galganov's claims is the restoration of the place of publicity denied anglophones by Québec's sovereignty project, which constituted anglophones as "second-class" citizens. As the sine qua non of human life, the public sphere is, according to Arendt, the place where men meet as equals to debate political issues free from constraint and self-interest (1958: 32). Constituted outside it by the province's sovereignist discourse, Galganov's only challenge could emerge from that external, or fringe position. Were he to be included in Québec's public sphere as an equal political player with a political voice, his challenge of the project from within its boundaries would carry greater illocutionary force, as his claims would be heard.

Yet, far from resolving the debate, Galganov's goal of widening of the franchise within the province is intended to give him, and others like him, a place *within* the Québécois sovereignist discourse from which to speak *against* it. This is where, ultimately, the case of Québec anglophones proves its uniqueness among studies of counter-nationalism insurgencies. It runs contra conventional theories, whereby those who are denied the 'sorrow of the commonwealth'

protest against inclusion, gain inclusion, and then, ironically, go from being a collective subject to an individual subject:

> the ... rights sought by a politically defined *group* are conferred upon depoliticized *individuals*; at the moment a particular 'we' succeeds in obtaining rights, it loses its 'we-ness' and dissolves into individuals. (Brown 1995: 98)

In these cases, the action is concluded — to use Habermasian language — the discussion ends. The crisis has been resolved, where a kind of consensus emerges. Yet, such protests from the margins as those elaborated by Bhabha, for instance, fail to account for secession movements. While the narrative of the nation is mutable, they take the existence of the state for granted.

This is not true, however, of the Québec case. And it is precisely because Québec is not a sovereign state that a third ideological goal is at work here, which takes us back to Galganov's declaration regarding his objective of "the death of the Parti Québécois, the reactionary, exclusionary party".[54] When the focus is Québec, it becomes not a question of, in Walzer's terms, "opening up spheres for use", but rather, of opening up a sphere for its eventual destruction. Thus, unlike Bhabha's hybrid subject who endorses plural identifications and "does not seek cultural supremacy or sovereignty" (1996: 58), in the case of competing subjectivities where one of the states concerned is not indisputably sovereign, battles for cultural sovereignty can and do take place. Such is the case with anglophones such as Galganov, who envision the Canadian sphere as the sovereign

---

[54] Ibid.

source of both political and national subject constitutions. Accordingly, Galganov fights for a single cultural supremacy and the opening up of a single sphere for use for anglophones and francophones alike: the Canadian sphere. "I am a citizen of Canada," he says. "[O]ne country, one flag and one citizenship".[55]

---

[55] Goldenberg, "Galganov, Jedwab": A24.

CONCLUSION

Dual Identities / Dueling Rhetorics

In October of 1996, Léger and Léger, a polling company, released a poll sounding out Quebecers' opinion of their government. It found that voting intentions for the Parti Québécois had slipped by 6.9 per cent from the previous June, while support for the Québec Liberal Party had increased by 10.5 percentage points in the same period. The poll also surveyed francophones' opinions on language in the province. An overwhelming majority of 87.1 per cent agreed that the present law regarding the status of English on signs should stay the way it was, although a majority thought the French language very threatened (54 per cent), whereas English faced no threat (80.2 per cent). Still, about 80 per cent of francophones agreed that the Québec government had an obligation to "protect the rights of the anglophone minority and to ensure that it receives services in English".[1]

At the time the poll was released, the PQ government had been in the process of establishing stricter measures regarding the use of the English language in the province.[2] Hence, the fact that the

---

[1] Don MacPherson, "Obsessed by language law. PQ hard-liners are out of touch," Montreal Gazette 9 Oct. 1996: B3.

[2] Bill 40 had been introduced to tighten the French linguistic policies and the Charter of the French language, in part, through the reestablishment of the Commission de protection de la langue française. The Commission would have the power to act on its own initiative, enter an establishment said to contravene the language laws at any "reasonable time", and examine all products, documents, etc. pertaining to the case. The Commission was known in anglophone circles as the "tongue troopers" and the "language police." Bill 40: An Act to amend the Charter of the French language (Quebec: Quebec Official Publisher, 1996): 5-9.

114

province's francophones thought the linguistic laws should remain the same was significant, as was the majority opinion that the government had an obligation to protect the English-speaking minority. These results suggest that Galganov's minority rhetoric may have been effective, at least on the people of the province — a conclusion underlined by the decrease in government support due to its "mishandling" of the language issue.[3] Moreover, that the government was actively pursuing more linguistic restrictions equally suggests that Galganov's targeting of the PQ had produced the intended effect of revealing that the hard-liners of the party were in fact invested in maintaining the hegemony of the French language to the detriment of English. It gives substantive weight to Galganov's argument that language is the element that binds the nationalist movement. Finally, the decrease in PQ support equally suggests a distancing of Québécois from the party which constituted them as sovereign in the first place; a distancing which is further underscored by the electoral results of the 1998 provincial election. While it returned the PQ to power with the majority of seats, it was the PLQ that received the greater popular support, although only by a margin of .68 per cent.[4]

Ultimately, this margin of victory was slim, not to mention totally unexpected, and francophones responding to the questions

---

[3] MacPherson, "Obsessed by language": B3.
[4] DGE Québec website: www.dge.qc.ca/information/tab_resu_officiels.html, 3 May 1999.

asked by Léger and Léger wanted the linguistic policies to remain the same. Hence, the extent of Galganov's success is limited; the most he achieved was the maintenance of the status quo. Add to this the fact that he incorrectly predicted a Parti Québécois defeat in the 1998 election[5], and the full extent of his success is truly undermined.

