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Abstract

This thesis uses narrative theory and the concept of narrative framing, as elaborated by Mona Baker’s *Translation and Conflict* (2006), to study a catalogue of translated non-fiction works about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the 1980/1995 referenda. Its aim is to analyze how works on these three subjects have been reframed by various agents to different ends, with the goal of illustrating what assumptions and expectations about English- and French-speaking readers are revealed in the narratives about the published works, namely prefaces, postscripts, notes, appendices, book reviews and editorials.

Part 1 outlines the historical and theoretical frameworks that form the basis of this thesis. Baker’s *Translation and Conflict* is the work on which most of the theoretical framework is based, but other scholarship on narrative theory is also explored, as are competing theoretical frameworks, namely critical and political discourse analysis.

Part 2 presents and explores the delimited catalogue that forms the basis for this thesis. This delimited catalogue consists of all the works published in Canada between 1968 and 2000 on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda, as per the National Library and Archives catalogue. Using the delimited catalogue, Part 3 begins to explore the questions that are central to this thesis: what do peritextual frames such as prefaces, postscripts, appendices, and book covers say about the translated works, and how are expectations about the TL audience revealed through these frames?

Finally, two case studies are analyzed in detail in Part 4: Mordecai Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and Pierre Vallières’ *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*. The first case study centers around the use of selective appropriation, labels and positioning in the French-Canadian press and the translation by Daniel Poliquin published by Les Éditions Balzac. An interview with Daniel Polquin completes this analysis and helps provide more insight into the translator’s motivations for translating Richler, his goals for the translation, and the events that shaped the translation. In the second case study, labelling, positioning, and temporal/spatial framing are the framing strategies on which particular emphasis is placed. Once again, an interview—with translator, Joan Pinkham and her consultant, Malcolm Reid—complements the analysis to provide a better idea of the events that shaped the translation and the translator’s motivations for undertaking this project.
**Résumé**


Dans la première partie, on trouvera les notions historiques et théoriques dont il sera question dans cette thèse. Même si *Translation and Conflict* est l’œuvre sur laquelle la majorité de la théorie se repose, d’autres études sur la narratologie—ainsi que d’autres approches théoriques telles que l’analyse de discours politique—feront aussi l’objet d’une brève analyse.

Dans la deuxième partie, on présente le catalogue à la base de cette thèse. Celui-ci se compose de toutes les œuvres publiées au Canada entre 1968 et 2000 et qui, d’après Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, traitent du nationalism querbécois, des mouvements indépendantistes et des référendums querbécois. Avec ce catalogue, on abord, dans la troisième partie, les questions les plus importantes à cette thèse : que disent les peritextes tels que les préfaces, les postfaces, les annexes et les couvertures de livre à propos des œuvres traduites, et quelles attentes avaient-on des lecteurs des textes cibles?

Enfin, dans la quatrième partie, on analyse deux études de cas : *Oh Canada!* *Oh Quebec!* de Mordecai Richler et *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* de Pierre Vallières. Le premier cas vise à comparer trois stratégies (l’usage des détails choisis, les étiquettes et le positionnement) dans la presse canadienne-française et dans la traduction de Daniel Poliquin publiée par Les Éditions Balzac. Une entrevue avec Daniel Polquin sert à approfondir cette analyse et à nous éclairer sur les raisons pour lesquelles il a accepté de traduire Richler, sur ses buts quant à la traduction, et sur les événements qui ont eu un effet sur la traduction. Le deuxième cas est également centré sur trois stratégies : les étiquettes, le positionnement et l’encadrement temporal et spatial. Encore une fois, une entrevue—cette fois avec la traductrice, Joan Pinkham et son conseiller Malcolm Reid—appuie l’analyse afin de mieux contextualiser les événements qui ont eu un effet sur la traduction et de mieux cerner les raisons pour lesquelles la traductrice a décidé de réaliser ce projet.
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PART 0: INTRODUCTION

In the decades leading up to both the 1980 and the 1995 sovereignty referenda, a number of works were published in English and French by Canadians debating Quebec independence, arguing for and against sovereignty, sovereignty-association and renewed federalism. Other works studied nationalism in Quebec, the October Crisis and revolutionary movements, or political figures linked to the sovereignty movement. Among these publications were polemical, political and historical texts—some by staunch nationalists and federalists whose ideas would likely appeal to only select groups of English- or French-speaking Canadians. And a number of these texts were translated.

What makes this particular period interesting from the perspective of translation is that the source texts were often written for a very select group of readers, and usually those of a particular linguistic and cultural background. Frequently, the target-language readers were not only excluded from the original intended audience, but were criticized by the ST author. How such works were translated, and how the translations were presented to TL readers is an intriguing issue that has yet to be studied by translation researchers. It is an important issue too. By studying how these works were presented to TL readers, this thesis will also be able to show what assumptions and expectations translators, publishers, editors and other agents had about English- and French-speaking Canadians: what these agents thought about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda, and what they expected their readers to think as well.

The objectives of this thesis are primarily two-fold. First, to determine—by compiling a delimited catalogue—which non-fiction works were published and translated in Canada between 1968 and 2000 on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the
referenda. Second, to determine how the delimited catalogue translations were framed for target-language readers by translators, editors, publishers, or other agents. The concept of framing, explained in greater detail in Parts 2, 3 and 4, is key to this thesis. Essentially, these three parts analyze what has been said about works on Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda and attempt to determine why.

To better achieve the two objectives of this thesis, four questions need to be answered: what works were included in the delimited catalogue, why were the delimited catalogue translations framed as they were, what do the frames reveal about expectations of TL readers, and what role did translators play in creating and disseminating these frames? The first three questions are answered to varying degrees in Parts 2 and 3 of this thesis. My hypothesis in this case is that the agents writing about the delimited catalogue TTs had certain expectations about TL readers, and the peritextual analysis in Section 3 reveals that a number of assumptions about English- and French-speaking Canadians are evident in the TT written and visual frames. The last three questions are explored in much greater detail in Part 4, where a closer study of two translations allows translator motivations and intentions to be explored. Finally, special emphasis is placed throughout this thesis on how the works most critical of the TL audience were reframed for TL readers, since this is the question that most interests me as a researcher.

Non-fiction texts were selected as the basis for this thesis for a number of reasons. First, many previous studies of translation and Quebec nationalism examine literature (poetry, prose, and dramatic works) produced during periods of tension between English and French Canada. Mezei (1998), for instance, studies the difficulty of translating into English the bilingualism and the anti-anglophone sentiments of Michèle Lalonde’s 1968 poem *Speak White*. This tension, as

---

1 As Part 2 will demonstrate, the number of works published is quite large, and this prevented a detailed comparison between which works had been translated and which had not. Instead, focus is placed on the kinds of works translated: these are briefly compared to the kinds of works published (whether translated or not).
one might expect, surfaces not just in poetry, but also in the non-fiction works produced by separatists, federalists and nationalists. Mezi’s comments on the difficulty of translating into English a text that is critical of English Canada are therefore pertinent to this thesis. However, her focus, the late 1960s and early 1970s, covers only the earliest period of this thesis and her corpus is literary rather than non-fiction. Brisset (1989) studies theatre translation in post-1968 nationalist Quebec and the politics of translating into “Québécois French” (1989: 13); while these are not necessarily nationalist texts, Quebec nationalism does affect the translations. Ladouceur (2000) studies literary texts when she examines translation trends related to French- and English-language dramatic works written and translated between the mid 1960s and late 1990s. Her work is important to this project because she analyzes the number of translations into and out of French within this time period, just as Part 2 of this thesis explores translation statistics and trends in the delimited catalogue. Ladouceur, by drawing parallels between the sociological factors affecting translation trends, is able to explore why one culture may be more receptive of translations than the other. Her conclusions—that French Canada preferred to perform original plays rather than translations as a way of resisting the traditional position of the French language in Canada (French is usually the target rather than source language) are considered in Part 2, when trends in the delimited catalogue are explored. The studies by Mezi, Brisset and Ladouceur illustrate that both fiction and non-fiction can be political. This thesis concentrates solely on non-fiction not because non-fiction is more politicized than fiction—it is not—but rather because non-fiction has seldom been studied in this context, while literary fiction has been widely covered.

Other researchers have, of course, analyzed non-fiction texts related to Quebec nationalism, independence movements or the sovereignty referenda; however, their works are
either less comprehensive than this thesis or else they have studied texts that have not been explored here. Trépanier (2001), for instance, uses discourse analysis to examine separatist texts written in French around 1995, but her corpus includes only ten texts written within a year or two of the second referendum. This thesis includes a much larger set of texts, and so more trends can be explored. Létourneau & Ruel (1994) study the briefs submitted to the Bélanger-Campeau commission, while Robinson (1998), Khouri (1994) and Brisset (1988) study English- and/or French-Canadian press articles—but all of these texts have been excluded from the delimited catalogue. Denis (1992) does examine a period that closely mirrors that of the delimited catalogue (1970-1991), but he focuses exclusively on academic texts, most of which have appeared in Canadian periodicals, which have also been excluded from this thesis. The one study that does include a number of texts that are also part of this project is that of Sarra-Bournet (1995), who analyzes English-Canadian discourse on sovereignty and nationalism in books, reports, and press clippings from 1990-1994. Once again, however, the study represents only a small percentage of the works actually written on the topic and covers only a small portion of the 1968-2000 period.

This thesis does not purport to be a comprehensive study of translation with respect to Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the 1980/1995 referenda, but it does aim to explore these issues from a new perspective (non-fiction texts as examples of narratives—or stories—about Canada) and to analyze how works on these three subjects have been reframed by various agents to different ends. By exploring the concept of framing, this thesis helps illustrate assumptions and expectations about English- and French-speaking readers as revealed through what is said about the published works in, for instance, prefaces, postscripts, notes,

---

2 Indeed, as Pym (1998) argues, “any list of translations must be to some extent depend [sic] on previous lists, and thus on someone else’s criteria. As a result, there can never be any guarantee of absolute completeness, since there are always reasons to mistrust or disagree with the products of someone else’s labour” (1998: 51).
appendices, book reviews and editorials.

Part 1 outlines the historical and theoretical frameworks that form the basis of this thesis. In Section 1, events related to Quebec nationalism and leading up to the two referenda on Quebec secession are outlined and their relevance to this thesis is justified. Particular emphasis is placed on the FLQ and two of its members: Pierre Vallières and Charles Gagnon, since Vallières is one of the foci of Part 4. Section 2 explains the concept of narratives, which forms the theoretical framework for this work. While Mona Baker’s *Translation and Conflict* (2006) is the work on which most of the theoretical framework is based, other scholarship on narrative theory is explored in this section, as are competing theoretical frameworks—namely critical and political discourse analysis.

Part 2 presents the delimited catalogue at the basis of this thesis. This delimited catalogue consists of all the works published in Canada between 1968 and 2000 on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda, as per Library and Archives Canada. It contains more than 1000 works, including nearly eighty translations into either French or English.\(^3\) Section 1 describes the methodology used to establish the delimited catalogue, justifies the terminology used to refer to it, categorizes the works within the delimited catalogue and offers some statistics about the ST/TT pairs that are the focus of this thesis. Then Section 2 presents the ST/TT pairs in more detail and introduces the seven narratives most commonly found in the source texts: speculative narratives, pro- and anti-independence narratives, narratives about Quebec nationalism, narratives exploring Canadian society, narratives about the FLQ/October Crisis, and (auto)biographical narratives. Some conclusions about the narratives most commonly offered to English- and French-speaking Canadians are

\(^3\) The difference between the number of works published and the number available in translation will be commented on in more detail in Section 2.1.2.
explored, as are trends about which narratives were most often translated.

Using the delimited catalogue, Part 3 begins to explore the questions that are central to this thesis: what do paratextual frames—*peritexts* such as prefaces, postscripts, appendices, and book covers, and *epitexts* such as press releases by literary institutions—have to say about the translated works, how are expectations about the TL audience revealed through these frames, and how were the works most critical of TL readers reframed for this same audience? After the concept of narrative framing is discussed in greater detail, Part 3 analyzes the new peritexts that have been added to the translations (e.g. prefaces, appendices, translator notes), and compares their framing techniques. A number of ST/TT book covers are contrasted, and their use of colours, illustrations, photographs, and national symbols are analyzed.

To better demonstrate how narratives can be reframed by translators, journalists and other agents, two case studies are analyzed in detail in Part 4. The first is Mordecai Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* (1992). This case study explores translation as a framing device and contrasts the translated passages in the French-Canadian press with the version by Daniel Poliquin, who translated *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* into French for Les Éditions Balzac in 1992. An interview with Daniel Polquin completes this analysis and helps provide more insight into his motivations for translating Richler, his goals for the translation, and the events that affected the translation process. The second case study is Pierre Vallières’ *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* (1968, 1969). In this section, labelling, positioning, and temporal/spatial framing are the framing strategies on which particular emphasis is placed. This case study centres around the peritexts that were prepared for the two English editions. Its goal is to determine why a controversial French-speaking author was reframed in a particular way for English-speaking readers in Canada around the time of the October Crisis and what role the translator and other
agents played in the reframing. The peritexts in the American and Canadian editions of White Niggers of America are also compared to help show how the same text is reframed—or not—for different audiences. Once again, an interview with the translator complements this analysis to provide a better idea of the events that shaped the translation and the translator’s motivations for undertaking this project. Because Joan Pinkham, the translator of Nègres blancs, is an American, she consulted Malcolm Reid, a bilingual Canadian journalist throughout her translation. For this reason, the Nègres blancs case study also includes responses from Malcolm Reid about the translation process, his motivations for assisting Joan Pinkham, and his reasons for remaining anonymous when the English edition of Nègres blancs was first published in 1971.

By analyzing the frames about the narratives of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda, I hope to demonstrate that what is said about these narratives reveals much about francophone and anglophone relations. These frames offer additional insight into the very issues discussed within the narratives, namely how English- and French-speaking Canadians perceive one another and the country they share.
**PART 1: FRAMEWORKS**

**SECTION 1.1: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

In 1979, the Quebec government, led by Premier René Lévesque and the Parti Québécois,\(^4\) drafted a proposal for sovereignty-association, and one year later called a provincial referendum that would allow Quebecers to vote on whether they accepted the terms for a sovereign Quebec economically associated with Canada as set forth in the proposal. On May 20, 1980, more than eighty-five percent of the Quebec electorate voted, rejecting the proposal by a vote of 59.6 to 40.4 percent.

The proposed changes to Canadian federalism could not be laid aside lightly however, and fifteen years later, on October 30, 1995, a second referendum was called on a slightly different question. Quebecers were asked whether they wanted Quebec to become sovereign after the provincial government formally offered Canada a new economic and political partnership. Once more the proposal was rejected, though by a much smaller margin: 50.6 to 49.4 percent. This time, ninety-six percent of eligible voters went to the polls, demonstrating that this issue was deemed important by the vast majority of the population.

This second referendum set off a chain of events that included the *Clarity Act* and Sponsorship Scandal, but the issues leading up to the proposals for a new type of federalism or a more sovereign Quebec have not been resolved. Understanding how the two referenda arose is possible only if one steps back several decades before the 1980 vote and explores the progression of Quebec nationalism and reasons for the dissatisfaction of many Quebecers with the Canadian federalist system.

---

\(^4\) In power since the 1976 election.
1.1.1 THE PROGRESSION OF QUEBEC NATIONALISM: 1960-1979

1.1.1.1 The Quiet Revolution

Neither nationalist sentiment nor the sovereignty movement in Quebec began in 1960. French-Canadian nationalism\(^5\) was alive and well in 1933, for instance, when the periodical *L’Action nationale* was founded. It is clearly a nationalist publication, as the preface to the first edition of this Catholic, French-Canadian review illustrates.\(^6\) Its call for contributors seeks those “qui ont quelque chose à dire *chez nous*, qui peuvent aider au développement intellectuel *des nôtres*, à leur progrès religieux, social, économique, à la création d’un sens national averti, robuste, militant *chez notre peuple*” (Bernard 1933: 5; my emphasis). And the “militant” side of the journal is evident in its February 1933 edition, which contains a one-page article titled *Pour la monnaie bilingue* questioning: “[...] pourquoi une seule race se réserve-t-elle le droit de faire figurer sa langue, et rien que la sienne, sur l’une des principales pièces officielles où s’affirme chez nous et pour l’étranger le caractère national de l’État ?” (*L’Action nationale* 1933: 65). It concludes that this slight must be the result of one “race” marking a difference in dignity between itself and the other and that this same “race” is relegating the other to the rank of the humble younger sibling. And since, it insists, English and French are supposed to be equal, readers should have the courage to push out of the poor-relative rank. A pre-cursor to such militant nationalist texts as the FLQ manifesto—which stated for instance that “nous en avons soupd du fédéralisme canadien qui pénalise les producteurs laitiers du Québec pour satisfaire aux besoins anglo-saxons du Commonwealth [...]” (reprinted in FLQ 1998: 14)—*Action*

---

\(^5\) The definition offered by Balthazar (1995a) seems best suited for this thesis: “nationalism is a movement that consists of giving priority to national belonging and of fighting for better recognition of the nation to which one belongs.” While some definitions of nationalism include the notion of ethnicity, Balthazar argues that this concept is not essential. His definition is therefore able to encompass a wider variety of views and has been adopted in this thesis, unless stated otherwise.

\(^6\) The publication page of the first edition (1933) defines this review as seen by the founders: “L’Action nationale, publié par la Ligue d’Action nationale, est un organe de pensée et d’action au service des traditions et des institutions religieuses et nationales de l’élément français en Amérique.”
*nationale* is an example of early twentieth-century French-Canadian nationalism, one in which the differences between English- and French-speaking Canadians are linked to the idea that English- and French-speaking Canadians are of different races rather than of different cultures and languages.