Indeed, in December 1996, a panel of radio personalities at CJAD, an anglophone radio station in Montréal, concluded that Galganov "didn't achieve anything".[6] Initially a success story due to his mobilization of anglophones regarding the language on signs, Galganov then proceeded to fail at two major initiatives. The trip to New York criticized by Norman Spector at the outset of this work failed because no one showed up to hear him speak. And the opening of his store, Presque Pure Laine, equally failed to incite the action Galganov had anticipated. It featured bilingual signs with English of equal size to French — in direct contravention of Bill 101. Galganov had hoped to be fined for his transgression, and intended to go to jail rather than pay it: "I'm ready to go to jail," he said. "Is Lucien Bouchard prepared to be Quebec's first premier to create a political prisoner?"[7] Galganov was not fined, however, because a clause in the language law permits any language to appear in any size on signs of a political nature.[8] As Galganov's action consisted of an explicit act of

---

[5] Galganov, "Speech to Algonquin Hotel," New York City, 12 Sep. 1996.
[6] Karen Unland, "Galganov to quit language battle," Globe & Mail 4 Jan 1997: A7.
[7] Barbara Yaffe, "Angry English movement tackles Quebec sign law," Vancouver Sun 13 Aug. 1996: A3.
[8] Philip Preville, "Civil disobedience. When is a store not a store? When it won't shut up," Mirror 5-12 Dec. 1996: 11.

civil disobedience, it was considered political. Thus, he was not fined, and accordingly, did not become the martyr he had hoped and his intention to become the rhetorical symbol of anglophones' oppression in the province was denied.

Aside from the failure of his actions to prompt the counter-measures he anticipated, Galganov's very rhetoric met roadblocks as well. In challenging the power brokers who had defined anglophone identity in advance of his claims, Galganov entered into a sphere in which he was not the only one speaking. This contrasts sharply with the original constitution of the anglophone as minority and national subject in 1979. It took place without his being spoken to directly, and succeeded precisely because anglophones were excluded from the audience and thus, could offer no direct challenge to the discourse which constituted them. In the post 1995 period, we see a different type of communication, however. In reappropriating the terms of anglophones' national and political constitution, Galganov entered into a direct conversation with the political party. But in doing so, Galganov allowed for the birth of a two-way conversation about the party's definition of material goods, Québécois identity, and the sovereign state, thus leaving himself open to (mis)interpretation. Galganov invited a response and, hence could not control the party's speech as it had anglophones' by excluding them from the 1979 audience.

Arendt contends that the public is always a site of contestation. Indeed, her very definition of public is "subject to dispute" (1968:

222). Accordingly, "judgement must come into 'contact' with others' perspectives: it cannot simply be imputed to them" (Disch 1996: 151). Thus, while the majority of this thesis has been devoted to the relationship between nationalism, its outsiders, and corresponding acts of rhetorical insurgency, what needs to be addressed is what effect Galganov's reappropriations had on the outsiders themselves. In other words, what needs to be addressed is what happens when one inverts the focus, and stands in the position of the PQ to look on at the anglophone community?

The sovereignists Galganov attacked are just as interested in defining the debate as are the anglophones he sought to politicize. Significantly, they provided a rhetorical counter-measure to his actions reminiscent of the qualities isolated by Andrew King as endemic to groups which have lost their hegemonic positions, except in this case, these are attributions of motive which come from without, and are ascribed to anglophones' actions. King isolates the golden age strategy and rebirth and revenge (1976: 132-133), and Louise Beaudoin, the minister responsible for Bill 101, will accuse Galganov of enacting both. First, she argues that he wishes to return to a golden time in the past where English dominated. "Il y a 50 ans, 25 ans, Montréal était une ville à visage anglophone," she says. But she adds that, "on ne reviendra pas à cette situation. ... Notre objectif c'est que le français progresse à Montréal. ... pas de retour en

arrière."[9] Beaudoin will equally suggest that he is seeking revenge: "C'est lui ... qui est en guerre,"[10] not the PQ — thus reaffirming the party's strength.

Indeed, other avowed sovereignists equally display examples of King's majority rhetoric, in that they too attempt to portray Galganov as a "social clown". According to Gilles Rhéaume, "L'entreprise de Galganov est devenue délirante, grotesque, burlesque et peu civilisée ... Nous ne voulons pas être associés à ce cirque, ni de près ni de loin...".[11] Serge Ménard, then-Minister responsible for Montréal referred to Galganov as a "sorcerer's apprentice".[12] Finally, in a more explicit demonstration of sovereignists' political power, Beaudoin claimed: "Nous ne laisserons pas Montréal se rebilinguiser ... on n'assistera pas impuissants à une éventuelle rebilinguisation de Montréal".[13]

Each of these retorts had the effect of ridiculing Galganov's claims, just as he attempted to ridicule those of the PQ. These attributions of intent amount to (re)defining the terms of the debate, and essentially, (re)position anglophones as having been dislodged from their position of power, all while reaffirming sovereignists' political strength. Thus, every politically empowering move made by

---

[9] Jean Chartier, "Affichage: Chrétien approuve le boycottage anglophone." Le Devoir 2 Aug. 1996: A2.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Gilles Paquin, "Rhéaume renonce à suivre le cirque 'grotesque' de Galganov à New York." La Presse 11 Sep. 1996: B4.
[12] Gilles Lesage, "Ménard met en garde les activistes anglophones." Le Devoir 15 Aug. 1996: A1.
[13] André Loiselle, "Beaudoin ne laissera pas Montréal se <<rebilinguiser>>." Le Devoir 20 Aug. 1996: A3.

Galganov is countered by a rhetorical claim that repositions him as a weak political subject.

Other problems with Galganov's strategy bear mentioning too, and offer lines of future study. First, his very actions risked reconfirming the outsider status that he hoped to abrogate. As Martha Minnow explains, the 'dilemma of difference' lies in the fact that any claim to speak from difference against norms by which difference is equated with inferiority "will be interpreted — in light of those norms — to confirm one's status as an outsider and inferior" (in Disch 1996: 181). Secondly, in attempting to overcome the scapegoating of anglophones found in the White Paper, Galganov may have provided an ideal model of the scapegoat himself. He became an "opponent", just as English speakers were viewed as enemies in the White Paper. As Don MacPherson points out,

> For some francophones, ... the anglophone Galganov makes a much more convenient scapegoat. His belated arrival on the scene has at last given the hard-liners a bogeyman, a pretext, a big bad English wolf against which French-speaking Quebecers must be protected by eternally vigilant language watchdogs ...[14]

Thus, while trying to undermine the scapegoating effect of the White Paper, Galganov risked reifying it as well.

Finally, precisely because Galganov continuously tied his linguistic claims to "saving the country", his external source of

---

[14] Don MacPherson, "Convenient bogeyman: Galganov may not get result he wants," Montreal Gazette 14 Aug. 1996: B3.

120

national identification threatened the ability of his internal minority rhetoric to hit its mark. According to another political columnist.

> We all know the language of signs isn't *the* issue. Quebec's future — more specifically, independence, is.
> Galganov's crime is that he was transparent about it. ...
> "Moderates" share Galganov's objective, but feel his methods, i.e. the Wall St. gambit and his call for civil disobedience, and his timing ... could boomerang. Shrewder, they don't want to waken the slumbering sovereignist beast.[15]

That a majority of francophones agreed that Québec's English minority was deserving of protection suggests that arguments in this vein might "meet their mark". For this to happen, however, Galganov would have to review his adoption of Arendt's conscious pariahdom as a position from which to articulate rhetorical claims. For, while the political claims and historical positioning of anglophones in the province of Québec puts Galganov on the fringes, where he differs from the conscious pariah is that he *does* have a home — Canada — and he repeatedly claims membership in that nation. In contrast, Arendt's conscious pariah "accepts homelessness as a condition of his existence and attempts to live as a marginal among marginals" (Disch 1996: 186).

If one looks only within the boundaries of Québec, one would sense that Galganov's minority talk is emblematic of the homeless, as he has been constituted as such by the nationalist discourse of the province and he makes repeated claims to this effect. But, given that he repeatedly speaks of "saving the country", he undermines the

---

[15] Ed Bantey, "PQ language policy must be as clear as Bill 101," Montreal Gazette 25 Aug. 1996: A5.

rhetoric's ability to do what it says. While he redeploys the term minority — the name anglophones were called by the Québécois — his continued emphasis on his national Canadian identity puts "into risk the security of linguistic life, the sense of one's own place in language, that one's words do as one says" (Butler 1997: 163).

For Arendt, he who is homeless has the ability to exercise critical judgement, which is a direct outgrowth of his non-partisanship membership in a particular society. Critical judgement, or the ability to train one's imagination to go visiting, are the hallmarks of her ideal political actor, and they are realized by stepping back or away from the world:

> the critic, like the storyteller, has to feel some connection
> to the world and some expectation of an audience for his
> or her work to be moved to write at all. But to have
> anything to say, this connection must be discontinuous.
> It cannot be an emphatic identification or partisan
> membership. (Disch 1996: 188)

In contrast, Galganov's claims where emphatically partisan as to the motives behind his minority rhetoric. While his rhetoric operated within the Québec sphere, he drew on his membership in the Canadian sphere to advance his claims. Accordingly, his continued stress on his Canadian national identity prevented him from fully accepting his homelessness in Québec.

Meanwhile, to be a true conscious pariah with something to say in Québec, Galganov must see Québec, not Canada, as the home that has been stripped from him. While Arendt's concept of judging needs to be impartial, judging is only possible "within the limits of

some community, because it is only *in* community that communicability makes sense (Disch 1996: 152). Thus, it is only by choosing one community *in the singular*, and in this case, the Québec community in particular, with all the ramifications that loyalty entails, that Galganov's communicability will make sense, and the discontinuity of his connection to the province made impossible to ignore.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

----. "Galganov says goodbye." Editorial. Montreal Gazette 21 June
      1997: B4.

----. " 'We are also Quebecers...' " Montreal Star 23 Apr. 1977: D1-2.

Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the
      Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Revised edition. London:
      Verso, 1991.

Ang, Ien. "On Not Speaking Chinese". New Formations 24 (1994): 1-
      18.

Arendt, Hannah. Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in
      Political Thought. London: Faber, 1961.

----. Crises of the Republic. New York: Harcourt, 1972.

----. The Human Condition. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1958.

----. "The Jew as Pariah: A Hidden Tradition." Jewish Social Studies
      6 (1944): 99-122.

----. "Reflections on Little Rock". Dissent 6.1 (1959): 45-56.

Assimopoulos, Nadia and Laferrière, Michel. Législation et
      Perceptions Ethniques. Une Étude du Contenu de Presse
      Anglaise de Montréal au Vote de la Loi 101. Montréal: Office de
      la Langue Française, 1980.