In fact, a French Canadian—if not yet necessarily Quebec—nationalism has been traced back as early as the beginning of the 19th century by Canet (2003). This form of nationalism, Canet asserts, focused on political sovereignty and national allegiance: its goals were the emergence of a Canadian nation that would control its own political institutions within a defined territory—Lower Canada (Canet 2003: 138-144). Trofimenkoff (1983) sets the date of the emergence of French-Canadian nationalism even earlier, stating that “in the Lower Canadian political arena there were no self-styled *patriotes* in the 1790s; by the 1830s they cannot be mistaken. Somewhere between the two dates they, as nationalists, and nationalism along with them were born (1983: 50).

So then why not begin this section decades or even centuries earlier? The 1960s have been selected for several reasons. First, according to Gill (1995), a new form of nationalism rose in Quebec in the 1960s. As he explains:

Whereas survival—cultural, linguistic, and religious—was the communal goal of Quebec’s “traditional” nationalism, the goal of the new nationalism has been broader, including development as well as survival. As Anne Griffith puts it, “the idea of *la survivance* is not dropped, but there is a new emphasis on the quality of survival.” Since 1960, the nationalist goal has been the creation and development of a modern, and at least predominantly, French-speaking society in Quebec (1995: 410).
While Gill argues that the 1960s was when Quebeckers moved from being “a rural, agricultural, Catholic, and closed society to an urban, industrial, predominantly secular, and much more open society” (1995: 409), his view is not supported by other historians, including Robert (1975), who notes that in 1959: “la province de Québec, industrialisée et urbanisée, conserve un gouvernement ruraliste, dont les opinions sur l’industrialisation n’ont guère progressé depuis le début du siècle, ce qui n’empêche pas de collaborer avec le grand capital américain.” (Robert 1975: 200-201). Likewise, Behiels shows that the population of Quebec by 1951 was 63 percent urban, and by 1961, was already 71 percent urban (Behiels 1985: 12). Thus, Quebec was not a closed, rural society prior to the Quiet Revolution; however, the province did undergo many changes beginning in 1960, making this year an ideal point of departure for this chapter.

Moreover, the 1960s saw the creation of a number of significant organizations and political parties, many of which would directly support Quebec sovereignty and/or the referenda on sovereignty-association. The Rassemblement pour l’indépendance nationale (RIN), which would become a political party in 1963, was created on September 10, 1960 (Ferretti & Miron 2004: 163). The Front de libération du Québec, a pro-sovereignty movement infamous for the violent means some of its members used to advance the cause of Quebec independence, published its first manifesto in 1963.7

This same year also saw the publication of the first issue of Parti Pris, a monthly, pro-independence journal,8 and La Cognée, the organ of the FLQ, which was published until 1967, when it was replaced by La Victoire.9 Finally, in mid- to late-1960s, a series of reports were

---

7 Manifesto and short introduction about the FLQ in Ferretti & Miron (2004: 167).
8 Parti Pris was also a publishing house that published, among other works, Pierre Vallières’ Nègres blancs d’Amérique (cf. Section 4.4.5.1).
9 The names of these publications clearly show the activist stance they take. The title Parti Pris encourages readers to take a side and commit themselves, La cognée evokes images of violence, as it means axe, but can also symbolize a traditional form of employment for early Quebec—and other Canadian—inhabitants,
published on bilingualism in Canada. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (hereinafter RCBB or CREBB, according to whether the French or English version was consulted) was established by Lester B. Pearson and headed by André Laurendeau and A. Davidson Dunton. Its purpose was to determine 1) the nature of a bilingual and bicultural state, 2) what equality between two languages and cultures meant concretely and under what conditions it could be achieved, and 3) whether Canadians wanted such equality, whether they would accept the conditions necessary for it to be achieved, and how other cultures would contribute (CREBB 1965: 170). The Commission released its preliminary and final reports in 1965 and 1968 respectively, making a series of recommendations that will be studied in greater detail throughout this section and the next.

The increasing number of sovereignist or nationalist movements, organizations and publications—of which the above are only examples—make the 1960s a good starting point for this section, given that many of the individuals involved with these publications and organizations played a significant role in the 1980 and, in some cases, the 1995 referenda.

So let us begin, then, on June 22, 1960, when Jean Lesage, leader of the Quebec Liberals, was elected premier of Quebec, ending 16 years of Union nationale government. Lesage gained power by only a small margin; the Liberals won 51 of 95 seats and 51% of the popular vote. Narrower still was the margin by which René Lévesque, who had run as a Liberal in this election, won his riding: just 129 votes (Thomson 1984: viii; 87).

Thomas (1984) states that when Lesage was elected, his political objective was “the modernization of Quebec” (1984: 88), and he strove to accomplish this goal during his two...
terms in office. The year Lesage became premier is widely regarded\(^\text{10}\) as the beginning of the Quiet Revolution, the period during which the State began to nationalize Quebec’s natural resources\(^\text{11}\) and take control over educational\(^\text{12}\) and social institutions such as retirement plans, health insurance, social assistance and hospital insurance (Canet 2003:100-101). At this time, the average income of a Quebecker was approximately 88 percent that of the national average, placing it in the middle ranks of the provinces behind Ontario (118 percent), British Columbia (116 percent), Alberta (102 percent), and Manitoba (97 percent), but ahead of Saskatchewan and the Atlantic provinces (Podoluk 1968: 152).

Control of Quebec economic institutions was largely in the hands of the anglophone minority. Francophones made up more than 80 percent of the Quebec population\(^\text{13}\) in 1961, yet they controlled only 47 percent of Quebec companies,\(^\text{14}\) while anglophones, who at this time comprised only 16 percent of the population in Quebec controlled more than 39 percent of its establishments (Raynault & Vaillancourt 1984: 81).\(^\text{15}\) Moreover, the average value added—the value of the goods produced less the cost of energy and raw materials—of francophone-owned

\(^{10}\) The *Canadian Encyclopedia*, for instance, sets the start of the Quiet Revolution in 1960, when Lesage was elected Premier, as do Linteau et al (1989: 421-423).

\(^{11}\) The Société québécoise d’exploration minière (SQEM), for instance, was created in 1965, while hydro-electricity was nationalized in 1963, after the Quebec Liberal Party was re-elected in 1962 (c.f. Thomson 1984: 118-126). For details of the SQEM Act, see: http://www.ijican.org/qc/laws/sta/s-19/20051019/whole.html.

\(^{12}\) Recognizing that Quebec was the province with the lowest level of school attendance, the Liberals promised in their 1960 platform to make schooling compulsory until age 16 (1960: 4); in 1961 the age for compulsory school attendance was raised from 14 to 15 (Thomson 1984: 294). In addition, the Liberals created the Ministry of Education in 1964. See the Loi sur le ministère de l’Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport available online at: http://www2.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/dynamicSearch/telecharge.php?type=2&file=M_15/M15.html

\(^{13}\) According to the 1961 census results: Quebec’s total population: 5 259 211; French mother tongue: 4 269 689; English mother tongue: 697 402; others: 292 120.

\(^{14}\) Although the FLQ manifesto claims that 80% of Quebec’s economy was controlled by foreign interests (des intérêts étrangers), it does not cite any source for this figure (Comeau, Cooper & Vallières 1990: 14). Their statement is still interesting, though, as it shows how some separatists viewed anglophones in Quebec as foreigners whether they were native-born Quebeckers or not. By not being French-speaking, anglophones could only be part of the Other in Quebec.

\(^{15}\) The Raynault & Vaillancourt study compared the ownership of establishments in the agriculture, mining, manufacturing, construction, transportation, business, financial, service and public administration sectors. It further determined that by 1978, the number of Quebec companies controlled by francophone had increased to 54.8 percent (Raynauld & Vaillancourt 1984: 81).
Quebec establishments was $790,000 per year, compared to $3.31 million for companies that were owned by anglophones and $5.64 million for those that were foreign owned. Finally, those establishments that were owned by francophones employed an average of 94 workers, while anglophone owners employed an average of 145, and foreigners, 332 (RCBB 1969: 55-56).

The situation for francophone employees in general mirrored these same trends: a 1964 study commissioned by the RCBB determined that within Quebec, outside of the Montreal region, most employees of 31 large manufacturing firms were francophones, but the small number of anglophones was employed in higher positions. In the same study, it was determined that in the 36 large manufacturers within the Montreal region, the highest-paying positions were overwhelmingly occupied by anglophones.16

Statistics such as these were quoted in many pro-independence and sovereignist texts in the 1960s. For instance, in 1961 Marcel Chaput, one of the founders of the RIN, published Pourquoi je suis séparatiste, in which he highlighted the reasons for supporting separation, explored possible solutions to the “French-Canadian problem” (assimilation, integration, autonomy, confederation, or independence), and argued against possible objections to independence. Contending that independence was required for dignity’s sake (1961: 23), he asserted that French Canada “a été conquis par les armes, occupé, dominé, exploité, et qu’encore aujourd’hui, son destin repose, dans une très large mesure, entre les mains d’une nation qui lui est étrangère” (1961 : 19).17

Similarly, the first issue of Parti pris, published two years after Chaput’s book, contained an introduction asserting that the alienation felt by Francophone Quebecers stemmed

---

16 Of the 1082 employees in the top two salary scales ($12,000-$14,999 and $15,000 and over), 83 percent were anglophone and 17 percent were francophone (RCBB 1969: 457).

17 The word étrangère here, to refer to English-speaking Canadians as well as foreigners, depicts English-speaking Canadians as part of an incompatible Other that French-speakers can neither understand nor work with.
from the fact that (French-speaking) Quebecers were colonized and exploited politically, economically, and culturally. It further stipulated that Quebecers would break free of this alienation because Quebec society was entering a revolutionary period: the masses were revolting against their inferior economic status, young Quebecers wanted political control over their industries, and young intellectuals who supported the national and economic liberation of Quebec, of which Parti Pris was just one example, were getting the upper hand. Toward the end of the introduction, Parti Pris asserted that:

Nous luttons pour l’indépendance politique du Québec parce qu’elle est une condition indispensable de notre libération; nous croyons que l’indépendance politique ne serait qu’un leurre si le Québec n’acquérait pas en même temps son indépendance économique; nous croyons enfin que le contrôle de l’économie et des moyens de production ne peut être véritable que si ce contrôle passe dans les mains de tous les québécois, à la faveur d’une transformation totale de notre système économique (Parti Pris 1963: 4).

After inviting its readers to “s’engag[er] avec nous à la libération des québécois [sic],” Parti Pris promised to do its part by organizing conferences and meetings (Parti Pris 1963: 3).

And, when the FLQ published its first manifesto in 1963, it, too, focused on the disadvantaged situation of French Canadians:

En 1963, nous avons beau être plus de cinq millions, l’assimilation n’en pousse pas moins sa progression insidieuse. Alors que nous étions en 1940 près de 40 % de la population canadienne, nous n’en sommes plus que 28 %. […] Les colonialistes ont cependant oublié une chose, essentielle pourtant. Elle se produit actuellement. Des patriotes se sont rendu compte qu’ils étaient
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Even the Quebec Liberal Party expressed many of these sentiments—albeit in a much less radical tone—in its 1960 and 1962 platforms. In 1960, stressing the need to considerably develop “le fait français,” the Liberal Party asserted that they were “conscients de nos responsabilités envers la langue française,” toward which they would be protective (Parti libéral du Québec 1960: 3). And by 1962, the Party opened its manifesto with the following statement from Jean Lesage: “L’ére du colonialisme économique est finie dans le Québec. Maintenant ou jamais, MAÎTRES CHEZ NOUS” (reprinted in Lapalme 1988: 338). They asserted that if the Liberals were re-elected, they would nationalize hydroelectricity, which would allow more advanced training and promotion of young Quebec technicians and ultimately advance “notre oeuvre de libération économique.” Although Quebec would have to borrow Canadian or foreign capital to achieve this project, it would do so “sous une forme où le contrôle reste entre nos mains” (reprinted in Lapalme 1988: 344-345, original emphasis).

The Quebec Liberals, however, did not support the independence of Quebec, whereas many of the other nationalist groups did. Some of these groups, such as the people involved with Parti pris, urged readers and the general public to commit to the independence of Quebecers (reprinted in Ferretti & Miron 2004: 185). The FLQ, to which many Parti Pris members also belonged, was also committed to independence, but unlike other nationalist

---

18 Interestingly, the English edition stressed that the main characteristic of Quebec was its two distinct cultures that existed “side by side in harmony” and which the Liberal Party wanted to develop (Quebec Liberal Party 1960: 3).
groups, their tactics for achieving this goal were violent.

The first mention of the FLQ in the *Globe and Mail* appeared on the front page of the March 9, 1963 issue, when they printed a story from the Canadian Press about the discovery of kerosene bombs bearing cards marked *Front de Liberation Quebecoise [sic]* at the Victoria Rifles’ armoury in Montreal (Canadian Press: 1963). By April, the FLQ had been credited with toppling the James Wolfe monument on the Plains of Abraham, blowing up part of the CNR track over which Prime Minister Diefenbaker’s train was to pass, throwing a bomb into the National Revenue Building’s ventilation system and causing considerable damage and placing twenty-four pieces of dynamite under a communications tower on Mont Royal.19 Further, they were blamed for the death of William O’Neil, a janitor who was killed by a bomb while emptying a garbage can outside the Canadian Army’s recruiting centre (Ferrabee 1963: 8; Oancia 1963: 1). Throughout the rest of the 1960s, similar bombings and acts of vandalism continued, and by 1966, five members of the FLQ were arrested while two others, Pierre Vallières and Charles Gagnon, were being sought in connection with two additional deaths: that of Jean Corbo, a sixteen year old who was killed while planting a bomb near Dominion Textile Co., and Thérèse Morin, who was killed when an FLQ bomb exploded in the LaGrenade shoe factory (Cote 1966: 3; Canadian Press 1966: 1).

Vallières and Gagnon were eventually arrested in New York where they were protesting in front of the United Nations in an effort to “sensibiliser certains pays—que l’on disait révolutionnaires—à la cause d’un Québec libre et socialiste” (Vallières 1994: 30). While in prison, Vallières penned *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*, an autobiographic essay in which he argued that French Canadians in Quebec were like the Blacks in the United States: alienated, hated,

---

19 These were discovered and disabled before they could explode.
exploited, and second-class citizens. Nègres blancs was finally published by Parti Pris in 1968, and by 1969, the Attorney General of Quebec ordered that all copies of the book be seized—including the one deposited in the Bibliothèque nationale du Québec—and that the author, publisher and distributors be accused of sedition and conspiracy to overthrow the provincial and federal governments. Vallières, however, claims this ban served only to increase the number of copies of his book that were sold in secret (Vallières 1994: 9).

During this period of increased FLQ activity, several government changes occurred on a provincial and federal level. Although Lesage had won a second term in 1962, the Liberals lost to the Union nationale in the 1966 campaign, and Daniel Johnson became the new premier of Quebec. A year after the Liberal defeat, René Lévesque left the Liberal Party and by November 1967 had formed the Mouvement Souveraineté-Association (MSA). On October 11, 1968, the MSA merged with the Ralliement national to form the Parti Québécois (PQ). When the RIN, which had been unable to win any seats in the 1966 provincial election, dissolved two weeks later, most of its members joined the PQ, whose ultimate goal was to achieve nation-statehood for Quebec.

Federally, Pierre Trudeau became Prime Minister in April 1968, when Lester B. Pearson retired. Because of his views on bilingualism, Trudeau would have a lasting effect on the way in which Quebec nationalism and the sovereignty movement were treated by the federal government. As McRoberts (1997) states:

When Pierre Trudeau became prime minister, the struggle to find in Canadian federalism

---

20 Found guilty of murder in April 1968, Vallières appealed the verdict. He was found guilty of manslaughter in a second trial and sentenced to twenty months in prison. On March 1, 1973, he was acquitted of the manslaughter charges (Canadian Press 1973: 9).

21 See Reynolds (Winter 2002-2003) for an account by a McGill librarian who denied being able to locate the library’s copy when the police came to seize it.

22 Pierre Bourgault, who wrote Maintenant ou jamais! (1990), was leader of the RIN at this time.

23 Pearson had succeeded Prime Minister Diefenbaker in April 1963.
an accommodation of the new Quebec nationalism, a struggle that had enlisted all three federal parties, had come to a full and irrevocable end. […] Rather than seek to accommodate Quebec nationalism, […] the Trudeau government tried to confront Quebec nationalism head on and to replace it with a new Canadian identity. By and large, the federal government acted as if Quebec were simply a province like the others, and avoided policies that threatened to suggest otherwise (1997: 75-76).

It was under Prime Minister Trudeau that, following the RCBB report, the *Official Languages Act* was first passed, the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages was first established (both in 1969), and Keith Spicer was appointed first Commissioner (in 1970). During Trudeau’s terms as prime minister, he supported neither Quebec nationalism nor the granting of special status to Quebec, preferring instead to promote official bilingualism across the country. McRoberts (1997) argues that this decision was made because if all Canadians were able to obtain services from the federal government in either language, French-speaking Quebecers would be able to consider the federal government their primary government (1997: 79). Moreover, promoting equality among all provinces would help defeat Quebec nationalism (1997: 85).

1.1.1.2 The October Crisis

The October Crisis began on October 5, 1970, when the FLQ cell *Libération* kidnapped British diplomat James Cross from his Montreal home. In a communiqué (number 1) made public shortly afterward, the FLQ revealed its demands for the release of Mr. Cross. Among these were:

1. That the FLQ political manifesto be broadcast on television for a half-hour period
between 8 and 11 p.m. and that it be published on the front page of every major newspaper in Quebec;

2. That twenty political prisoners be released from prison;

3. That a plane be made available to these political prisoners for safe conduct to Cuba or Algeria, pending the approval of one of these countries; and

4. That $500,000 in gold bullion be deposited in the plane for the political prisoners.

If their demands were not met within 48 hours, declared the kidnappers, James Cross would be killed (communiqué reprinted in Trait 1970: 30-34). The manifesto, which was eventually read at 10:30 p.m. on October 8, repeated many of the same complaints voiced by the FLQ and other nationalist groups throughout the 1960s. For instance, it stated emphatically that the FLQ’s goal was the complete independence of Quebec, which should be purged of “les « big-boss » patronneux et leurs valets qui ont fait du Québec leur chasse-gardée du cheap labor et de l’exploitation sans scrupules” (reprinted in Comeau et al. 1990: 234). According to the manifesto, the Quebec Liberal Party’s win in the 1970 election, when Robert Bourassa became premier, proved only that “démocratie” in Quebec was and had always been “democracy” of the rich (Comeau et al. 1990: 235). Later, the manifesto asserted that French Canadians were cheap labour for anglophones, that (francophone) Quebecers lived in a society of “terrorized slaves,” and that the FLQ wanted to replace these slaves with a free society that functioned by itself and for itself (1990: 238-9).