Authier, Philip. "Bouchard takes control. He prevails in language
      vote at PQ meeting." Montreal Gazette 25 Nov. 1996: A1.

Balakrishnan, Gopal. "The National Imagination." New Left Review
      211 (1995): 56-69.

Balibar, Étienne. Ambiguous Universality. différences 7.1 (1995):
      48-74.

Bantey, Ed. "PQ language policy must be as clear as Bill 101."
      Montreal Gazette 25 Aug. 1996: A5.

Bauch, Hubert. "Galganov's goal is to 'isolate the bigots'." Montreal
      Gazette 17 Aug. 1996: A1+.

Bauer, Julien. "Les Minorités en France, au Canada et au Québec: Minoritaires ou Mineures?" Revue Québécoise de Science Politique 20 (1991): 5-34.

Beaudoin, Monique. "750 mob Galganov rally." Montreal Gazette 24 Aug. 1996: A1-10.

Benhabib, Seyla. Democracy and Difference. Contesting the Boundaries of the Political. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP. 1996.

----. "Hannah Arendt and the Redemptive Power of Narrative." Social Research 57.1 (1990): 167-196.

----. "Judgment and the Moral Foundations of Politics in Hannah Arendt's Thought." In Seyla Benhabib. Situating the Self. UK: Polity Press, 1992: 121-144.

----. "Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition and Jürgen Habermas." In Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Massachusetts: MIT UP. 1996: 73-98.

----. Situating the Self. UK: Polity Press, 1992:

Bhabha, Homi K. "DissemiNation: time, narrative and the margins of the modern nation." In Nation and Narration. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990a: 291-322.

----. "Freedom's Basis in the Indeterminate." In The Identity in Question. Ed. John Rajchman. New York: Routledge, 1995: 47-62.

----. Nation and Narration. London: Routledge, 1990a.

----. "The Third Space." In Identity, Community, Culture, Difference. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990b: 207-221.

Bickford, Susan. 1997. "Propriety and Provocation in Arendt's Political Aesthetic." In Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics. Eds. Craig Calhoun and John McGowan. Minnesota: U Minn. Press: 85-95.

Bill 40: An Act to amend the Charter of the French language. Québec: Official Publisher, 1995.

Block, Irwin. "Paper distorted my remarks: Galganov." Montreal Gazette 15 Nov. 1996: A13.

Bohman, James and Rehg, William. <u>Deliberative Democracy</u>.
   Cambridge, Mass: MIT UP, 1997.

Bouchard, Lucien. "Living Together Before, During and After the
   Referendum". Speech given at the Centaur Theatre, Montréal.
   11 Mar. 1996.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." In <u>In Other
   Words</u>. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990: 123-139.

----. "Identity and Representation." In <u>Language & Symbolic Power</u>.
   Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew
   Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991: 220-228.

----. "On Symbolic Power." In <u>Language & Symbolic Power</u>. Ed.
   John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew
   Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991: 163-170.

----. "Political Representation: Elements for a Theory of the Political
   Field". In <u>Language & Symbolic Power</u>. Ed. John B. Thompson.
   Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge:
   Harvard UP, 1991: 171-202.

Brown, Wendy. <u>States of Injury. Power and Freedom in Late
   Modernity</u>. New Jersey: Princeton U Press, 1995.

Burgess, Parke G. "The Rhetoric of Black Power: A Moral Demand?"
   <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 54 (1968): 122-133.

Burke, Kenneth. <u>A Grammar of Motives</u>. Berkeley: California UP,
   1969.

----. <u>A Rhetoric of Motives</u>. Berkeley: California UP, 1962.

----. "Excerpts from A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of
   Motives." In <u>Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected
   Readings</u>. Ed. Richard L. Johannesen. New York: Harper and
   Row, 1971: 75-95.

----. <u>Language as Symbolic Action. Essays on Life, Literature and
   Method</u>. Berkeley: California UP, 1966.

Butler, Judith. <u>Excitable Speech</u>. New York: Routledge, 1997.

----. "Subjection, Resistance, Resignification: Between Freud and
   Foucault." In <u>The Identity in Question</u>. Ed. John Rajchman.
   New York: Routledge, 1995: 229-250.

Cairns, Alain and Williams, Cynthia. <u>The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity and Language in Canada</u>. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1986

Caldwell, Gary. <u>La Question du Québec Anglais</u>. Québec: IQRC, 1994.

----. "People and Society." In Gary Caldwell and Eric Waddell. <u>The English of Québec: from Majority to Minority Status</u>. Québec: IQRC, 1982: 57-71.

----, and Waddell, Eric. <u>The English of Québec: from Majority to Minority Status</u>. Québec: IQRC, 1982:

Calhoun, Craig. <u>Habermas and the Public Sphere</u>. Massachusetts: MIT UP, 1996.

----, and McGowan, John. <u>Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics</u>. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1997.

----. "Plurality, Promises and Public Spaces." In <u>Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics</u>. Eds. Craig Calhoun and John McGowan. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1997: 232-259.

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. <u>The National</u>. 12 Sept. 1996.

Canovan, Margaret. "A Case of Distorted Communication: A Note on Habermas and Arendt." <u>Political Theory</u> 11.1 (1983): 105-116.

----. "The Contradictions of Hannah Arendt's Political Thought." <u>Political Theory</u> 6.1 (1978): 5-26.

----. "Politics as Culture: Hannah Arendt and the Public Realm." <u>History of Political Thought</u> 6.3 (1985): 617-642.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric and the *Peuple Québécois.*" In <u>Critical Questions</u>. Eds. W. Nothstine, C. Blair, G. Copeland. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994: 211-232.

Chartier, Jean. "Affichage: Chrétien approuve le boycottage anglophone." <u>Le Devoir</u> 2 Aug. 1996: A2.

Chauvin de Callières, Yves. "Le Problème des Minorités." In <u>Nations, Souveraineté et Droits</u>. Ed. Yves Lafrance. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1980: 145-172.

CJAD. <u>The Tommy Schnurmacher Show</u>. 20 Aug. 1996.

Clift, Dominique and Arnopoulos, Sheila. <u>Le Fait Anglais au Québec</u>. Québec: Libre Expression, 1979.

127

Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and Language Rights in Québec. <u>Position of the French Language in Québec. Vol. 3: Ethnic Communities</u>. Gendron Commission. Québec: Éditeur Officiel, 1976.

Contenta, Sandro. "How angry man became English rights crusader." <u>Toronto Star</u> 24 Aug. 1996: A18.

Daoussis, Leonard. "Beginning of the End?" Letter to the Editor. <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 20 Dec. 1988: B24.

Desbarats, Peter. <u>A Minority Report</u>. Montreal: Montreal Star, 1963.

Dickey, D. J., Palk, Helen, Woodley, E. C. <u>My Country's Story</u>. Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1941.

Dietz, Mary G. "Hannah Arendt and Feminist Politics." In <u>Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays</u>. Eds. Lewis P. Hinchman and Sandra K. Hinchman. New York: State University of New York Press, 1994: 231-260.

Dion, Jean. "Galganov n'a pas vraiment abandonné." <u>Le Devoir</u> 10 Jan. 1997: A3.

----. "Les insolences d'un Galganov." <u>Le Devoir</u> 13 Nov. 1996: A2+.

Dion, Stéphane. "Why is Secession Difficult in Well-Established Democracies? Lessons from Quebec." <u>British Journal of Political Studies</u> 25.4 (1994): 269-283.

Dionisopoulos, George N. and Goldzwig, Steven R. " 'The Meaning of Vietnam': Political Rhetoric as Revisionist Cultural History." <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 78 (1992): 61-79.

Directeur des Élections du Québec. <u>Rapport des résultats officiels du scrutin</u>. Québec: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1994.

----. <u>Rapport préliminaire des résultats du dépouillement des votes le soir du scrutin: Référendum du 30 octobre 1995</u>. Québec: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1995.

----. www.dge.qc.ca/information/tab_resu_officiels.html. 3 May 1999.

Disch, Lisa. <u>Hannah Arendt and the Limits of Philosophy</u>. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1996.

----. "More Truth than Fact: Storytelling as Critical Understanding in the Writings of Hannah Arendt." <u>Political Theory</u> 21.4 (1993): 665-694.

----. " 'Please Sit Down, but Don't Make Yourself at Home': Arendtian 'Visiting' and the Prefigurative Politics of Consciousness-Raising." In <u>Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics</u>. Eds. Craig Calhoun and John McGowan. Minneapolis: Minnesots UP, 1997: 132-165.

Douglas, Tom. <u>Scapegoats: Transferring Blame</u>. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Eley, Geoff. "Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures." In <u>Habermas and the Public Sphere</u>. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1992: 301-338

Fenhoulhet, Henri. "Make it Supreme." Letter to the Editor. <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 20 Dec. 1988: B24.

Fontaine, Mario. "Le fédéraliste Rock Demers chauffe les oreilles de Galganov." <u>La Presse</u> 11 Oct. 1996: B14.

Foss, Sonja K. "Equal Rights Amendment Controversy: Two Worlds in Conflict." <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 65 (1979): 275-288.

Fraser, Joan. "Time for hard compromises." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 10 Aug. 1996: B5.

Fraser, Nancy. "Communication, Transformation and Consciousness-Raising." In <u>Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics</u>. Eds. Craig Calhoun and John McGowan. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1997: 166-175.

Gagnon, Alain. <u>Quebec, State and Society</u>. Third edition. Scarborough, Ont: Nelson Publishing, 1993.

----, and Bickerton, James. <u>Canadian Politics: An Introduction to the Discipline</u>. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 1990

----, and Montcalm, Mary Beth. <u>Québec: Beyond the Quiet Revolution</u>. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada, 1990.

Galganov, Howard. <u>Bastards</u>. Hudson, Qc: Promar Media Group Inc., 1998.

----. "Fight is about everyone's rights, not language." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 9 Oct. 1996: B2.

----. "Rights group has drawn line in the sand." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 15 Aug. 1996: B2.

----. Speech delivered at Algonquin Hotel, New York City. 12 Sept. 1996.

Gervais, Raymond. "Galganov refuse de témoigner à Québec." <u>La Presse</u> 25 Aug. 1995: A4.

Goldenberg, Joel. "Galganov, Jedwab battle over citizenship week." <u>Suburban</u> 12 Nov. 1997: A24+.

----. "Howard 'Galganizes' Audience of 700 in West Island." <u>Suburban</u> 29 Aug. 1996: A9.

Gray, John. "Anglophones find a folk hero." <u>Globe & Mail</u> 4 Nov. 1996: A4+.