Five days after the Cross kidnapping, during which the kidnappers extended the 24-hour deadline several times, Pierre Laporte, the Quebec labour minister (Ministre du Travail et de la Main d’Œuvre) was kidnapped from his home during the evening of October 10 by the FLQ cell Chénier. And over the course of the next five days, numerous arrests took place as police
tried to discover where these two men were being held.24

On October 15, Premier Robert Bourassa turned to the federal government, asking Prime Minister Trudeau for the support of the army. Four hours after his request, more than a thousand soldiers arrived in Montreal and Quebec City, and within another three hours, additional reinforcements were sent, bringing the total number of soldiers in Montreal to an estimated six thousand (Trait 1970: 125).

When Bourassa wrote to Trudeau the next day to inform him that Quebec was in a “state of apprehended insurrection,” Trudeau invoked the War Measures Act nationwide. According to the Act, authorities were able to arrest, without a warrant, anyone who was—or was suspected of being—a member of the now-illegal FLQ. A member was defined as someone who had attended a meeting of the FLQ, spoken publicly in favour of the organization or acted as its representative. By the end of the day, two hundred and fifty Quebeckers had been arrested, sixty percent of them in Montreal (Trait 1970: 132-33; Lebel 1970: 1-2).25 Pierre Vallières and Charles Gagnon were among those apprehended and charged with unlawful membership in the FLQ.

On October 17, one day after the War Measures Act was invoked, the body of Pierre Laporte was found in the trunk of a car, following an anonymous phone call to a Quebec radio station. The autopsy would reveal that Laporte had been strangled with the chain he wore around his neck. By early November, Bernard Lortie had been arrested, and on the night of December 27, he was finally joined by the rest of the Chénier cell: Francis Simard and brothers

---

24 On October 11, for instance, more than fifty arrests were made in Quebec City alone (Trait 1970: 83).
25 By the end of 1970, of 468 people arrested, 408 were eventually released without charges being laid (Saywell 1971: 125). Fournier argued that after studying the list of people arrested, one can conclude that “the choice of victims was part of a shock treatment which it seemed appropriate to administer to Quebec public opinion at the time. The manoeuvre fitted with the ‘psychological warfare’ recommended by the Strategic Operation Centre, Trudeau’s special advisory group on intelligence. It was to be the starting point of the authorities’ attempt to manipulate the Crisis” (Fournier 1984: 239). Clearly, then, many of those arrested were not terrorists, nor were they a danger to Canada.
Paul and Jacques Rose. Sixteen people would be put on trial in relation to Pierre Laporte’s kidnapping and death for charges ranging from kidnapping and murder to accessories after the fact and obstruction of justice. Paul and Jacques Rose, Francis Simard and Bernard Lortie were all charged with, among other crimes, non-capital murder, kidnapping, unlawful FLQ membership, and advocating or using force to change the government of Canada (Globe and Mail 1971b: 8). Paul Rose was given two concurrent life sentences for kidnapping and murder, Francis Simard life for the kidnapping charge, Lortie twenty years for kidnapping and Jacques Rose eight years for complicity to the kidnapping, after being acquitted of murder26 (Shepherd 1973: 2).

Though Pierre Laporte was killed, James Cross was not. He was eventually freed on December 3, 1970, nearly two months after his abduction, when his kidnappers were given safe passage to Cuba. Four men, two women and one child were allowed to leave Canada for Cuba: Marc Carbonneau, Yves Langlois, Jacques Lanctôt, his wife Suzanne and their child, and Jacques Cossette-Trudel and his wife Louise. James Cross was handed over to the Cuban consul and was released once the kidnappers had safely arrived in Cuba (Trait 1970: 218).27

The kidnappings may have been resolved, but as far as the federal and provincial governments were concerned, the FLQ issue was not. The day that Cross was liberated, the War Measures Act was replaced by the Public Order Act, which banned the FLQ and allowed

---

26 Jacques Rose was out on parole July 17, 1978. Bernard Lortie had been granted parole one day earlier; he had been out on day leave since January 1978 (Canadian Press 1978: 01). Francis Simard was released on parole in March 1982 after serving 11 years of his sentence (Canadian Press 1982: 2). Paul Rose, after initially being refused, was granted parole in December 1982 (Canadian Press 1982: 8). See also Globe and Mail (1983: 6).

27 All of the kidnappers eventually left Cuba for France and then returned to Canada by the early 1980s. All five pled guilty to the Cross kidnapping. Jacques and Louise Cossette-Trudel were sentenced in August 1979 to two years less a day for their roles in the kidnapping and were granted parole by July 1980. Jacques Lanctôt was sentenced to three years (Canadian Press 1980: 01). Marc Carbonneau, who returned to Canada in May 1981, was sentenced to 20 months in jail. And Yves Langlois, the last of the FLQ cell to return to Canada, in June 1982, received a sentence of 2 years less a day and 150 hours of community service. (Globe and Mail 1983: 6; Malarek 1982: 9). Nigel Barry Hamer, a sixth member of the cell who did not flee the country, was arrested only in 1980 and given a one-year prison sentence after pleading guilty (Canadian Press 1981: 9).
authorities to arrest suspects without a warrant (Globe and Mail 1971b: 4). This Act did not expire until April 30, 1971. Under the War Measures Act, more than 450 people were arrested and many, including Pierre Vallières and Charles Gagnon, were held without trial for months.\footnote{The Globe and Mail reported on February 20, 1971 (page 4) that the two had been refused bail a second time as they waited for their March 1 trial.}

Reactions to the federal government’s actions during the October Crisis were mixed: a telephone survey conducted in Quebec by Bellavance and Gilbert (1971) around the time of the crisis found that while 35 percent of Quebecers completely approved of the federal government’s actions, another 22.5 percent completely disapproved.\footnote{Though Bellavance & Gilbert state that the surveys were conducted between March 5 and 11 1970, they must have meant March 5-11 1971, since the questions in the survey referred to the invocation of the War Measures Act and the October Crisis itself, neither of which had taken place until after March 1970. Clearly, approval rates for the War Measures Act had declined in the months following its implementation, as the earlier survey in November revealed much higher levels of support.} Of those remaining, 31 percent were partially in support and another 11 refused to answer the question (1971: 47). An earlier CROP poll published in La Presse on November 28, 1970, listed support among Quebecers for the War Measures Act itself at close to 73 percent (quoted in Trait 1970: 209).

Public support for the Quebec Liberal Party remained strong in the years immediately following the October Crisis. In the next provincial election, held in October 1973, the Liberal Party increased its hold on the seats in the National Assembly, winning in 102 of 110 ridings. But while it may have seemed that nationalism and support for Quebec independence were waning, given the number of seats held by Liberals, this was not quite the case. On November 15, 1976, during the next provincial election, the Parti Québécois, which had won only 6 seats (but 30.8 percent of the popular vote) in 1973, won 71 (and 41 percent of the popular vote) this time, and René Lévesque became premier. Lévesque would lead Quebec into its first referendum on a new relationship with Canada.
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1.1.1.3 Language protection in Quebec: 1971-1979

As the disadvantaged position of the French language and francophones in Canada with respect to education, salaries, and opportunities became apparent in studies like that of the RCBB and criticized by groups as diverse as the FLQ, RIN and PQ, the Quebec government adopted measures to try to promote and protect the French language in Quebec. After the RCBB published its final report on bilingualism in Canada, the Quebec National Assembly passed the Loi pour promouvoir la langue française au Québec on November 28, 1969. This Act was the first in Quebec to mention a goal of making French the official language in the workplace and the preferred language for public signs. But it was in the 1970s, after the October Crisis, that language laws increasingly began to restrict the use of English in the province.

The Loi sur la langue officielle/Official Language Act was passed on July 31, 1974. This Act made French the official language of Quebec and its public administration. French also became the official version of any statute passed in the province. Further, the Act stipulated that official texts and documents from the public administration had to be written in French, that no one could be appointed, promoted or transferred to an administrative position in a public office unless he or she had an appropriate command of French, that employers had to draw up instructions, notices and communications to their staff in French (but could provide an English version if their staff were partly anglophone), that products needed to be labelled in French as well or companies would be subject to fines, and that public signs had to be in French or in French and another language. Finally, it mandated the language in which Quebec children could be taught: students needed to have “sufficient knowledge” of the language of instruction to be educated in that language, otherwise they had to be taught in French. This measure was to restrict allophone and francophone parents from enrolling their children in English-language
schools and exacerbating the fact that the number of francophones in Canada was declining.

This Act was followed in 1977 by the *Charte de la langue française/Charter of the French Language* (often referred to as Bill 101), which imposed further restrictions on the use of English in education, the workforce, and on public signs. Under the *Charter*, Quebec students were allowed to be educated in English only upon the request of their parents, and only if one of their parents had been educated in English in Quebec. Otherwise all students in Quebec had to attend French-language school, even if their parents had been educated in English in another Canadian province. The Charter made French the only language in which public signs and commercial advertisements were allowed to be written, and it established the Office de la langue française,\(^{30}\) which was given the task of defining and conducting Quebec’s policy on language research and terminology, and seeing that “the French language [became] as soon as possible, the language of communication, work, commerce and business in the civil administration and business firms” (*Charter of the French language* 1977: ¶ 595, section 100).

Many parts of the *Charter*, particularly section 58, which banned commercial advertisements, signs and posters from being in any language but French,\(^{31}\) were not universally popular in Quebec. When Taylor & Simard (1981) conducted a survey among 196 working- and upper-middle class\(^{32}\) Montrealers, they determined that 87 percent of the polled anglophones (defined as only those whose mother tongue was English) disagreed with Bill 101 and found it unjust compared to 20 percent of francophones (defined as only those whose mother tongue was French). By contrast, 77 percent of francophones believed the opposite: they agreed with the

---

30 In 2002, this office became the Office québécois de la langue française when the *Charte de la langue française* was modified for the first time since it came into effect in 1977. Their website can be found at: [http://www.olf.gouv.qc.ca/](http://www.olf.gouv.qc.ca/)

31 Unless a firm employed fewer than five employees (including the owner) and was posting signs within its own establishment.

32 Upper-middle class was defined as those with an average annual income of $24,971 and working class as those with an average annual income of $8,470 (1981: 62).
Bill and thought it just, but their opinion was shared by only 9 percent of anglophones.\textsuperscript{33}

Attitudes such as those described by Taylor & Simard would seem to play a role on the significant increase in net migration out of Quebec between 1976 and 1981. While the net migration from Quebec to other parts of Canada remained at approximately 52,000 in both the 1966-1971 and 1971-1976 periods, it rose to 106,300 between 1976 and 1981, the years immediately following the Charter and the first referendum. A study by Locher (1988) determined that while political conditions in Quebec and the language laws were part of the reason why 20 percent of the sample group left the province between 1978 and 1983, they were not the only cause. Economic reasons headed the list: 24.4 percent emigrated due to the job transfer of the head of household, 15.6 percent because of a new job offer for the head of household, and 20 percent to look for better economic advantages for the head of household. Language laws (17.8 percent) and political climate (11.1 percent) followed closely behind as the primary reason. But respondents were also asked for secondary reasons for emigrating, and here, 50 percent of respondents listed political conditions in Quebec. It seems, then, that the new language policies and factors such as the PQ’s rise to power had a significant impact on anglophone attitudes in Quebec in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Language policies were not, however, the only changes the PQ government was implementing in Quebec. Three years after its election into power, it drafted an important white paper that would set in motion the first of two sovereignty referenda.

\textsuperscript{33} While this study does break down the anglophone and francophone respondents by ethnicity, it does not specifically include the reactions of allophones. This is one example of studies that consider the issue of language in Canada (or specifically in Quebec) as bipolar rather than one involving various linguistic and cultural groups in Canada (e.g. aboriginal groups or immigrants whose first language is neither French nor English).
1.1.2 The 1980 Referendum on Sovereignty Association

In 1979, one year before the first Quebec referendum on sovereignty-association, the Quebec government, led by René Lévesque and the PQ, published a white paper titled *La nouvelle entente Québec-Canada: Proposition du gouvernement du Québec pour une entente d’égal à égal : la souveraineté-association*. This text opened with an outline of “our history”:

Nos ancêtres prirent racine en terre américaine au début du XVIIe siècle, au moment où les premiers colons anglais débarquaient sur la côte est des États-Unis. […] les Québécois se définirent progressivement comme des Nord Américains (1979: 3).

It then highlighted the ways that Quebec had been disadvantaged by Canadian federalism—conscription in the two world wars, lack of special status within the confederation, repeated intervention by the federal government into municipal affairs, lack of emphasis on the interests and aspirations of the francophone minority by the anglophone majority, etc—before listing a number of changes that would help reduce the disadvantages of federalism. The PQ government stressed a need to entirely administrate its own social security plan and to reject other solutions, including recognition of Quebec as a distinct society within the Canadian federation and renewed federalism, as these offers would not actually give Quebec more power. Its final sections were devoted to outlining the sovereignty-association proposal that would see Quebec granted the right to make its own laws, levy its own taxes and establish international relations but remain a member of NATO, NORAD and the British Commonwealth. Under the proposed association, Quebec would still use the Canadian dollar and people and goods would be able to pass freely between the Quebec-Canada borders (1979: 61-62). The white paper did not, however, specify the question that was to appear on the ballot, a missing detail that is
criticized by Kenny (1980: 146), among others. Instead, the text explained that the question would be revealed at the end of the year. Indeed, it was released seven weeks later, shortly before Christmas (Kenny 1980: 146).

This initial proposal for a sovereign Quebec associated economically with Canada was based on the notion that the Quebec people were distinct. Yet, noticeably absent from the first section, je me souviens, was an inclusive definition of the Quebec people. “Nos ancêtres,” seemingly the ancestors of all Quebeckers, were the French who came to Canada in the 17th century. Immigrants, anglophones and first nations did not seem to play a role in this version of Quebec history, unless they were part of the British group who colonized the Quebec people.

In fact, almost all of the arguments in the white paper rested exclusively on the perceived disadvantages French-speaking Quebeckers had had over the course of Canadian history: under-representation in the House of Commons, minority status in Canada, conscription crisis, etc. Robinson (1998) asserts that the white paper used binary opposition to cast Quebeckers as the victims and the Canadian federal government as the villains of this story. What Quebeckers needed to do, urged the white paper, was rise up and destroy their dependency on this villainous “other” (Robinson 1998: 113).

French-speakers, it would seem from reading the sovereignty-association proposal, were the only inhabitants of Quebec, while English speakers lived outside the province, as in the following example: “[T]he unitary dream of English Canadians, however, caused them to interpret Canadian federalism very differently from Quebeckers” (1979b: 16; emphasis added).\footnote{French version: “le rêve unitaire des Canadiens anglais leur fit, cependant, interpréter le fédéralisme canadien dans un sens tout différent de celui des Québécois” (1979: 16).} The proposal excluded the very audience it addressed in the English translation: Anglophones were not considered part of the society that was founded by “our ancestors” who, in 1774 won
their first political victory: “[T]he Québec Act made it possible for them [our ancestors] to live in French and be governed by French civil law. Though it was partly because the British hoped to find in our people an ally against the rebel American colonies, this victory was nonetheless a vitally important one” (1979b: 4; emphasis added).

In response to the white paper, the Liberal government published French and English versions of the beige paper: Choose Québec and Canada: A Working Document for the Members of the Québec Liberal Party.\textsuperscript{35} This text provided counter-arguments to each of the points raised by the PQ government in its white paper. The Liberal document acknowledged that “historic injustices” had taken place in the first century of federalism, but it highlighted measures that had since been taken to correct these issues. These steps included making New Brunswick bilingual and providing francophone minorities in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia with French-language education (1979: 58). It further emphasized that ethnic and First Nations communities should not be overlooked when defining the nature of Canada, because they helped make Canada not just a country of “two ‘majorities’” (1979: 62). The only choice for Quebecers, the document repeatedly stressed, was to vote No to the referendum question.

And, on May 20, 1980, when more than 85 percent of Quebecers went to the polls, the proposition was defeated by a vote of 59.6 percent to 40.4 percent. In his concession speech soon after the results were released, Lévesque promised that this defeat would be only until next time: à la prochaine fois. And despite (or perhaps because of) the defeat of its proposal, the PQ was re-elected one year later, during the next provincial election.

\textsuperscript{35} Choisir le Québec et le Canada : document de travail à l’intention des membres du Parti libéral du Québec.
1.1.3 After the 1980 Referendum: 1981-1994

Prime Minister Trudeau, it has been noted above, was focused on Canadian unity. But during his term in office, he was also intent on patriating the power to amend the Canadian Constitution. Until 1982, when the patriation process was finally complete, any changes to the Canadian Constitution had to be made by Great Britain, despite the fact that the Statute of Westminster had granted Canada independence from Britain in 1931. Trudeau’s goal was not a new one. As he himself notes, he was not the first prime minister to try to initiate the patriation process: Richard Bennett (1930-1935), William Lyon Mackenzie King (1935-1948), Louis St-Laurent (1948-1957), John Diefenbaker (1957-1963) and Lester B. Pearson (1963-1968) had all held unsuccessful federal-provincial constitutional conferences (Trudeau 1990: 375).