Gutmann Amy. <u>Multiculturalism</u>. Princeton NJ: Princeton UP, 1994.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Hannah Arendt's Communications Concept of Power." <u>Social Research: Hannah Arendt Memorial Issue</u> 44 (1977): 3-24.

----. <u>The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society</u>. Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge, Mass: MIT UP, 1989.

Hall, Stuart. "Culture, Community, Nation." <u>Cultural Studies</u> 7.3 (1993): 349-363.

----. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In <u>Identity, Community, Culture, Difference</u>. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990: 222-237.

----. "Negotiating Caribbean Identities." <u>New Left Review</u> 209 (1995): 3-14.

----. "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities." In <u>Culture Globalization and the World-System</u>. Ed. Anthony King. London: MacMillan, 1991: 41-68.

----. "What is this 'Black' in Black Popular Culture?" <u>Social Justice</u> 20.1-2 (1993): 104-114.

Hansen, Philip. <u>Hannah Arendt: Politics, History and Citizenship</u>. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1993.

Hariman, Robert. "Status, Marginality, and Rhetorical Theory." Quarterly Journal of Speech 72 (1986): 38-54.

Hayes, Jack. "We're stripped of civil rights." Letter to the Editor. Montreal Gazette 20 Dec. 1988: B24.

Hebdige, Dick. "Towards a Cartography of Taste 1935-1962." Block 4 (1981): 194-217.

Henderson, Keith. "A historical view on the preservation of minority rights." Financial Post 23 Apr. 1996: 17.

Hinchman, Sandra K. "Common Sense and Political Barbarism in the Theory of Hannah Arendt." Polity 17.2 (1984): 317-339.

Hinchman, Lewis P. and Hinchman, Sandra K. Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays. New York: New York State UP, 1994

Honig, Bonnie. "Arendt, Identity, and Difference." Political Theory 16.1 (1988): 77-98.

----. Feminist Interpretations of Hannah Arendt. Pennsylvania: Penn. State UP, 1995:

----. Political Theory and the Displacement of Politics. New York: Cornell UP, 1993.

----. "The Politics of Agonism." Political Theory 21.3 (1993): 528-533.

----. "Toward an Agonistic Feminism: Hannah Arendt and the Politics of Identity." In Feminist Interpretations of Hannah Arendt. Ed. Bonnie Honig. Penn.: Penn. State University Press, 1995: 135-166.

Housefather, Anthony. "Where are the bilingual signs in Montréal's stores?" The Globe & Mail 5 Aug. 1996: A15.

Innis, Hugh. Bilingualism and Biculturalism: an Abridged Version of the Royal Commission Report. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Isaac, Jeffrey C. "Oases in the desert: Hannah Arendt on Democratic Politics." American Political Science Review 88.1 (1994): 156-168.

----. "Situating Hannah Arendt on Action and Politics." Political Theory 21.3 (1993): 535-540.

Jacobitti, Suzanne. "The Public, the Private and the Moral: Hannah Arendt and Political Morality." <u>International Political Science Review</u> 12.4 (1991): 281-323.

Jay, Martin. "Hannah Arendt: Opposing Views." <u>Partisan Review</u> 45.3 (1978): 348-80.

Jenson, Jane. "Québec: Which Minority?" <u>Dissent</u> 46 (1996): 43-46.

Jerome-Forget, Monique. "Québec's Anglos are a 'reluctant' minority." <u>Financial Post</u> 9 Mar. 1996: 21.

Johannesen, Richard L. <u>Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings</u>. New York: Harper and Row. 1971:

Johnson, William. "Anglo Quebecers finally speak up over French-only signs." <u>Financial Post</u> 26 Jul. 1996: 11.

----. "Anglo Québec must now start all over again." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 19 Dec. 1988: B3.

----. "Anti-partitionists — the lamb lobby." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 10 Feb. 1996: B5.

----. "Boycotts can work. Protest against language law will be historic." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 26 Jul. 1996: B3.

----. "Galganov's civil disobedience is a sign of things to come." <u>Financial Post</u> 22 Nov. 1996: 13.

----. "How I propose to put an end to the threat of secession." <u>Financial Post</u> 20 Mar. 1998: 13.

----. "Time to stand and fight on language. PQ seeks to ghettoize English." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 22 Nov. 1996: B3.

Kateb, George. "Freedom and Worldliness in the Thought of Hannah Arendt." <u>Political Theory</u> 5.2 (1977): 141-182.

King, Andrew. "The Rhetoric of Power Maintenance: Elites at the Precipice." <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 62 (1976): 127-134.

King, Anthony. <u>Culture Globalization and the World-System</u>. London: MacMillan, 1991:

Kohler, Lotte and Saner, Hans. <u>Hannah Arendt/Karl Jaspers Correspondence, 1926-1969</u>. Trans. Robert and Rita Kimber. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.

Kymlicka, Will. Multicultural Citizenship: a Liberal Theory of Minority Rights. Oxford UK: Clarendon Press, 1995.

----. The Rights of Minority Cultures. Oxford UK: Oxford UP, 1995.

Lafrance, Yves. Nations, Souveraineté et Droits. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1980

Lasalle, Luann. "Even graffiti becoming part of Quebec's language debate." Montreal Gazette 12 Sept. 1996: A12.

----. "Galganov engage la lutte finale pour sauver le Canada contre <<ces bâtards là>>." Le Devoir 9 Sept. 1996: A2.

Laczko, Leslie. Pluralism and Inequality in Québec. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1995.

Lecker, Robert. "The Writing's on the Wall." Saturday Night Magazine Jul.-Aug. 1996: 15+.

Legault, Josée. L'invention d'une Minorité: les Anglo-Québécois. Montréal: Éditions Boréale, 1992.

LeRiche, Timothy. "Quebecers outraged by predictions of violence: Activist foresees 'blood in the streets'." Edmonton Sun 14 Nov. 1996. Online at www.edmontonsun.com 16 Nov. 1996: n.p.

Lesage, Gilles. "Ménard met en garde les activistes anglophones." Le Devoir 15 Aug. 1996: A1+.

Liberal Party of Quebec. Choisir le Quebec et le Canada. Quebec: Liberal Party of Quebec, 1979a.

----. Constitution. Québec: Liberal Party of Québec, 1997.

----. Our Best Choice: Quebec and Canada. Montreal: Liberal Party of Quebec, 1979b.

Loiselle, André. "Beaudoin ne laissera pas Montréal se <<rebilinguiser>>." Le Devoir 20 Aug. 1996: A3.

MacPherson, Don. "A genuine anglo star: Galganov shows he can draw a crowd." Montreal Gazette 27 Aug. 1996: B3.

----. "Bourassa's begging rings hollow." Montreal Gazette 20 Dec. 1988: B3.

----. "Convenient bogeyman: Galganov may not get result he wants." Montreal Gazette 14 Aug. 1996: B3.

----. "Misplaced priorities: Anglos' sign victory could prove hollow."
Montreal Gazette 6 Aug. 1996: B3.

----. "Quick spread of partition should worry all of Québec". The
Montreal Gazette 25 Nov. 1996: B3.

----. "Obsessed by language law: PQ hard-liners out of touch."
Montreal Gazette 9 Oct. 1996: B3.

Mallea, John. Québec's Language Policies: Background and
Response. Québec: Laval UP, 1977.

McGee, Michael. "The Fall of Wellington: A Case Study of the
Relationship Between Theory, Practice and Rhetoric in History."
Quarterly Journal of Speech 63 (1977): 28-42.

----. "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative." Quarterly
Journal of Speech 61 (1975): 235-249.

----. "Secular Humanism: A Radical Reading of 'Cultural Industry'
Productions." Critical Studies in Mass Communication 1.1
(1984): 1-33.

McLure, Kirstie M. "The Odor of Judgment: Exemplarity, Propriety,
and Politics in the Company of Hannah Arendt." In Hannah
Arendt and the Meaning of Politics. Eds. Craig Calhoun and
John McGowan. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1997: 53-84.

Mouffe, Chantal. "Democratic Politics and the Question of Identity."
In The Identity in Question. Ed. John Rajchman. New York:
Routledge, 1995: 33-46.

----. The Return of the Political. London: Verso, 1993.

Normand, François. "Galganov veut que Bouchard déclare que tous
les Québécois sont égaux." Le Devoir 25 Aug. 1996: A5.

Orr, Royal. "Wanted: 'Courage to do what is right." Montreal Gazette
20 Dec. 1988: B3.

Paquin, Gilles. "Rhéaume renonce à suivre le cirque 'grotesque' de
Galganov à New York." La Presse 11 Sept. 1996: B4.

Parti Québécois. La nouvelle entente Québec-Canada. Proposition du
gouvernement du Québec pour une entente d'égal à égal: la
souveraineté-association. Quebec: Éditeur Officiel, 1979.

----. La volonté de réussir: Programme et statuts du Parti Québécois. Montréal: Parti Québécois, 1996.

Pasternak, James. Political Action in English Québec: The Case of Alliance Québec. London, Ont.: J.L. Pasternak, 1984.

Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. "Justice: On Relating Private and Public." In Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays. Eds. Lewis P. Hinchman and Sandra K. Hinchman. New York: New York State UP, 1994: 261-288.

Potter, Winifred. "Amin Told Asians to Pack and Leave. Was MNA Right to See Parallel Here?" Montreal Gazette 18 Aug. 1977: 7.

Preville, Philip. "Civil disobedience. When is a store not a store? When it won't shut up." Mirror 5-12 Dec. 1996: 11.

Procter, David E. "The Dynamic Spectacle: Transforming Experience Into Social Forms of Community." Quarterly Journal of Speech 76 (1990): 117-133.

Rajchman, John. The Identity in Question. New York: Routledge, 1995: 47-62.

Rapport de la Commission d'enquête sur l'enseignement dans la province du Quebec. Parent Report. Quebec: The Commission, 1967

Richer, Jules. "Galganov défile avec les francophones d'Ottawa." Le Devoir 5 Sept. 1996: A4.

Ring, Jennifer. "The Pariah as Hero: Hannah Arendt's Political Actor." Political Theory 19.3 (1991): 433-452.

Rocher, Guy. "Autour de la Langue: Crises et Débats." In Le Québec en Jeu. Montréal: Montréal UP, 1992: 423-450.

----. Le Québec en Jeu. Montréal: Montréal UP, 1992:

Robinson, Gertrude J. Constructing the Québec Referendum: French and English Media Voices. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1998.

Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Constitutional Problems. The Tremblay Report. Ed. David Kwavnick. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973.

Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Laurendeau-Dutton Report. Ottawa: Queen's Press, 1967.

Rudin, Ronald. "English-Speaking Québec: the Emergence of a Disillusioned Minority." In Québec, State and Society. Ed. Alain Gagnon. Third edition. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Publishing, 1993: 338-349.

----. The Forgotten Quebecers. Québec: IQRC, 1985.

Rutherford, Jonathan. Identity, Community, Culture, Difference. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990.