Ideally, patriating the Constitution should have helped unify Canada and given it, as Trudeau felt, “firm foundation for a national identity” (1990: 379). Yet this did not quite come to pass. Even before the Constitution was brought home to Canada, substantial disagreement existed between the provinces and the federal government regarding the powers each would have in certain areas, including natural resources, broadcasting and family law. When Ottawa decided to unilaterally patriate the Constitution, Manitoba, Newfoundland and Quebec asked their respective courts whether such an action would be legal, and the matter was eventually referred to the Supreme Court, which rendered its decision on September 28, 1981. Seven of the nine Supreme Court judges determined that unilateral patriation was indeed legal, but they added that substantial agreement at the provincial level—more than two provinces but less than all ten—would be necessary (Supreme Court 1981: 43; Trudeau 1990: 377-378; Privy Council 2001).

So, in 1982, the new Constitution was ratified by every Canadian province except Quebec, which wanted the federal government to grant the province special status within the federation, to stipulate that Quebec would maintain its right of veto over constitutional amendments, and to allow Quebec to abide by education guarantees for French and English minorities on a voluntary basis (Dunsmuir 1995). With this new Constitution, Quebec was bound by a Constitution it had not signed. Notes Balthazar (1995b): “This action may have been legal, but it was, and is, illegitimate in the eyes of most Quebeckers” (1995b: 523). Such was the state of affairs when Pierre Trudeau retired from politics in 1984 and Brian Mulroney, leader of the Conservative party, won the next federal election, succeeding Trudeau’s replacement, John Turner.

With the aim of including Quebec in the Constitution and rectifying this “illegitimacy,” two efforts were made under Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to modify the Constitution to include the “distinct society” clause and several of Quebec’s other requests. These unsuccessful attempts were the Meech Lake (1987-1990) and Charlottetown (1992) Accords.

The Meech Lake Accord, drafted in 1987 and signed by all ten provinces and the federal government, proposed, among other constitutional changes, the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society and a stipulation that at least three of the nine judges in the Supreme Court of Canada be members of the Quebec bar. The Accord was based on five conditions drafted by the Quebec government and deemed necessary for the province to support the Constitution. These conditions were: 1) recognition of Quebec as a distinct society, 2) increased provincial powers in immigration, 3) limitations on federal spending power, 4) a veto for Quebec in Constitutional matters, and 5) participation by Quebec in appointing Supreme Court judges (Johnson 1988: 5).

37 Phrases like “return Quebec to the Constitutional fold” are used to refer to the intention behind the Constitutional amendments. See, for instance, Addendum A of The Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons (1987).
One of first and arguably among the most influential figures to speak out against the accord was former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, who published an article in the *Toronto Star* on May 27, 1987 condemning the proposed distinct society addition and denouncing the Accord as one that would “render the Canadian State totally impotent” (reprinted in Trudeau 1988: 22). Later, he appeared before the Senate and the House of Commons, explaining why he believed the Accord was unacceptable and should be rejected. He focused specifically on reasons why capitulating to the five conditions would not be beneficial to Canada and would mean giving up powers the federal government should rightly have. According to Allen (1997), Trudeau’s objections were one of the main reasons the Accord was ultimately rejected (1997: 60-61). Another came along shortly afterward.

In December 1988, a year after Meech Lake had been drafted, the Supreme Court ruled in *Ford v. Quebec* that Section 58 of the *Charter of the French Language*, which stipulated that signs, posters and commercial advertisements must be only in French, was not justified under the Quebec *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*. Moreover, it determined that Section 69 of the *Charter of the French Language*, which restricted companies to using only the French version of their name in Quebec, was justified under neither the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* nor the Quebec *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*. It further declared that Section 69 was inconsistent with the *Constitution Act, 1982*. In response to this decision, the Quebec legislature invoked the notwithstanding clause of the *Charter* to extend Section 58 for five more years.

---


39 The “Notwithstanding” clause refers to section 33 of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which stipulates that any provincial legislature can decide to operate notwithstanding a provision included in section 2 or sections 7 to 15 of this Charter. Such a decision will cease to have effect after five years, though it can be renewed afterward. See the full text of the *Charter* at [http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/charter/](http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/charter/).

Section 58 of the *Charter of the French Language* was not modified until 1993, when Bill 86 was passed. Section 58 now stipulates that public signs, posters and commercial advertising can appear in French and
Luther (1997) argues that when Premier Bourassa claimed, after the notwithstanding clause had been invoked, that had Meech been in effect, the Supreme Court would have supported French-only signs in Quebec, these comments did not help bolster support from the rest of the country for the Meech Lake Accord (1997: 62). Nemni (1994) advances a similar argument when he states that Bourassa’s refusal to repeal the sign law angered many Canadians, particularly Quebec anglophones, and made them hostile to the proposed Accord (Nemni 1994: 185-86).

So, between 1987 and 1990, the year the Accord was to be ratified, three provinces, Newfoundland, Manitoba and New Brunswick, questioned the ‘distinct society’ clause for Quebec. When the Manitoba legislature ran out of time to vote, due in part to procedural delays initiated by MP Elijah Harper, Newfoundland decided not to hold a vote, since unanimous support would be impossible, and the Accord was effectively nullified (Dunsmuir 1995; Nouailhat 1992). As a consequence, notes Nemni, the period immediately after the Accord’s failure saw nationalism and support for sovereignty among Quebecers rise to more than 50 percent, higher than it had previously been (Nemni 1995: 37, footnote 6).

One year later, another attempt to modify the Constitution was undertaken. In 1991, the Privy Council published *Shaping Canada’s Future Together*, a set of proposals for renewing Canadian federalism. A Special Joint Committee was then established to travel across Canada to listen to the views of Canadians on these proposals, while the provinces and territories created forums to consult the public so that recommendations could be brought before the federal government. From March to August 1992, a series of 16 meetings took place. The first twelve were held in various Canadian cities by the Special Joint Committee, while the last four were

another language, provided that French is “markedly predominant”. See the full text of the Charter at http://www.olf.gouv.qc.ca/english/charter/index.html.
held by the prime minister and the provincial and territorial leaders. Following the final meeting on August 28, the Charlottetown Accord—named after the city in which this final session was held—was drawn up (McRoberts & Monahan 1993: 284-5).

A legal text was drafted based on this report in early October 1992. The federal government, all ten provinces, the two territories, the Assembly of First Nations, the Native Council of Canada, the Métis National Council and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada participated in the drafting process. 40 This draft stipulated that:

1) Quebec was a distinct society within Canada because of its French-speaking majority, unique culture and civil law tradition;

2) The role of the Quebec government and legislature was to preserve and promote Quebec’s distinct society;

3) Any bill affecting French language or culture could not be passed unless it were approved by a majority of senators and a majority of French-speaking senators;

4) Quebec would always be entitled to no fewer than 25 percent of the seats in the House of Commons; and

5) At least three Supreme Court judges must be from Quebec.

But it also proposed amendments not related to Quebec or francophones, among which were stipulations that:

1) Because the aboriginal peoples had been the first to govern Canada, they had the right to promote their languages, cultures, traditions and to ensure their governments were one of the three in Canada;

2) The two territories would never have fewer members in the House of Commons than they were currently entitled to; and

---

40 See the preface to the Draft Legal Text available in McRoberts & Monahan (1993: 313).
3) The aboriginal peoples had the right to self-government.\textsuperscript{41}

After this legal text had been drafted, a referendum was held across Canada on October 26, 1992, with Quebec holding its own vote simultaneously. Although more than 60 percent of voters in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and the Northwest Territories accepted the proposal,\textsuperscript{42} voters in the Yukon and the other provinces were not in favour; the Accord was ultimately defeated by a vote of 55 to 45 percent.

It has been argued that Quebec and the other six provinces that voted against the Accord did so for different reasons. McRoberts (1993), for instance, states that while the Accord appeared to adopt the constitutional projects of both Quebec and the rest of the country, the projects were considerably modified so that they would be acceptable to both sides. He argues that: “Rather than a mutual accommodation of the two projects we have a mutual frustration of them. As a result, neither Quebec nor English Canada (at least outside Ontario) was left with a clear reason to support the project” (1993: 254).

1.1.4 THE 1995 REFERENDUM ON SOVEREIGNTY

The failure of the two Accords led to growing dissatisfaction with Canadian federalism among most Quebec nationalists. And so, on October 30, 1995, a second referendum was called. This time, however, the question did not specify that a sovereignty-association relationship would exist between Canada and Quebec. Instead, it asked voters whether they wanted Quebec to become sovereign after formally offering Canada a new economic and political partnership.

Although the results were much closer than in 1980, the proposal was rejected by 50.56

\textsuperscript{41} This mention of the aboriginal peoples in the question of self-government within Canada shows the need to study the question of Quebec independence and nationalism not from a bi-polar point of view, where only Quebec on one hand and the rest of Canada on the other need to negotiate, but from a wider point of view in which various cultures and linguistic groups are considered.

\textsuperscript{42} Support was as high as 73 percent in PEI.
percent of Quebec voters. A significant linguistic divide existed between No and Yes voters, with most anglophones and allophones in Quebec voting against sovereignty (Gill 1995: 418): an analysis of voting patterns indicates that No side won in all but one of the ridings where francophones made up less than 75 percent of the population (Drouilly 1995-6: 126). Francophones, by contrast, were divided. Though most of them supported constitutional change, they did not all agree that sovereignty was the best way to achieve this goal, and many were swayed to vote No on the expectation that fundamental constitutional change would result afterward, based on comments made by Prime Minister Chrétien toward the end of the campaign (Gill 1995: 410-416).

Among those who did not support the provincial government’s proposal were Quebec’s First Nations. Some native groups in Quebec held their own referenda days before the Quebec-wide 1995 vote, and 96 percent of Cree, 95 percent of Inuit and 99 percent of French-speaking Montagnais voted against supporting Quebec sovereignty (Gill 1995: 416). These results give rise to questions about what would have happened had the Yes side won: would Quebec’s borders have changed in order to allow First Nations to remain in Canada? Would the borders have stayed the same with dissatisfied First Nations forced to remain in a new Quebec rather than the old Canada? Issues such as these were raised when the Liberal government, after the close referendum results, asked the Supreme Court to determine whether Quebec secession would be legal.

1.1.5 **Beyond the 1995 Referendum: 1996-2000**

Following the second referendum and the close results, the federal government, headed

---

43 In this referendum, 93.5 percent of registered voters went to the polls, the highest turnout for any vote in Canadian history since confederation (Drouilly 1995-96: 123).
by Liberal leader Jean Chrétien, began to implement plans in case of a referendum. According to Gill (1996), their intention was to ensure that in the event of another referendum, the question and consequences would be clear and all Canadians would have a say in whether Quebec should separate (Gill 1996: 634). Accordingly, the government referred to the Supreme Court to determine whether secession would be legal.

The Supreme Court determined that under international law and the Canadian Constitution, Quebec had no right to unilaterally secede from Canada. However, it also determined that the Quebec government had the right to hold referenda on any issue, and that in the event that a clear majority of Quebecers voted in favour of secession, Canada would have to negotiate with Quebec. This negotiation could take place only if a majority of Quebecers clearly supported secession (Clarity Act: preamble).

Following the decision of the Supreme Court, the Clarity Act was assented to June 29, 2000. The purpose of this Act is to “give effect to the requirement for clarity as set out in the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Quebec Secession” (Clarity Act, 2000, c. 26.). It stipulates that in the event of another referendum, the House of Commons must consider the question put to voters and determine, within thirty days, whether it is clear. In the event that the House of Commons decides the question is unclear, the federal government is under no obligation to negotiate with Quebec\(^4^4\) in the event of a Yes vote. Should the House of Commons conclude that the question is clear, and should the majority of voters agree to the question, the House of Commons must then consider: (1) the size of the majority that voted in favour of the secession; (2) the percentage of eligible voters who voted in the referendum; and (3) any other matters or circumstances it considers to be relevant. Only then can it determine whether or not a clear majority of Quebecers have expressed a desire to secede from Canada (Clarity Act: 2.2).

\(^4^4\) Or any other province that might hold a referendum on secession from Canada.
Finally, the Act stipulates that because no province can unilaterally separate from Canada, in the event of a clear Yes vote by a clear majority of Quebecers, the Constitution would have to be amended. All provincial governments and the federal government would therefore have to negotiate. Moreover, before an amendment could be made, the federal government would have to address the following issues during negotiations: division of assets and liabilities; any changes to provincial borders; aboriginal rights, interests and territorial claims; and the protection of minority rights (Clarity Act: 3.1-3.2).

Apart from seeking to determine the legality of unilateral separation and stipulating the need for a clear referendum question, the issue of Quebec secession has not been definitely resolved and continues to generate debate. As early as one year after the referendum, Gill (1996) argued the federal government had not actually taken any steps to actively convince Quebecers to vote No in any future referendum (1996: 635-36). One of its primary strategies instead has been to increase the federal government’s visibility in Quebec—a plan that ultimately led to the 2005 Sponsorship Scandal after the federal government tried to increase the federal government’s visibility in Quebec. Balthazar (1996) argues, however, that the post-referendum campaign to promote federalism across the country has been successful outside Quebec, where most Canadians feel that all provinces should be equal, but largely unsuccessful within Quebec. In a conclusion that is not dissimilar from that of McRoberts (1997), Balthazar suggests that promoting Canadian national unity will only widen the gap between Quebec and the rest of Canada, citing as evidence the fact that the government’s promotion of federalism has strengthened English Canada’s Canadianism but has not changed the point of view of many

---

45 Consider, for instance, the numerous editorials and press articles in and after November 2006, when Prime Minister Harper introduced a motion in the House of Commons “that this House recognize that the Québécois form a nation within a united Canada” (see, for instance, Thompson 2007: A3; Clark 2006: A1; Simpson 2008: A17, along with the Hansard debate for November 27, 2006)
Quebecers.

These arguments seem to be supported by surveys in Quebec: a 2001 poll conducted by Leger Marketing for the *Globe and Mail* found that although support for sovereignty had dropped since 1995, 44 percent of respondents would still vote Yes in the event of another referendum. Moreover, only 16.8 percent were satisfied with the current form of federalism, while 29.6 percent favoured renewed federalism\(^{46}\) and 27 percent sovereignty-association (Mackie 2001)\(^{47}\). The referendum issue is far from closed, nor has the question of Quebec’s role in the Canadian federation been resolved, as demonstrated by the ongoing debate on the House of Commons motion to recognize the “Québécois” as a nation within a united Canada.

---

\(^{46}\) More powers for Quebec, which would still remain a Canadian province.

\(^{47}\) Poll sample: 1008 Quebec residents. For a sample of this size, 19 times out of 20, the results obtained would be the same as those obtained if all eligible voters were questioned, within a margin of error of 3.4 percentage points, upward or downward (Mackay 2001).
SECTION 1.2: THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

1.2.0 FINDING A FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework that will be the basis for this thesis is derived from narrative theory, as outlined by Somers & Gibson (1994), Riessman (1993) and Baker (2006). This framework seems ideally suited to a project of this nature, for reasons that will be explained in this section and become evident over the course of this thesis. This section describes narrative theory, justifies why it has been chosen over other possible theoretical frameworks and explains how it has been adapted to study the paratexts surrounding the delimited catalogue translations.

1.2.1 DEFINING NARRATIVES

The term narrative is defined in various ways but is often used to refer to a form of communication that differs from other forms, such as description or exposition. Genette, for instance, defines récit (or narrative in the English translation)\(^{48}\) as “l’énoncé narratif, le discours oral ou écrit qui assume la relation d’un événement ou d’une série d’événements” (1972: 71), making narratives only those texts that relate events or series of events. Barthes (1977) and Prince (1987) are among those scholars who view narrative in a sense similar to Genette’s.\(^{49}\) However, Barthes (1977), among others, considers that narratives can be recounted through “articulated language, spoken or written, fixed or moving images, gestures, and the ordered mixture of all these substances” (1977: 79), while Prince asserts that a narrative needs a narrator, and specifically excludes dramatic performances as types of narratives (1987: 58).

This first sense of narrative is not, however, the one that has been adopted for this thesis. Narratives, according to Baker (2006), are “public and personal ‘stories’ that we subscribe to and that guide our behaviour” (2006: 19). Narratives, the “inescapable mode by which we

\(^{48}\) See page 25 of Gentte (1980).
\(^{49}\) Barthes, for instance, considers the narrative to be different from poetry or essays (1977: 79).
experience the world” (Baker 2006: 169), are constructed by human beings to make sense of reality, and they guide human behaviours and interactions (ibid.). People make sense of experience mainly by putting it in the form of narratives (Riessman 1993: 4; Baker 2006: 169; Somers & Gibson 1994: 38). Through narratives, which differ from one person to another, and from one group, community, nation or region to another, people relate their experiences and interpret the world around them.

Narratives do not have to be in written form. Baker cites examples of narratives told through visual, kinetic or oral media such as film, photography, ballet or oral tales (2006: 19). Indeed, Riessman (1993) analyzes narratives in the form of oral, first-personal accounts, while the authors in the collection edited by Hawthorn (1985) analyze both film and text, and the collected texts in Ryan (2004) explore narratives in the form of film, music, visual art, video games and graphic novels. This makes narrative a useful framework for the purposes of this thesis, which is to study not just the written material that frames the delimited catalogue works, but also the visual, namely book covers. And so, in this thesis, book cover images, text, and colours are studied as specific examples of narrative frames in Section 3.2.6.