Salée, Daniel. "Identities in Conflict. The Aboriginal Question and the Politics of Recognition in Québec." Ethnic and Racial Studies 18.2 (1995): 277-314.

Saul, John Ralston. Reflections of a Siamese Twin: Canada at the End of the Twentieth Century. Toronto: Viking, 1997.

Schneider, Howard. "Quebec speaks out for English: Adman says language key to unity." Washington Post 4 Sept. 1996: A18.

Scott, Sarah. "Stores caught between signs." Montreal Gazette 3 Aug. 1996: A1-10.

Scowen, Reed. A Different Vision: The English in Canada in the 1990s. Don Mills, Ont.: Maxwell Macmillan Canada, 1991.

Séguin, Rhéal. "Firm rejection of the status quo is the only clear result." Globe & Mail 31 Oct. 1995: A1-2.

Seidman, Karen. "2,500 rally for bilingual store signs." Montreal Gazette 19 Apr. 1996: A1-2.

Simon, Roger. "Forms of Insurgency in the Production of Popular Memories: The Columbus Quincentenary and the Pedagogy of Counter-Commemoration." In Between Borders: Pedagogy and The Politics of Cultural Studies. Eds. Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren. New York: Routledge, 1994: 127-144.

Simons, Herbert W. "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: a Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements." Quarterly Journal of Speech 56 (1970): 1-11.

Smith, Anthony D. The Ethnic Origins of Nations. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell, 1988.

Smith, F. A. "Anglos in Québec face a sell-out." Letter to the Editor. Montreal Star 28 Apr. 1977: A10.

Spector, Norman. "Cultures warring in the bosom of a single state."
Globe & Mail 7 Sept. 1996: D3.

Statistics Canada. 1976 Census of Canada. Population. Demographic
Characteristics: Mother Tongue. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and
Services, 1978.

----. 1981 Census of Canada. Population: Language, Ethnic Origin,
Religion, Place of Birth, Schooling. Quebec. Ottawa: Minister of
Supply and Services, 1984.

----. 1996 Census of Canada.
www.Statcan.ca:80/english/pgdb/people/population/demo18b.h
tm; demo29bhtm.

Stein, Michael. "Changing Anglo-Quebecer Self-Consciousness." In
Gary Caldwell and Eric Waddell. The English of Québec: from
Majority to Minority Status. Québec: IQRC, 1982: 107-125.

Taylor, Charles. "Nationalisme et Droits." In Yves Lafrance. Nations,
Souveraineté et Droits. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1980: 173-185.

----. "The Politics of Recognition". In Multiculturalism. Ed. Amy
Gutmann. Princeton N. J.: Princeton UP, 1994: 25-73.

----. Sources of the Self. Cambridge: Harvard UP: 1989.

Thompson, John B. Language & Symbolic Power. Trans. Gino
Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991

Trottier, Eric. "It's over! Plus jamais les menaces et l'intimidation."
La Presse 24 Aug. 1996: A17.

Unland, Karen. "Galganov to quit language battle." Globe & Mail 4
Jan. 1997: A7.

Villa, Dana. Arendt and Heidegger: The Fate of the Political.
Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1996.

----. "Postmodernism and the public sphere." American Political
Science Review 86.3 (1992): 712-721.

Waddell, Eric. "Language, Community and National Identity: Some
Reflections on French-English Relations in Canada." In Alain
Gagnon and James Bickerton. Canadian Politics: An
Introduction to the Discipline. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview
Press, 1990: 609-621.

----. "Places and People." In Gary Caldwell and Eric Waddell. <u>The English of Québec: from Majority to Minority Status</u>. Québec: IQRC, 1982: 27-55.

----. "State, Language and Society: The Vicissitudes of French in Québec and Canada." In Alain Cairns and Cynthia Williams. <u>The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity and Language in Canada</u>. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1986: 67-111.

Walzer, Michael. "Exclusion, Injustice and the Democratic State." <u>Winter</u> 40.1 (1993): 55-64.

Wander, Philip. "The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory." <u>The Central States Speech Journal</u>. 35 (1984): 197-216.

Warner, Michael. <u>Interpretation and Social Criticism</u>. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1987.

Weeks, Jeffrey. "The Value of Difference." In <u>Identity, Community, Culture, Difference</u>. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990: 88-100.

Wills, Terrance. "Anglo rally to target sign law." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 6 June 1996: A1-6

----. "The politics of culture. Is Céline Dion a Quebec performer? Commons committee needs to know." <u>Montreal Gazette</u> 3 Apr. 1999: B1.

Wolin, Sheldon S. "Democracy in the Discourse of Post-Modernism." <u>Social Research</u> 5.1 (1990): 5-30.

----. "Hannah Arendt: Democracy and the Political." In <u>Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays</u>. Eds. Lewis P. Hinchman and Sandra K. Hinchman. New York: State University of New York Press, 1994: 289-306.

Yaffe, Barbara. "Angry English movement tackles Quebec sign laws." <u>Vancouver Sun</u> 13 Aug. 1996: A3.

----. "Montreal anglophone leading fight to keep Quebec in Canada." <u>Vancouver Sun</u> 12 Sept. 1996: A3.

Young, Iris Marion. "Difference as a Resource for Democratic Communication." In <u>Deliberative Democracy</u>. Eds. James Bohman and William Rehg. Cambridge, Mass: MIT UP, 1997: 383-406.

----. "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship." <u>Ethics</u> 99 (1989): 250-274.