As many scholars (e.g. Baker 2006; Riessman 1993, Somers & Gibson 1994) stress, “social life is itself storied and narrative is an ontological condition of social life” (Somers & Gibson 1994: 38, original emphasis); that is, people construct identities on the basis of stories, their experiences are developed through narrative, and they make sense of what has happened and will happen to them by incorporating these happenings into narratives (ibid.). Thus, narratives figure in all aspects of our lives, and not just in literature or folk/fairy tales. As Toolan (1988) points out, for instance, scientific accounts of experiments are simply a form of narrative. New scientific theories are generated to bring “enhanced descriptive or explanatory
power” to existing narratives, while laws can be seen as a changeable story “about socially impermissible conduct and the means of redress available when such conduct is exposed” (1988: xiv). As the typology of narratives in Section 1.2.3 illustrates, every field has multiple narratives circulating within it, some of which are dominant in certain places at a given time period. Narratives, then, affect all aspects of human life: all events or actions must be subjectively understood and communicated through narratives. This definition, which has been adopted throughout this thesis, is the existential view of narrative; such approaches to narrative “try to capture what it means for us to produce (or receive) narratives” (Ryan 2004: 3). She elaborates:

The existential type [of narrative exploration] [...] tells us that the act of narrating enables humans to deal with time, destiny, and morality; to create and project identities; and to situate themselves as embodied individuals in a world populated by similarly embodied subjects. It is in short a way, perhaps the only one, to give meaning to life. Through narrative we also explore alternate realities and expand our mental horizon beyond the physical, actual world—toward the world of dreams, phantasms, possibilities, and counter factuality (Ryan 2004: 2-3).

And finally, a note about the terms narrative and story. A number of researchers who work in narrative studies do not use these terms interchangeably. Genette (1972) proposed using different terms to distinguish between the various senses of récit (or narrative) to help avoid ambiguity:

[...] l’analyse du discours narratif telle que je l’entends implique constamment l’étude des relations, d’une part entre ce discours et les événements qu’il relate

---

50 Or, of course, to completely replace existing narratives, such as Galileo’s narrative that the sun, rather than the Earth, is the centre of the universe.
(récit au sens 2), d’autre part entre ce même discours et l’acte qui le produit, réellement (Homère) ou fictivement (Ulysse) : récit au sens 3. Il nous faut donc dès maintenant, pour éviter toute confusion et tout embarras de langage, désigner par des termes univoques chacun de ces trois aspects de la réalité narrative. Je propose, sans insister sur les raisons d’ailleurs évidentes du choix des termes de nommer histoire le signifié ou contenu narratif (même si ce contenu se trouve être, en l’occurrence, d’une faible intensité dramatique ou teneur événementielle), récit proprement dit le signifiant, énoncé, discours ou texte narratif lui-même, et narration l’acte narratif producteur et, par extension, l’ensemble de la situation réelle ou fictive dans laquelle il prend place (1972: 72).51

Genette repeats this distinction more concisely in Nouveau discours du récit (1983): “histoire (l’ensemble des événements racontés), récit (le discours, oral ou écrit, qui les raconte) et narration (l’acte réel ou fictif qui produit ce discours, c’est-à-dire le fait même de raconter)” (1983: 10). English-speaking theorists have reformulated this distinction with terms that will be used throughout this thesis. Riessman, for instance, stresses that the terms narrative and story are not interchangeable in narrative theory. Narratives are “discrete units, with clear beginnings and endings” (1993: 17), but not all oral narratives are stories “in the linguistic sense of the term” (1993: 18), by which she means that not all narratives have the “protagonists, inciting conditions, and culminating events” (18) that one expects to find in stories. Some narratives, for instance, are descriptions of recurring events with no climax, while others are hypothetical depictions of events that did not happen. Likewise, Abbott (2002) defines narrative as the “representation of an event or a series of events” (12), asserting that narratives consist of a story

---

51 In the English translation, these terms are the same as those later used by English-language scholars such as Abbott and Czarniawska. Récit became narrative, histoire is story and narration has been translated as narrating.
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—an event or sequence of events—and the narrative discourse—the way in which the story is related (2002: 16). Without an event or action, Abbott stresses, a narrative cannot be present, though description, exposition, argument or lyric, for instance, may. Other theorists also comment on the distinction between narratives and stories: Czarniawska (2004), for example, considers narratives “purely chronological accounts” and stories “emplotted narratives” (2004: 17). She explains that a narrative becomes a story only when it has a plot. It must begin in some state of equilibrium and, following a series of actions or events, reach another state of equilibrium that may or may not be identical to the first (2004: 19). The distinction between story and narrative, however, seems unnecessary for the purposes of this thesis, and the sense of narrative adopted by Baker—in which “narratives are the stories we tell ourselves and other people about the world(s) in which live” and in which “the terms ‘narrative’ and ‘story’ can be used interchangeably” (2006: 169)—has been adopted throughout this thesis.

1.2.2 Why Use Narrative Analysis

To explain why narrative analysis is well-suited as a theoretical framework for this thesis, I would like to return to the goals of this project, as stated in the introduction. The first is to determine which works were published and translated in Canada between 1968 and 2000 on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda. As Part 2 will illustrate, these works are diverse in nature, and although difficult to classify, they have been categorized in a way that accounts for the diverse facets of the delimited catalogue: polemical, political and historical texts. Narrative analysis—as proposed by Baker—is suited to studying texts from various fields (e.g. political science, history) and of various types (e.g. polemical

52 In this sense, the features Baker ascribes to narrative make it a story, as she asserts that “only when events are emplotted [do] they ‘take on narrative meaning’” (2006: 67).
essay, political analysis, report), even if each text, in its entirety, is not necessarily a narrative in the strictest sense. Baker has adapted narrative theory so that it can be applied to translation studies, and in particular to texts, like those in the delimited catalogue, that address controversial and politicized subjects. Her approach, then, seems apt for a study such as this one.

In addition, the wide definition of the terms narrative and story adopted for this thesis allows the delimited catalogue works to be explored as examples of personal, public and conceptual stories (cf. Section 1.2.3)—in the widest sense of the term—about Canada. In some of these narratives, Canada’s current form of federalism is fundamentally flawed and needs to be replaced or reconceived. In others, the Quebec nation would be able to more fully develop if it were no longer a part of Canada. These works, which do not necessarily all narrate events, are still constructing a particular version of reality, one that applies to Canada in the twentieth century. These stories are, in many ways, no different than those historiographer Hayden White refers to when he notes that:

[...] most of the important theoretical and ideological disputes that developed in Europe between the French Revolution and World War I were in reality disputes over which group might claim the right to determine of what a “realistic” representation of social reality might consist. One man’s “reality” was another man’s “utopia,” and what appeared to be the quintessence of a “realistic” position on one issue might represent the quintessence of “naiveté” from a different perspective of that same issue (White 1973: 46).

Exploring these histories as narratives provides a framework for exploring how “reality” has been shaped by various Canadian writers. This is because narratives are interpretations of
reality, and not reality itself, a point emphasized by White (1973) and Baker (2006), among others. White (1973), for instance, notes that historical works—of which the delimited catalogue is largely comprised—are “verbal structure[s] in the form of a narrative prose discourse that [purport] to be a model, or icon, of past structures and processes in the interest of explaining what they were by representing them” (1973: 2, original emphasis). Similarly, Riessman notes “[h]uman agency and imagination determine what gets included and excluded in narrativization, how events are plotted, and what they are supposed to mean. Individuals construct past events and actions in personal narratives to claim identities and construct lives” (1993: 2). Finally, Baker asserts that narratives construct, rather than represent, reality (2006: 148). In this thesis, narratives published circa 1968-2000 will be used to study how historical events are interpreted in different ways by each author and how the various linguistic and cultural groups in Canada are portrayed in sometimes conflicting ways.

Which brings us to the second, equally important goal of this thesis: to determine how the delimited catalogue narratives were reframed for TL readers by translators, editors, publishers, or other agents.53 Here again, Baker’s framework proves useful. She discusses the role such agents play, noting that framing is an “active strategy that implies agency” and a way for us to “consciously participate in the construction of reality” (2006: 106). Studying frames—which have by definition been actively prepared—provides a way to explore what reasons TL readers were given for why they should read works not originally addressed to or intended for them and which, in some cases (e.g. Richler’s Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!) criticize or insult the TL audience by making disparaging remarks about their ancestors, customs, language or laws. The advantage of using the concept of frames to analyze the delimited catalogue is that more works from the catalogue can be explored, since only such paratextual material as prefaces and

53 Frames are discussed in greater detail in Section 1.2.4, and the concept is applied in Parts 3 and 4.
introductions are selected from the delimited catalogue for closer study. This way, general trends in the catalogue can be determined—in Part 3—and then—in Part 4—these general trends can be compared to two specific cases that more fully explore the framing strategies outlined by Baker (2006). If the concept of framing were not adopted as the main theoretical framework for this thesis, only one or two works from the catalogue could have reasonably been studied in detail, and general trends would have been limited.

Finally, the concept of narratives is an intriguing way to explore Canadian culture. Riessman (1993) explains that “[…] culture ‘speaks itself’ through an individual’s story. […] Narrators speak in terms that seem natural, but we can analyze how culturally and historically contingent these terms are” (1993: 5). Thus, using the concept of narratives to study the works published in Canada on the topics of Quebec independence, nationalism and the referenda will help show how the various cultures in Canada have imagined and portrayed themselves. Particular focus will be placed on the way translators, publishers, reviewers and authors have labelled, repositioned or otherwise framed the narratives in the delimited catalogue. Narrative analysis as the basis for this thesis therefore seems to offer some intriguing aspects of study and a perspective on translation that has not been exhaustively explored.

1.2.3 Types of Narratives

Narratives can be divided into several types. Because the groupings differ from one scholar to another, the typology that has been adopted for this thesis is that of Baker (2006), which is in turn based on the typology of Somers & Gibson (1994). Because Baker has focused on translation studies, her categorization seems well-suited to the study of translation and narrative. According to Somers & Gibson, four main types of narratives exist: personal, public,
conceptual and master. Let us begin by exploring each of these more closely.

1.2.3.1 Personal narratives

Baker uses the term personal narratives to refer to the concept of ontological narratives described by Somers & Gibson (1994). They define ontological (or personal) narratives as the stories actors use to “make sense of [... and] act in” their lives (1994: 61). According to Baker, personal narratives are those told by a person to relate his or her history and place in the world (Baker 2006: 28). The term personal narrative is also used by Riessman (1993), who explains that narrating the past, or telling stories about past events, “seems to be a universal human activity” used by people from all social backgrounds and in various settings (1993: 3).

Personal narratives are social and interpersonal; agents “adjust stories to fit their own identities” and will also “tailor ‘reality’ to fit their stories” (Somers & Gibson 1994: 61). But personal narratives are not simply biographies or oral stories. Some of the works cited in Section 1.1 are personal narratives. These include Marcel Chaput’s Pourquoi je suis séparatiste (1961) and Pierre Vallières’ Nègres blancs d’Amérique (1968). Many other works that will be studied in Part 2 are also personal narratives. This category will therefore be further explored in the next part of this thesis.

1.2.3.2 Public narratives

According to the typology offered in Somers & Gibson (1994), public narratives are those “attached to cultural and institutional formations larger than the single individual, to intersubjective networks or institutions” (1994: 62). Baker expands this definition by stating that such narratives are stories elaborated by and circulating within social formations and
institutions, including family, religious, literary or educational institutions, the media or a nation (Baker 2006: 33).

As Baker asserts, several narratives may compete in the same public space at the same period of time. Various versions of the same public narratives circulated simultaneously within Canada during the 1968-2000 period: as Part I has demonstrated, the narrative of Quebec’s history circulated by the PQ in 1979 differed considerably from that circulated by the Liberal Party in the same year. While the PQ’s narrative focused on the injustices faced by French Canadians over the course of Canadian history, the Liberal Party’s narrative focused on the steps that had been taken to correct these injustices.

These contrasting public narratives elaborated by two political parties help illustrate four specific features of narratives, as outlined by Somers & Gibson (1994) and Baker (2006): relationality of parts, causal emplotment, selective appropriation, and temporality, sequence and place.\(^{54}\) Narratives are connected, related parts (relationality) that are selected (selective appropriation) and put together in some sort of order (causal emplotment) and firmly anchored in a particular time and place (temporality, sequence and place) (Somers & Gibson 1994: 59-60). In both the 1979 PQ and Liberal narratives, select events have been included. The Liberals have focused on the fact that French Canadians outside Quebec had been given additional rights over the years: New Brunswick had been made bilingual and French-language education had been provided to francophone minorities in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia (1979: 58). These facts were selected and ordered to counteract the PQ argument that francophones (specifically francophone Quebecers) had been disadvantaged by the current form of Canadian federalism. The PQ focused on specific injustices to support its

\(^{54}\) Note: these features are not particular to public narratives but can be found in all types of narratives. They are mentioned here only for the sake of convenience.
Conclusion that sovereignty-association was not only reasonable, but necessary. These narratives are embedded in the Canadian political situation in 1979: the Charter of the French Language had come into effect in 1977, increasing the use of French in Quebec, and the PQ, elected to power in 1976, had promised a referendum on Quebec’s status in Canada by the end of its term.

The ways in which people act are based on expectations, memories and projections in public narratives. For this reason, personal narratives such as Vallières’ (1968) and Richler’s (1992) are invariably influenced by other narratives (past or present public/personal/conceptual/master narratives) circulating within local and international cultural, political and social groups. This aspect of narratives will be explored in greater depth in the case studies of Vallières and Richler for reasons explained in section 1.2.4 below.

1.2.3.3 Conceptual narratives

Baker uses the term conceptual narratives to refer to “disciplinary narratives in any field of study” (Baker 2006: 39, original emphasis). In doing so, she expands the Somers & Gibson definition, which includes only narratives within the social sciences (1994: 62). Conceptual narratives are circulated and generated by researchers in a given field. Similar to both personal and public narratives, conceptual narratives may be circulated by a single scholar in a particular field (much like a personal narrative), or may instead be widely circulating among many researchers (much like a public narrative). Competing narratives may shift to the centre from the periphery of a field—and vice versa—as they are circulated and repeated by more or fewer scholars in the discipline.

Conceptual narratives can also slip into the public sphere: Baker cites an example of Stuart Mill’s History of British India, a 19th-century history text that helped perpetuate the public narrative that Indians were “‘wild’, ‘barbaric’, ‘savage’ and ‘rude’” (Baker 2006: 39). An
example more relevant to this thesis is that of the *filles du roi*, who, as Part 4 will demonstrate, have been labelled “hookers” (Richler 1992: 102), “generally well-brought up orphans” (Mathieu 1977) and “choice emigrants” (Lanctôt 1964: 152) in various public and conceptual texts, the term having slipped from history texts into the public sphere, and competing narratives having circulated at various periods.

1.2.3.4 Master narratives

Somers & Gibson use the term *metanarratives* to refer to the “‘master-narratives’ in which we are embedded as contemporary actors in history and as social scientists” (1994: 63). Throughout this thesis, the term *master narrative* is used to describe this concept. In addition the definition has been expanded to include not just “social scientists,” but all researchers. This means both “actors in history” and “researchers in general” are influenced not only by public and conceptual narratives, but also by narratives operating on a larger scale. Baker explains that master narratives are narratives that are shared across multiple countries or cultures. Master narratives are thus larger than public narratives, because they circulate within multiple groups at the same time. All theories and concepts, indeed all other narratives, are “encoded with aspects of these master narratives,” although we may be completely unaware of their influence (Somers & Gibson 1994: 63). Examples of past or contemporary master narratives include the narratives of Capitalism vs. Communism or the War on Terror.

However, while these master narratives may be shared across multiple countries, they are not always identical in various places. As Baker asserts, different versions of a master narrative may exist; master narratives may even be contested by certain groups (Baker 2006: 45). For instance, the War on Terror master narrative might exist in France, Britain and the United States, but would vary from one country to another. Master narratives circulating in Canada and abroad
between 1968 and 2000—and relevant to the issues discussed in this thesis—might include Nationalism and Socialism vs. Capitalism.

The concept of master narratives was developed by Lyotard in *La condition postmoderne*, where he discusses the concepts of grand récit and métarécit (1979: 57; 63). However, he argues within this essay that:

Dans la société et la culture contemporaine, société postindustrielle, culture postmoderne, la question de la légitimation du savoir se pose en d’autres termes. Le grand récit a perdu sa crédibilité, quel que soit le mode d’unification qui lui est assigné : récit spéculatif, récit de l’émancipation (1979: 3).

In his foreword to the English translation of *La condition postmoderne*, Fredric Jameson suggests that although “the older master-narratives of legitimation no longer function in the service of scientific research—nor, by implication, anywhere else (e.g., we no longer believe in political or historical teleologies, or in the great ‘actors’ and ‘subjects’ of history—the nation-state, the proletariat, the party, the West, etc.)” (Jameson 1984: xi-xii), these master narratives have not disappeared *per se*, but have instead passed underground. They have an unconscious effect on the way in which we currently think an act and persist in “our ‘political unconscious’” (ibid.).

Whether master narratives do influence our thinking today—unconsciously or otherwise—is an intriguing question, but not one that will be answered or explored in this thesis, as it falls outside the goals set for this project. Moreover, numerous public, personal and conceptual narratives were already circulating during the 1968-2000 period about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda, so these three types of narratives already provide a large framework for study, and their role in Canada with respect to these
topics is very clear—unlike the role of master narratives, which have, according to some researchers, lost their place in contemporary society.

1.2.3.5 Categorization problems

As with any method of categorization, this typology is not perfect, and the categorization of some narratives can be particularly difficult. Some public narratives, for instance, verge on master narratives, while some conceptual narratives become public narratives. Consider the example of French-speaking Quebecers as a dominated, exploited and conquered people, a narrative expressed in similar ways by Marcel Chaput (1961: 19), the Parti Pris (1963: 3), the FLQ in 1963 (reprinted in Comeau, Cooper & Vallières 1990: 15), Pierre Vallières (1968: 26), and even, to a certain extent, the 1962 Liberal Party (reprinted in Lapalme 1988: 338) and the Parti Québécois (1979b: 4): this narrative circulated in both the public and personal spheres, although by the mid to late 1960s it is probably best described as a public narrative, given its wide circulation by political parties and the French-Canadian press. Alternatively, the Quiet Revolution narrative circulated in both public and conceptual spheres. Originally attributed to a Globe and Mail reporter writing about the changes that had occurred in Quebec since 1960 (Linteau et al. 1989: 421), this narrative about Québec’s modernization also appears in history and political science texts (e.g. Linteau et al 1989: 421-423; Thomson 1984; McRoberts 1997). Narratives such as these are often difficult to classify as entirely belonging to one category or another. Moreover, these categories often change over time; what may have started out as a conceptual narrative may later become a public narrative, just as personal narratives can easily become public narratives when they are echoed by public institutions. But while the categorization outlined in this section may be problematic in some cases, for the most part it is a
useful way of describing and grouping the various narratives that influence one another. Any labels used to describe the narratives from the delimited catalogue should for this reason not be considered definitive, but rather one way of categorizing the narrative at a given place and time.

1.2.4 Framing Narratives

The way a narrative is interpreted depends not just on what other public, conceptual and personal narratives are circulating in the reader’s sociocultural situation; it also depends greatly on how these narratives are framed. Narrative framing functions in two ways: it sets the status of and/or discloses an attitude toward a narrative (Young 2004: 77). Thus, frames indicate that a narrative is, for instance, a political analysis, biography, novel or diary, and that it is objective or subjective, separatist or federalist, relevant or irrelevant to the current political situation, etc.

So what then, distinguishes a narrative from a narrative frame? This is a question that needs to be answered before I analyze the frames surrounding the delimited catalogue works. The difficulty stems from the fact that Baker seems to use the term in several senses. While she defines frames as “structures of anticipation, strategic moves that are consciously initiated in order to present a narrative in a certain light” (2006: 167, emphasis added), she occasionally uses the term in a way that makes it appear to be a feature of narratives rather than an element that reshapes how a narrative is received. For instance:

If frame ambiguity is a feature of everyday life, then we should expect this to be reflected in the texts and utterances we translate and interpret, but this ambiguity is often resolved or obscured in translation. Bongie’s (2005) analysis of The Slave-King, the English translation of Victor Hugo’s novel Bug-Jargal, offers one

---

55 Baker, of course, is not alone. She quotes several scholars who use the terms frames, framework, and framing in a variety of ways (2006: 105).
example of this phenomenon. While Hugo’s text reveals an ambivalent attitude to slavery, the English version resolves this frame ambiguity and presents the reader with a narrative that is unequivocally anti-slavery (2006: 108, emphasis added).

Here, Baker presents framing as a way to narrate events (Hugo’s ambivalent attitude toward slavery in Bug-Jargal is “frame ambiguity”), even though she has defined frames as ways of presenting a narrative, while the translation is a narrative, even though Baker is using this chapter on framing to argue that “translation may be seen as a frame in its own light” (2006: 106). So are translations frames or narratives? Is framing a strategy for situating events—much like narratives—or are frames distinct from narratives, and a way of situating narratives?

The distinction is blurred even further when Baker discusses the notion of framing through labelling: “[...] the labelling by UK newspaper The Sun of the 1991 massive bombardment of Iraq as blitz on Baghdad (18 January 1991) is a euphemism that ‘reduces the slaughter to a game of alliteration’” (Baker 2006: 123, original emphasis). Here, she is describing labelling, a feature of framing rather than a feature of narratives, and yet the blitz label is clearly being used in a public narrative, namely the one circulated in the UK by The Sun. What, then, distinguishes a frame from a narrative?

Obviously some clarity is needed if the term is to be used as the basis for this thesis. If we return to Baker’s definition, frames are initiated to present a narrative in a certain way. What is important in this definition, in terms of this thesis, is the idea that frames present narratives. Framing is therefore not a strategy for presenting events, or for shaping how a series of events are selected, ordered and emplotted. Rather, it is a strategy for constructing how these narratives are presented to others. Frames can therefore be considered a special type of narrative: they are stories about stories. Frames can share many of the features of narratives (they can be circulated
by public institutions or private individuals, for instance, or they can allude to selected events that have been ordered in a particular way), but what distinguishes a frame from a narrative is its ultimate purpose. While narratives allude to select events and present these events in a certain way to construct a particular reality, frames can allude to events and present them in a certain way to reshape how a particular narrative is received or interpreted. The goal of a narrative is to present a story about “reality”; the goal of a frame is to present a story about a narrative. In this sense, frames are akin to paratexts: the elements that accompany, surround, prolong and present a work (literary or not) (Genette 2002: 7). Throughout this thesis, then, the concept of framing will be equated with paratexts, as defined and explained in Section 3.1.

But translations can also act as frames, as Baker argues. She considers translation a means of reframing a narrative: it is an “interpretive frame” in more than the basic sense of reinterpreting source-language words for the target language. Indeed, it is a frame in “many more ways, some of which remain concealed from direct observation by most readers and/or hearers” (2006: 107). While translations are not paratexts in Genette’s typology, they do fit the definition of frames, given that a translation interprets a ST narrative, and then presents this narrative to TL readers.56

An example here, of how translators can actively reframe narratives can be found in Moskop (1990). While he does not address the concept of frames or even narratives, Moskop does show how various translation strategies reframe a text to match an institution’s goals. For instance:

[...] while idiomatic translation may well perform such useful functions as making

56 One might argue that translations could be considered narratives in their own right, particularly if the TT is studied without reference to the ST. However, as with other frames, the purpose of a translation differs from the purpose of a narrative. The narrative has been constructed to present “reality” in a certain way, using such features as plots and selected, ordered events, but the translation has been constructed to present the source text in a certain way, just as frames like prefaces, book covers, and book reviews present a narrative in a given way.
it easy for a Francophone to read income-tax instructions originally drafted in English, it also conveys the false impression that the federal tax department and taxation authorities are somehow “French”. Idiomatic translation by its nature conjures up a certain image of the state which does not correspond to reality since, given the demographics of Canada, the federal public service and the federal law-making and regulatory agencies are, and are likely to remain, predominantly in the hands of Anglophones even if Francophones are represented in proportion to their numbers (1990: 347).

Later, he expands on this idea by discussing the disadvantages to idiomatically translating René Lévesque’s resignation letter (i.e. avoiding the use of gallicisms or French syntax). Mossop argues that the unidiomatic translation of this letter published in the Globe and Mail is the “right approach” because

most of the readers of the Globe would have heard Lévesque speaking English on television and would expect him to sound odd in English. Even though this is writing and not speech, a rendering which made him sound like the premier of an English-speaking province would clash with his television English. Second, this is something of a historical and biographical document, so rather than trying to find “equivalents”, it is worth mimicking Lévesque’s rhetoric (syntactic style, word choices, images), in order both to render his unique voice and to avoid any impression that the text originated in English Canada (1990: 350).

These two examples serve to show how public institutions (the federal government and the English Canadian press) can reframe a text by translating it idiomatically or not. Both strategies result in a different narrative being presented to the TL audience. With an idiomatic
translation of Lévesque’s letter, he would be presented as a Quebec politician who writes fluent English, while the unidiomatic translation presents Lévesque as someone who writes English awkwardly, but also as someone who is expressing himself as TL readers are accustomed to hearing him speak English. As these two arguments demonstrate, translation itself acts as a frame for narratives, greatly influencing how they will be received in the target culture. An idiomatic translation can, among other things, disguise the fact that a text is a translation, which can in turn help disseminate ideas as though they had originated in the target culture rather than elsewhere. Conversely, an unidiomatic translation can have various effects, among which are clearly indicating to readers that a speaker is part of an Other.

As Baker has argued, these frames show agency, and the way in which a text is framed will show the intentions of the agent who has adopted a particular translation strategy. Part 4 explores how translation acts as a frame, while Part 3 examines how the translations have been framed by various agents, including translators, publishers, authors, scholars and politicians. The frames studied in Part 3 are the paratextual material that accompanies and comments on the narratives that were selected for translation during the 1968-2000 period. This material includes titles, introductions, prefaces, forewords, biographies, book covers and press and academic reviews, which sometimes offer conflicting interpretations of the same narrative. The various strategies that can be used to frame a narrative are discussed in greater detail in Parts 3 and 4 of this thesis.

1.2.5 NARRATIVE ANALYSIS VS. CRITICAL AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Both political discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis were considered possible theoretical frameworks for this thesis but were ultimately rejected. Political discourse analysis
and narrative analysis do have common aspects. Chilton & Schäffner (2002), for instance, describe the subjective nature of political discourse analysis as follows:

[...] the analysis of political discourse, especially where the analyst has a critical purpose, must acknowledge that the analysis is not an objective discovery procedure but an engagement with text and talk, in which the analyst *qua* social actor cannot afford to ignore, in all scientific honesty, his or her a priori implication in a system of values (2002: 27).

As with political discourse analysis, subjectivity is key to narrative analysis. According to the existential definition of narratives, no one—researchers included—is able to understand the world except through the personal, public, conceptual and master narratives in which he or she is embedded. For this reason, narrative analysis is a particularly useful way of studying texts: it removes all claims to objectivity and provides a way for many researchers to explore the same material and arrive at different conclusions. Every analysis is another narrative that complements or contradicts others.

Theorists such as Schäffner (1997; 2004), have stressed the need to combine political discourse analysis and translation studies, and such a study would have been possible here. Schäffner explains that political discourse relies on translation and she highlights instances where certain translated keywords have led to politicians being criticized by an international audience for their comments (2004: 121).

Both political discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis, she notes, have focused on the use of keywords in texts to achieve political goals (2004: 121). However, when the text being analyzed is a translation, political discourse seldom considers the source text. Her arguments provide a basis for studying delimited catalogue texts by examining thematic
“keywords.” This would provide a means to explore how the source and target texts may have been used to achieve, support or argue against a political goal.

Schäffner asserts that politics is a wide notion, since any topic can become political or politicized, and since what is considered political depends on the participants. Yet some forms of communication are more political than others, such as those that discuss the political ideas, beliefs and practices of a society—usually textbooks or academic texts—and those that help define a political community or group—usually treaties, manifestos, or political speeches (2004: 119). However, as Part 2, Section 1 demonstrates, the works in the delimited catalogue are diverse in nature, and not all can be classified as political. In addition, political discourse analysis does not provide a framework for assessing the way that the delimited catalogue texts have been repositioned through paratextual material.

Critical discourse analysis takes the focus on subjectivity one step further than other types of discourse analysis, but it too, has been rejected as a theoretical framework for one reason in particular: namely that critical discourse analysts are actively encouraged to take a political stance. Consider, as Van Dijk notes in “Principles of critical discourse analysis” that:

Unlike other discourse analysts, critical discourse analysts (should) take an explicit sociopolitical stance: they spell out their point of view, perspective, principles and aims, both within their discipline and within society at large. [...] their work is admittedly and ultimately political. Their hope, if occasionally illusory, is change through critical understanding. Their perspective, if possible, that of those who suffer most from dominance and inequality. Their critical targets are the power elites that enact, sustain, legitimate, condone or ignore social inequality and injustice (Van Dijk 1993: 252).
Section 1.2: Theoretical Overview

The concept of the researcher as a subjective person is present here in critical discourse analysis too, yet narrative analysis still seems better suited to the goals of this thesis. First, many groups in Canada have argued that they suffered most from dominance and inequality during the 1968-2000 period: many French Quebeckers—particularly activists such as Vallières—argued that francophones in Quebec were a dominated culture that had been historically disadvantaged by English-speaking Canadians. Conversely, Quebec anglophones such as Richler (1992) have argued that such an interpretation of Canadian history is wrong and that Francophone Quebeckers were not oppressed in Canada: “English-speaking Canada, far from stifling Quebec, has acted—and could continue to act—as a committed partner, a buffer, shielding its culture from the rest of an English-speaking continent that Quebeckers perceive as a threatening force” (Richler 1992: 239). And minorities within Quebec have also felt oppressed during this period: anglophones and allophones residing in Quebec after the Quiet Revolution, for instance, saw many restrictions placed on their right to choose the language of their children’s education when Bill 101 was passed, while native groups were largely ignored in the version of “Our history” circulated by the Parti Québécois in 1979 (1979: 3). With critical discourse analysis, I as a researcher would have to take a political stance and clearly espouse the point of view of one or more of these groups. What seems more intriguing is studying the competing narratives during this time and the ways in which they were framed for the source- and target-language audiences. Such questions can then be complemented by an analysis of how these particular narratives came to be constructed and framed in these ways rather than arguing whether (and why) one narrative is more deserving of support. Because critical discourse analysts should take an explicit sociopolitical stance, narrative analysis seems better suited to the goals of this thesis, which are to explore what narratives were circulating in English and French in Canada and how
the translations were framed for various groups in the country.

Finally, discourse analysis—whether political or critical—must necessarily focus on texts. Narratives, however, are present in not just written works, but also in art and other visual forms. Looking at the delimited catalogue using narratives allows book covers to be explored as examples of visual frames that function in ways similar to written frames such as introductions, postscripts, book reviews and interviews. The visual frames of the delimited catalogue TTs merit closer study, and narrative analysis allows such elements to be examined.

1.2.6 A FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING NARRATIVES

Because this thesis uses narrative theory as the basis for analyzing the delimited catalogue, a framework for this analysis needs to be developed. Approaches focusing specifically on linguistics (e.g. Toolan 1988) have been considered, but were ultimately rejected. As Part 2 illustrates, the number of texts written on Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the two referenda and translated into English or French between 1968 and 2000 is too large for a detailed analysis of each work. Moreover, such an analysis is not one of the goals of this study, nor would it provide a framework for exploring visual frames. True, Richler (1992) and Vallières (1968) are case studies analyzed in detail in Part 4 but the focus is mainly on the paratextual material surrounding these narratives rather than on the narratives themselves. Moreover, in Part 2, an overview of the personal, public and conceptual narratives circulating during the 1968-2000 period is presented, and these narratives cannot all be analyzed at sentence level. The overview in Part 2 is needed so that the works by Richler and Vallières can then be analyzed with respect to the other public and conceptual narratives circulating in
Section 1.2: Theoretical Overview

Canada when these two works and their translations were (re-)published. Thus, the analytical framework must be appropriate for both a detailed and a briefer—but thorough—study. Several frameworks were explored, but only one is appropriate for analyzing the narrative frames rather than the narratives themselves.

Riessman (1993)’s framework for assessing narratives focuses solely on personal narratives—and more particularly on oral, first-person narratives that relate a specific experience or set of experiences. Her framework can, however, be adapted to other types of narratives as well. She raises a number of questions pertaining, for instance, to the structure of a narrative (e.g. how is the narrative organized? Why has the author developed the narrative in this way?) and power issues (e.g. who is represented in the narrative? How are others situated in the narrative?) (1994: 61). These questions are more appropriate for a detailed analysis of the delimited catalogue texts, though they can be briefly explored in Part 2, when the narratives in the delimited catalogue are presented. The power issues in particular are a useful starting point for the analysis, and accordingly Part 2, during the overview of the delimited catalogue source texts, examines the following questions: what reality have the authors and translators constructed in their narratives, and how are English- and French-speaking Canadians represented in the source and target texts? Answering these questions helps determine why the TTs were framed as they were and what these frames tell us about the expectations for TL readers—questions that will be explored in Parts 3 and 4.

As Riessman notes, personal narratives must be interpreted with respect to the social, cultural and institutional discourses in which they are situated (1994: 61) and social discourses and power relations do not remain constant over time (1994: 65). This point will be adapted so that the personal/public/conceptual narratives are analyzed with respect to other personal, public
conceptual narratives in which they are situated. How, for instance, does one author’s construction of reality compare to the public narratives circulating in the Canadian press when the source and target texts were published? And inversely, how are these personal narratives framed in newspaper and magazine reviews? By exploring these questions, I hope to explain why the narratives in the delimited catalogue were framed in a limited number of ways.

In many of the frameworks for narrative analysis, particular emphasis is placed on evaluating or assessing the reliability of a narrative. Baker (2006), for instance, outlines a method for assessing narratives to “decide whether we should subscribe to them, dissociate ourselves from those who subscribe to them, or even actively set out to challenge them” (2006: 141). She asserts that this analysis is difficult, given that narratives construct, rather than represent reality, and that no one is therefore in a position to objectively observe the narrative. This problem arises because every researcher is anchored within his or her own narratives, and every analysis will necessarily be influenced not only by the researcher’s personal narratives, but also by the public, conceptual and master narratives circulating in his or her field, nation and era.

Yet, determining whether a narrative should be subscribed to or challenged is not one of the goals of this thesis. What interests me most as a researcher is analyzing what other Canadians have considered reliable, pertinent narratives and why. Their reasons for subscribing to or challenging a narrative are often expressed in paratextual material, the frames constructed to present these narratives in a certain light. By studying what is said about the delimited catalogue narratives in the frames, I can hypothesize about why some narratives were deemed more reliable than others.

Because the bulk of this thesis focuses on how the delimited catalogue narratives were

57 Part 2 will explore these issues superficially, while Part 4 will examine them in greater depth.
framed in prefatory texts (Part 3), how French translations reframed one English ST in contrasting ways (Part 4) and how an English TT was reframed in paratextual material for two different audiences (Part 4), the features of narrative frames described by Baker (2006) are the most relevant analytical framework. Thus, Part 3, Section 2, which examines paratextual frames within the TTs (peritexts), and Part 4, which examines both peritexts and reviews in French- and English-language Canadian periodicals (epitexts), help determine what role translators and other agents—including editors and publishing houses—have played in circulating a given narrative. These sections help show how the narratives were framed and by whom. They explore reasons why certain narratives seem to have been preferred for translation into French, while other narratives were preferred for translation into English.

The analyses that follow are based on four devices that can be used to frame or reframe narratives, namely: temporal/spatial framing, framing through selective appropriation, framing by labelling and framing through repositioning of participants (Baker 2006: 112). These four devices are discussed in greater detail in Parts 3 and 4.

And now that the theoretical framework has been laid out, on to the analysis that comprises the bulk of this thesis.
PART 2: REFERENDUM NARRATIVES IN CANADA

SECTION 2.1: DELIMITED CATALOGUE METHODOLOGY

As the historical overview has demonstrated, the themes of Quebec independence, nationalism and the referenda are very controversial in Canada. Little consensus exists on these topics, even among members of the same language group and/or geographic region. Understandably, hundreds of French- and English-language works were published on the three themes between 1968, when the Parti Québécois was formed, and 2000, when the Clarity Act was passed. This section will describe the works published in Canada during these years on themes closely related to the sovereignty referendum. It will then outline and describe which of these texts were translated into English and French and explore some of the thematic trends related to these works. A more detailed analysis of the catalogue will be the subject of Section 2.

2.1.1 METHODOLOGY

Historical and thematic trends in the translation of nationalism-, sovereignty- and referenda-related texts in Canada between 1968 and 2000 can be found once a catalogue is defined and established. And, before an effective analysis of this catalogue can be carried out, the titles need to be placed within their historical and bibliographic context. Part I provides the historical context, while this section will provide the bibliographic.

2.1.1.1 Bibliographic context

The term bibliographic context will be used in this study to refer to the bibliographic catalogue compiled according to the criteria listed below. This catalogue includes translated and non-translated works so that the number of translations can be contextualized—that is to say,
they can be analyzed with respect to the total number of works published. Providing a bibliographic context for a list of translations allows for comparisons between such aspects as the number of works published and the number translated.

The bibliographic context is therefore limited by year and place of publication: texts must have been published within Canada between 1968 and 2000 to encompass the period between the creation of the PQ and the passing of the Clarity Act. While the focus of this thesis is on the sovereignty referenda, the catalogue includes works published before the first vote and after the second to provide a better overview of the works being published while the various forms of sovereignty were being debated.

The bibliographic context is also limited by genre and subject. This thesis centres on non-fiction texts written within Canada. Of these texts, only works that the Library and Archives Canada catalogue lists as having a subject of:

a) Nationalism--Quebec (Province)

b) Quebec (Province)--History--Autonomy and independence movements

c) Referendum--Quebec (Province)

were retained. Searches (a) and (b) were conducted in both French and English, since works written in a single language are catalogued in that language. Search (c) needed to be done only once, since the catalogue search engine does not distinguish between accented and unaccented characters and the English heading therefore returned all French works as well. These three subject headings were chosen based on correspondence with a reference librarian at Library and Archives Canada. Further, they were selected because they are closely related, which means that fewer works dealing with the referenda are likely to have been omitted and the list probably

---

58 i.e. A search was conducted for both Québec (Province)--Histoire--Autonomie et mouvements indépendantistes and Quebec (Province)—History—autonomy and independence movements.
approaches maximum completeness within the established criteria.

Although the librarian offered more than 20 subject headings related to the sovereignty referenda, searching with all of these headings is not necessary for the purposes of this thesis. First, many of the works are cross-listed, so a subject search for nationalism—Quebec (province) in 1980, for instance, yields 43 records, many of which are identical to the 99 hits for referendum—Quebec (province) in the same year. Each result had to be double-checked in the delimited catalogue to ensure that I was not searching for a translation of the same source text multiple times. Therefore, a search for all 20 subject headings would probably not have increased the completeness of the delimited catalogue to a much greater degree but would have required a considerable investment of time. As Section 2.1.2 will demonstrate, the delimited catalogue compiled for this thesis is extensive enough to represent a large—if not the major—proportion of English- and French-Canadian views published on the referendum question.

Finally, the bibliographic context was limited by text type. Excluded from the delimited catalogue were legal texts, theses, audiovisual recordings and electronic media, bibliographies, conference proceedings, and periodicals. These latter texts were excluded for the following reasons:

Legal texts, which are translated—or not—according to federal or provincial laws, would distort the analysis of translation vs. non-translation statistics. Since other works have been translated due to agents such as publishing houses, translators, authors or third parties, but not because of a legal requirement, it would be difficult to compare these works with legal texts. And, because the other texts were deemed more pertinent to the goals of this thesis, given that they represent the views of the English- and French-speaking Canadian public, they were

---

selected in place of legal documents. Legal texts have been defined as laws, acts, bills, legal proceedings, and briefs or other texts published by or presented to the National Assembly, House of Commons or other legislative assembly.

Theses, which are deposited at the National Library but are otherwise unpublished, are very unlikely to have been translated and would therefore skew the results of any research into translation vs. non-translation statistics.

Audiovisual recordings and electronic media, if translated, will have been dubbed or subtitled. As this type of translation differs considerably from translation of written texts, it falls outside the scope of this particular study.

Bibliographies, being a list of book titles, authors and publication information, do not in themselves present overt arguments or opinions.\(^{60}\) While they have been subjectively compiled, bibliographies do not have the same type of content as any other work in the corpus. In addition, bibliographies are not translated, although they may list works in multiple languages. They are therefore not of interest to this study.

Conference proceedings have been excluded because they may be published in several languages but are not usually translated. Those works that were listed as direct proceedings from a conference were excluded, while other works, which may have been based on conference papers but which have been revised and prepared for book format, have been included.

Periodicals, though they may contain translated passages (e.g. oral speech, formal report), do not often indicate that a particular passage is actually a translation, making it difficult to judge how translated information differs from the original. Moreover, the articles themselves

\(^{60}\) They do, however, present covert opinions, as every bibliography must include some works but exclude others. In addition, some bibliographies label the works included in the list. For instance, the *bibliothèque Question nationale*, compiled by QuebecPolitique.com (2004), labels the works in its bibliography as *for or against* independence. These labels are in themselves an argument, as the label *independence* was chosen over others, including *sovereignty* and *federalism*. 
are unlikely to be translated, nor is there a reliable source of translation information. It would therefore be difficult to determine how many articles—if any—had been translated and where they had been published. For these reasons, periodicals such as newspapers, journals and magazines have not been included in the catalogue.

Thus far, the term delimited catalogue has been used to describe the bibliography compiled according to the above-defined criteria. A short aside to define the use of this term would not be out of place here. Delimited catalogue is a term coined to describe what Pym refers to as a corpus. He explains that a bibliography such as the one just described should be referred to as a catalogue only when its main function is to “approach maximum completeness” and as a corpus when it has been drawn up according to strictly controlled criteria (1998: 42). However, even a catalogue, which is supposed to approach maximum completeness, must be drawn up according to controlled criteria; otherwise, researchers would be striving toward the next-to-impossible task of listing every work ever published worldwide. Therefore, the term delimited catalogue seems appropriate for all bibliographies and has been adopted to refer to the one used in this thesis.

2.1.1.2 Finding and Defining Translations

As the delimited catalogue was being compiled, both untranslated and translated texts were searched for. The distinction between a translation and non-translation is important and often difficult to precisely determine. Some of the reasons why this distinction presents problems are defined and discussed by Toury (1995), Hermans (1999) and Pym (1998).

In Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond, Toury argues that a text can be assumed to be a translation for several reasons. It may, for instance, be presented as a translation or have
certain features widely regarded in the target culture as belonging to texts that have been translated (from a particular source or just in general). Alternatively, another text in another language and culture, from which the translation was derived, may be assumed to exist. This translation was derived through some sort of transfer process and a relationship binds the two texts (Toury 1995: 71-72; Hermans 1999: 49-50). Though these assumptions work well in general, both Hermans and Pym raise some points that present difficulties. First, as Pym argues, one must assume, using Toury’s definition, that “virtually anything is a translation unless proven otherwise” (1998: 61). Second, since the source text is only assumed to exist, the original need not actually still exist, which means pseudotranslations, based on Toury’s definition, can legitimately be studied. As Hermans, however, points out, pseudotranslations are not actually translations, and one could therefore argue that they should not be placed in the same category or studied in the same ways as actual translations.

These two problems have been addressed in the following ways. First, all texts were assumed to be source texts unless proven otherwise, and texts were considered translations only when a target text could be located, consulted, and compared with the assumed source text. In cases where the source text could not be consulted (e.g. Moreau 1995), the target text was listed in the catalogue and marked as an assumed or possible translation, but the target text itself was not studied and compared with the other target texts. The second method of addressing these problems is based on Pym’s suggestion that one way to initially distinguish between a translation and non-translation is to rely on the paratextual material; thus, a text with a translator’s name or a note that the work has been “translated from the French,” for instance,

---

61 In some cases, the original may have been lost over time, or it may never have been published. In the delimited catalogue, several source texts could not be located. For instance, in the case of Moreau (1995), the author died before the English source text was published. The French translation, Le Québec, un pays opprimé, was published posthumously, which means that while the target text is based on an English manuscript, this source text could not be paired with the translation.

62 Readers are invited to consult Section 3.1 for a definition of paratext.
could be said to be a translation unless it is later discovered otherwise (1998: 62).

While this second method identifies overt translations, covert ones may be missed. For that reason, the paratext method was used to a limited extent while the delimited catalogue was compiled. Each subject heading was searched by year (e.g. Nationalism--Quebec (Province) for 1985), and then, as each new entry was added to the catalogue, an additional search was made for all other works attributed to the author as a means of determining whether or not a) the work was a translation or b) a translation of the work existed. For instance, during the 1999 search in Referendum--Quebec (Province), the entry for Reed Scowen’s Time to Say Goodbye: the Case for Getting Quebec out of Canada was found. This work was tentatively added to the list of works published in English, and a new search was conducted for all works published by Reed Scowen. When a French-language work was found (Le temps des adieux: plaidoyer pour un Canada sans le Québec), the year of publication was compared to that of the English text. A later publication date would indicate that the French edition was likely the target text, while an earlier publication date would indicate that the contrary was more likely. In this case, both the French and English edition were published in 1999, so the French edition could not immediately be assumed to be the translation. However, the catalogue entry contained the following paratextual information: “Traduit de l’anglais par Brigitte Chabert” and “Traduction de: Time to say goodbye.” Based on these details, Time to Say Goodbye was assumed to be the source text and Le temps des adieux was assumed to be the target text. Later, both versions were consulted to confirm this assumption.

In other cases, though, no paratextual information was offered in the catalogue. No translator was listed for the French version of Gustave Morf’s Terror in Quebec: Case Studies of the FLQ, nor, since both the French and English editions were published in 1970, was it
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immediately clear which version was the source text. In the English edition itself, however, readers are advised that “a French-language edition of portions of this book was published in Montreal by Les Éditions de l’homme in January 1970 under the title Le terrorisme québécois.” Based on this information, the French edition was deemed to be the original text and the English edition, the translation.

However, even the paratextual information does not help elucidate whether a text is actually a translation or a pseudotranslation. While every pair of potential source and target texts was located and compared, the assumed source text could not be located for three works: Moreau (1995), for which the English source manuscript was never actually published, Caldwell (1994), which contains only a “traduit de l’anglais” note, and Arnaud & Dofny (1977), for which the original French text could not be found.63 These three texts have been considered “borderline”, as suggested by Pym (1998: 65). They have been included in the statistics but were not analyzed, since a) it could not be definitively proven that these texts were translations and not pseudotranslations, b) the source and target versions could not be compared and c) it could not be definitely proven that the source text was ever originally published in Canada, which was one criterion for this study.

While the delimited catalogue was compiled, every text was assumed to be a source text until proven otherwise,64 more covert translations65 were likely to have been identified. In other words, a text did not have to be paratextually marked as a translation for it to be considered a potential target text. Provided that a search was made for any text attributed to Mordecai

63 Indeed, little information could be found about the assumed French ST other than the French title offered in the English edition. No listings for this title appear in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue, nor could a listing be found in the national catalogue for France or Belgium. It is possible that only the English edition was ever published.

64 For instance, if a French-language work was attributed to an author who had otherwise written only English-language works, I then considered the French work a potential translation instead of a potential source text.

65 i.e. Translations not marked as such in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue.
Richler, for instance, any French titles attributed to Richler were potential translations of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* until identified otherwise. However, this method does not necessarily catch all ST-TT pairs, as some authors, such as Kenneth McRoberts or Charles Taylor, write in both French and English, and though every effort was made to ensure that no translation was listed as an original work, it is still possible that some source and target texts are listed separately in the delimited catalogue as original works rather than as a source and target pair.

Works marked as “adaptations” in the paratextual material or in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue were considered translations. Some of these works have additional or fewer chapters than the source text; however, many of the works labelled “translations” in the paratexts also contain new material. Provided the potential target text was published after or in the same year as the source text, was attributed to the same author as the source text\(^\text{66}\) and had content similar to the original work, the TT was considered a translation. These TTs were later divided into translations and bilingual editions, a distinction that is discussed in section 2.1.2.

### 2.1.1.3 Distinction between fiction and non-fiction polemical, political and historical texts

In the preceding sections, emphasis has been placed on the fact that the works in the delimited catalogue are non-fiction polemical, political and historical texts. A short aside seems necessary to explain exactly how the works in the delimited catalogue were deemed to be non-fiction and why they have been labelled *polemical, political and historical* without further distinction. These labels are not without their problems, but they are the most precise that could accurately be applied to the wide variety of texts in the delimited catalogue.

Let us begin with the term *non-fiction*. The delimited catalogue texts could not be

---

\(^{66}\) A work could be a translation of another even though the ST author was not acknowledged. One limitation of the way this delimited catalogue has been compiled is that a work could be identified as a potential translation only if the author’s name was the same in both the French and English editions.
classified as simply *non-literary* instead of *non-fiction* for several reasons. First, literary texts include both fiction, such as novels, short stories and plays, and non-fiction, such as literary essays. Moreover, many fictitious texts, such as pulp novels or science fiction, are often not considered literary or, while considered literary at a certain period of time, may not be so considered ten or fifteen years later. Thus, while some literary essays are included in the delimited catalogue,\(^67\) no fiction or poetry (literary or not) is listed, and so all delimited catalogue texts have been labelled *non-fiction*.\(^68\)

And now for the *polemical, political and historical* label. First, let’s explore these terms separately. Polemical texts, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, are forceful verbal or written controversies or arguments. The term *polemical*, or other terms with similar senses, including *tract*, *plaidoyer*\(^69\) or *pamphlet*,\(^70\) has been used in various press reviews, titles or prefatory texts to describe such works as Mordecai Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* (Behiels 1992: H3) and Guy Bertrand’s *Plaidoyer pour les citoyens* (1996). Political texts, according to the broad definition offered by Schäffner (1997), can include various texts types or genres:

Political discourse includes both inner-state and inter-state discourse, and it may take various forms. Examples are bilateral or multilateral treaties, speeches made during an electioneering campaign or at a congress of a political party, a contribution of a member of a parliament to a parliamentary debate, editorials or commentaires in newspapers, a press conference with a politician, or a

\(^{67}\) Denis Monière’s *Le développement des idéologies au Québec: des origines à nos jours*, for instance, won the Governor General’s Award for non-fiction in 1977.

\(^{68}\) One work, Daniel Poliquin’s *Le Roman colonial* could conceivably be considered a work of fiction, as it is both an essay about Quebec nationalism and a story about two fictitious Quebec characters, but this work has been labelled “essai” on the front cover of the French edition, and has been subtitled “An essay on Quebec nationalism” for the English edition, so it has been included in the delimited catalogue.

\(^{69}\) “Défense passionnée (d’une ou plusieurs personnes, d’une idée), dans une grave affaire publique (*Nouveau Petit Robert*, 1996 edition)

\(^{70}\) “Écrit satirique, qui attaque avec violence le gouvernement, les institutions, la religion, un personnage connu” (*Nouveau Petit Robert*, 1996 edition)
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politician’s memoirs. [...] Political texts [...] fulfil different functions due to different political activities. Their topics are primarily related to politics, i.e., political activities, political ideas, political relations, etc. (1997: 119).

The term *political* could therefore be used to describe many of the delimited catalogue works, including the 1983 memoirs published by Gérard Pelletier (*Les années d’impatience*), the PQ’s *Le Québec dans un monde nouveau* (1993), the English-language collection *The Question: The Debate on the Referendum Question, Quebec National Assembly, March 4-20, 1980* (Bergeron *et al.* 1980). In fact, even a polemical work such as Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* could be labelled *political*, given that its theme is primarily related to politics, most notably the language laws in Quebec.

Finally, *historical* texts, if one adopts the definition offered by White (1973), are those consisting of a “verbal structure in the form of a narrative prose discourse that purports to be a model, or icon, of past structures and processes in the interest of explaining what they were by representing them” (1973: 2, original emphasis). This perspective would make works like *Histoire du nationalisme québécois : entrevues avec sept spécialistes* (Gougeon 1993) or *F.L.Q : histoire d’un mouvement clandestin* (Fournier 1982) historical texts. Here again, though, many works could be labelled in more than one way. A work like *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* (Vallières 1968) contains a narrative of Quebec’s history and the author’s life, but it is also a political work, in that it outlines the political changes that author believes should be made to Canada.

So, it would appear that individually, the terms polemical, political and historical are difficult to apply to the delimited catalogue texts. Each text would have to be analyzed individually to determine whether it is more polemical than political, more political than
historical, etc. To help resolve this problem, a short reference to Tymoczko (2000) is useful.

In her essay, Tymoczko criticizes Venuti’s imprecise use of terminology to describe aspects of translation related to engagement, power and politics. During her analysis, she explains that Venuti does not seem to have clarified the qualities a translation should have before it can be classified as resistant. How much resistance, she wonders, would a translation have to contain before it could be labelled resistant? Who determines or decides whether a text is really radical? How does time affect resistance? Will a text be resistant only during the specific moment and in the particular culture of its translation or is it always resistant? (2000: 37-38). These questions are important because one need only replace the word resistant with polemical or political to see that these labels pose the same problems. For instance, when Bourgault published Maintenant ou jamais! in 1990, it was certainly a polemical work. It consists of Bourgault’s arguments in favour of Quebec sovereignty. Early in the work, Bourgault acknowledges that style has been sacrificed for speed because “il nous faut agir vite et raide, pour arriver à temps. Parce que c’est maintenant ou jamais !” (1990: 13, original emphasis). However, now that nearly twenty years have passed since Bourgault’s work was published, is this polemic more appropriately referred to as a historical text that aptly depicts the sentiments of a separatist in the period immediately preceding the second referendum? Or, consider a government publication such as the PQ’s Le Québec dans un monde nouveau. Was this text more polemical than political when it was first published in 1995? Given that it was written by a political party, it would seem logical to label it a political text. However, it is also polemical, as it tries to argue that Quebec will be better off once its relationship with the rest of the country is reexamined and redefined. Now that more than a decade has passed since the work was published and the referendum held, is this work not also a historical text outlining the context in
which the referendum was held? Evidently, applying one of the three labels would be difficult. Not all of the texts are polemical: some are biographies of political figures, while others are sociological analyses. And while most of the texts are political in nature, given that they touch on the controversial issue of independence movements or nationalism, many focus on issues such as nationalism from a historical perspective, and therefore seem ill-suited to the *political* label.

As these examples show, the line between a polemical, political or historical text is often difficult to draw. Consequently, the label *polemical, political and historical* will be used to apply to all texts in general, even though some may be better described by only one of the three terms. This label seems the most concise way to generally describe the vastly different texts that comprise the delimited catalogue without the need for precise and possibly unnecessary delimitations.

2.1.2 DETAILS OF THE DELIMITED CATALOGUE

Once the three searches had been completed and duplicate entries removed, the delimited catalogue contained 1197 works, which can be divided as follows:

- 118 bilingual publications (i.e. 118 French and English pairs, 64 of which were published within Quebec)
- 7 English-language collections (all 7 published outside Quebec)
- 728 French-language texts (713 published in Quebec, and 15 published outside Quebec)
- 265 English-language texts (53 published in Quebec, and 212 published outside Quebec)
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28 French target texts\textsuperscript{71} (representing 26\textsuperscript{72} of the English-language texts)

51 English target texts (representing 53\textsuperscript{73} of the French-language texts)

As these figures show, more works were published in French than in English, in general, although a variety of translated texts were made available to both anglophones and francophones. And, while Quebec is the province where most of the works were published, it is not the only place of publication for works on nationalism, independence movements and the two referenda.

This section will examine each of these six groups in turn. For reasons that are explained below, this thesis will focus primarily on the English collections and French and English target texts rather than the bilingual publications.

2.1.2.1 Bilingual publications

Works were considered bilingual for one of two reasons: 1) French-English in one volume or 2) simultaneous publication of French and English texts.

In the first case, both a French and English version of the same text appear in the same volume, or a single volume contains at least one English-language and one French-language chapter, article or other section. For instance, some federal government publications include the French text on one side and the English on the other so that by flipping the work over and

---

\textsuperscript{71} The totals for the French-language and English-language texts include the 26 English STs and 53 French STs respectively, but do not include the 28 French target texts and the 51 English target texts. To ensure that the same text was not being counted twice, the target texts were counted separately from the totals for works originally written in French and English.

\textsuperscript{72} The discrepancy between the ST and TT figures represents the two French TTs for which the English ST could not be located. Since these STs could not be found, they have not been included in the ST figures, which is why there are two more translations than source texts.

\textsuperscript{73} The discrepancy between the ST and TT figures represents the two instance where an English TT was an abridged translation of two French STs. These are the translations of Jean-François Lisée’s \textit{Le Tricheur} (1994) and \textit{Le naufrageur} (1994), and Claude Morin’s \textit{Le combat québécois} (1973) and \textit{Le pouvoir québécois... en négociation} (1972).
turning it upside down, readers can choose which of the two languages to read. Some of these inverted texts, such as Referendum yes or no/Referendum oui/referendum non are also printed with French on one side and English inverted on the other, but the content is not necessarily the same in both versions. Similarly, a collection such as Philosophers look at Canadian Confederation (French 1979), contains both English and French essays but no translations for either. Because these works could not be categorized as either an English- or a French-language publication, they were listed as bilingual publications instead.74

In the second case, the French and English versions had not been published in a single volume, but the ST/TT pair was still labelled bilingual for the purposes of this thesis. These two-volume bilingual editions differ from translations in several ways. They were labelled bilingual editions when the following conditions were met: both the French and English versions had to have been published in the same year and city by the same publisher and contain the same cover and content. In such cases, a note usually appears in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue to indicate that a work such as A Quebec Free to Choose has been “issue[d] also in French under the title: Un Québec libre de ses choix.”75 For the vast majority of the bilingual editions (116 of 118 works), no translator is listed in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue or on the works themselves,76 contrary to the translations, where all but 3 of the 51 English target texts and 1 of the 28 French target texts identify the translator on the cover or in a prefatory text. Nor do the majority of these bilingual texts indicate which version (if any) was the source language and which the target. For this reason, these texts have been considered separately from the translated and untranslated texts, as different institutional factors were

---

74 Because the bilingual publications were not studied in any great detail for this thesis, the list of works labelled “bilingual” has not been included in either the bibliography or the appendices, for reasons of space.

75 The entry for Un Québec libre de ses choix indicates that another edition is available: Quebec Free to Choose.

76 While not all of the 118 works were consulted, a sample of 50 was randomly selected. Of these 50 works, none indicated whether the works were translations or written in parallel (such as with Canadian laws), nor did they list a translator name.
operating on the bilingual and (un)translated texts. In addition, because the source and target
texts could not be identified, and the bilingual editions do not seem to contain any new
paratextual material,\textsuperscript{77} they are not studied in Section 3.2 which analyzes the new paratexts
written to frame the translations for target-language readers.

All government documents in the delimited catalogue, with the exception of one, were
considered \textit{bilingual publications}. Only the PQ’s \textit{Le Québec dans un monde nouveau} (1993)
was available in both French and English but was not labelled \textit{bilingual}. This is because the
translation was released by a different publishing house than the ST, and a new foreword was
added to the English translation, making this work similar to the other ST/TT pairs in the
delimited catalogue: in this case, although the work was prepared by a political party, and all
other ST/TT pairs were not, the translation was targeted specifically at English-speaking
Canadians, as the written and visual frames demonstrate. In this way, the TT is similar to many
of the others in the delimited catalogue and does not really share any traits with the bilingual
publications. Moreover the PQ’s text in particular provides insight into the question of how very
controversial works were reframed for the TL audience, as the party’s plan for Quebec
sovereignty generated considerable controversy in the early 1990s, and the book outlines how
sovereignty will be achieved.

\subsection*{2.1.2.2 \textit{English-language collections}}

The label \textit{English-language collections} represents seven anthologies of texts originally
written in French but translated into English for the collection. These seven collections are listed
separately from the English-language texts because they are translations, while all English-
language texts are, as far as could be determined, works originally written in English. At the
\textsuperscript{77} i.e. Paratextual material written expressly for target-language readers.
same time, the seven English-language collections need to be considered separately from the 51 English target texts because no single collection can be matched with a comparable French edition to form a ST-TT pair. Instead, these collections are thematically organized translations of various texts. In four cases, the original French texts were published by a particular author in a variety of sources over his lifetime. These are the translations of selected essays by Lionel Groulx (1973), André Laurendeau (1973; 1976) and Hubert Aquin (1988). Others are collected texts from government sources: Bergeron, Brown & Simeon (1980) published a translation by Sheila Fischman of selected National Assembly debates, while Fidler (1991) selected and translated excerpts from the submissions to the Bélanger-Campeau commission. Finally, the *Saskatchewan Waffle* published English translations of several political texts originally written by the *Centre de Formation populaire* (1980).\(^{78}\) No equivalent French-language collections were found in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue, a finding that is explored in greater detail in Section 3.2.3.1. Because the English-language collections contain several new paratexts, they are studied in Section 3.3.

2.1.2.3 *French-language texts*

The terms *French-language* and *English-language texts* are used to refer to works originally written in French or English, respectively. Thus, the figures cited above for French-language publications do not include any works translated into French, though they do include some French-language works that were later translated into English. In these cases, only the French source text was counted.

\(^{78}\) In addition to engaging in research that helps “contribuer au développement du mouvement communautaire,” the *Centre de formation populaire* focuses on contributing “à la consolidation et au développement des organismes communautaires au Québec.” It does this by giving workshops on the history of populist movements, on the democratic functioning of organizations and on community intervention. See [http://www.lecfp.qc.ca/main.htm](http://www.lecfp.qc.ca/main.htm) for more information about the Centre de formation populaire.
For both the English- and French-language works, multiple editions of a text were counted only once, though a note was made to indicate whenever a second, third or subsequent edition was published in Canada. As the statistics indicate, nearly all French-language writing was published in Quebec, a finding also emphasized in a 2001 study using discourse analysis to examine ten separatist texts written in French around 1995 (Trépanier 2001). Trépanier shows that the sovereignist discourse makes use of an us/them dichotomy to delimit the members of the Quebec nation through exclusion (2001: 41-42). Further, the discourse emphasizes the importance of the French language for the definition of Quebec belonging. Separatist texts, then, are addressed to Quebecers by Quebecers. More specifically, the texts are written for francophone Quebecers and not anglophones from the rest of Canada (ROC). In her conclusion, Trépanier notes that Quebec is the main receiver, sender and regulator of discourse on the Quebec nation (129), and the figures from the delimited catalogue support this conclusion.

An interesting trend is the fact that none of the 15 French-language works published outside Quebec were translated into English. However, these texts comprise such a small percentage of the total number of works published on nationalism, independence movements and the referenda that this trend is not surprising. Overall, only a few of the French-language works were translated into English: of the 713 works published in French in Quebec between 1968 and 2000, only 53, or slightly more than seven percent, were translated into English. So if this trend were followed in the fifteen French works published outside Quebec, only one (or seven percent) would have been translated into English. Yet some interesting questions can still be raised, since the works published outside of Quebec were produced in areas such as Ottawa, Kingston and Moncton,\(^{79}\) where a greater concentration of anglophones live and where access to

\(^{79}\) 2006 Census statistics, while not identical to census results from the years in which the fifteen works were published, are still useful for roughly illustrating the population difference between anglophone concentrations in Montreal, where many of the French-language works were published, and Ottawa, Kingston and Moncton,
English-language publishers, editors and translators would be facilitated. One might expect, then that at least one of these works would have appeared in English, given that conditions seem better suited to translation. The reason why these works remain untranslated is perhaps simply because Quebec is, as Trépanier suggests, seen as the main sender and receiver of texts on Quebec nationalism, and hence as the most appropriate source for texts on this and related subjects.

2.1.2.4 English-language texts

Works originally written in English were published mainly outside Quebec (approximately 80 percent of English-language texts were published within Canada but outside Quebec). However, more English-language works were published within Quebec than French-language works outside of the province (20 percent compared to 2 percent). Here again, then, is an indication of the extent to which the issues of nationalism, independence movements and the referenda were being debated in Quebec rather than in the rest of the country. In addition, the number of English-language publications is considerably lower than the number of works originally published in French (265 compared to 723, or slightly more than one third the number of the French-language texts), again attesting to the fact that fewer anglophones were debating the issues so widely discussed by French-speaking Quebecers.

2.1.2.5 French and English target texts

The terms French target texts and English target texts are used to refer to the translations where most of the French-language works published outside Quebec were printed. While the 2006 Census also includes statistics for respondents who have more than one mother tongue, only the mother tongue figures are quoted here.

Anglophones in Montreal: 425,635 (francophones: 2,328,400); anglophones in Ottawa: 514,680 (francophones: 139,205); anglophones in Kingston: 129,770 (francophones: 4,305); anglophones in Moncton: 77,345 (francophones: 42,925)
of delimited catalogue works into French and English, respectively. While all translations were published in Canada, this fact does not mean that no other translations were published internationally.\footnote{In fact, Nègres blancs d’Amérique was published in Spanish (Vallières, Pierre. (1972). Negros blancos de América: autobiografía precoz de un "terrorista" Quebequense. México : Siglo XXI), and in German (Vallières, Pierre. (1969). Québec libre! Weisse Neger in Kanada. [Darmstadt]: Marz Verlag). While both of these translations are listed in the National Library and Archives Canada catalogue, they have not been retained for the delimited catalogue. Further research into this area would likely reveal intriguing aspects about the issues of Quebec nationalism and independence—such as which texts have been made available to an audience of non-Canadians and what image of the country these texts portray. Research into similar questions has been undertaken by other scholars. Von Flotow, for instance, explores cultural policy, or how the export of Canadian literature can be considered an integral part of exporting Canadian culture (von Flotow 2007: 192-194), but such research falls outside the scope of this thesis.} For this thesis, only works in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue were added to the delimited catalogue, and Library and Archives Canada does not necessarily have records of works published outside Canada.

While an initial glance at the figures cited above would seem to indicate that between 1968 and 2003, more translations into English than into French were published on the topics of nationalism, independence movements and the referenda (51 English TT compared to 26 French TT), closer scrutiny reveals that this conclusion is not quite true. By studying the number of works translated as a percentage based on the number of works published, one discovers that 53 of 728 French-language works (or 7.3 percent) were translated into English, while 26 of 265 English-language works (9.8 percent) were translated into French. Despite the fact that more than 2.5 times as many original works were published in French as in English, the percentages of works translated for French and English speakers are nearly equal.

As has been noted by many Canadian researchers, including Mezei (1998: 234), Ladouceur (2000: 207-208) and Mossop (2006: 7), general trends for commercial and government translation in Canada have been from English into French, marking English as the dominant language and leading, as discussed in Part 1, to the discontent of many francophone Quebecers with the status quo in Canada (see Mezei 1998, for instance, for an analysis of the
political poem *Speak White*). Simon (1989), too, has argued that when the political relationship between the source and target cultures is unequal, the administrative or official translation direction will be from the dominant into the weaker language (1989: 19). This tendency will be further explored in Section 3.3. For now, simply note that the translation statistics in the delimited catalogue mirror these wider Canadian trends.

And the trend in the delimited catalogue is, in a way, similar to the general trend: a slightly larger percent of English-language works were translated into French than vice versa. Yet surely the reasons why a larger percentage of English-language works were translated into French cannot quite be the same as the reasons why French is generally, in Canada at least, the target language. In this case, the French-Canadian market abounded with works on nationalism, independence movements and the referenda that explored these issues from many points of view. While the English market contained a much smaller selection, a wide number of pro-independence, anti-independence and more neutral views were still represented. By examining these trends in more detail, an answer to the above question may become more evident. This will be the task of Part 2, Section 2.
SECTION 2.2: NARRATIVES IN THE DELIMITED CATALOGUE

2.2.1 TRENDS IN THE DELIMITED CATALOGUE

The purpose of this section is to answer the first research question, namely: which works were published and translated between 1968 and 2000 on Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda? Now that the delimited catalogue has been outlined and the methodology established, we can explore what works are in the delimited catalogue, with the goals of determining how Canadian “reality” was shaped in these works and what kinds of narratives were offered to English- and French-speaking Canadians through translation.

2.2.1.1 Norms vs. trends

Before embarking on a study of the trends in the delimited catalogue, a short aside is necessary to explore the meaning of the word *trends* and to contrast it with Toury’s concept of *norms*. Toury places *norms* at the centre of a cline that is bound on one end by *rules* and on the other by *idiosyncrasies*. Norms, the sociocultural constraints operating on translation in a given locale, may be very binding (close to the *rules* end of the cline) or very loose (close to the *idiosyncrasies* end of the cline) (2000: 199). Toury distinguishes between two groups of norms: operational and preliminary. Those norms constraining the decisions made by the translator during the actual translation process are referred to as operational norms, while those that affect translation policy (i.e. norms that affect the choice of texts or text types for translation into a culture), are termed preliminary norms. Some considerations within preliminary norms include determining what text-types, periods, source languages, etc. are preferred, prohibited, permitted or tolerated in a particular language and culture at a given time (Toury 2000: 202).

---

81 Used here, as in the localization industry, to mean a given language and region (e.g. English Canada or French Canada).
Section 2.2: Narratives in the Delimited Catalogue

The trends that will be studied in this section are most closely related to Toury’s concept of preliminary norms. In general, the texts themselves, and hence the decisions of the translators, will not be explored in great detail; the large number of texts prevents such a study. Instead, this section will draw conclusions about which ones were most frequently published in French and English and which of these texts and narratives were most frequently translated into English and French. However, the term *norm* will not be used to describe these occurrences. Instead, the terms *trend* and *tendency* will be used interchangeably to describe recurring features in the delimited catalogue, such as the number of works published in a given year and the average number of years between ST/TT publication. The focus of this section is on exploring statistics within the delimited catalogue for the sake of discovering tendencies.

2.2.1.2 Delimited catalogue trends

As Table 1 indicates, the publication trends for works related to Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda mirrored socio-political events in Canada between 1968 and 2000. The publication of both English- and French-language works first peaked in 1970, years after the Parti Québécois was formed, then in 1980, the year of the first referendum, again in 1991-1992, when the Charlottetown Accord was being negotiated, and finally in 1995, the year of the second referendum. While these statistics do not reveal any unexpected trends, they are still important aspects to consider, as they provide the basis for further analysis. Moreover, as Pym (1998) notes, turning lists into frequency curves to plot the distribution of translations over a given period of time allows researchers to confirm or deny hypotheses (1998: 71). So these statistics help confirm my hypotheses that publication of works related to nationalism, independence movements and the referenda peaked at key periods related to these
events, and graphing these data allows for a more detailed analysis of trends.

![Graph: Number of works published in French and English from 1968-2000](image)

Table 1: Number of works published in French and English from 1968-2000

A closer study of the table reveals two important trends:

1. As expected, French Canadians were writing about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda more than English Canadians. This is also evidenced by some of the figures listed in Section 2.1.2.3.

2. English and French publications share nearly identical peaks and drops, with the exception of the post-1995 period, when French-language publications dropped slightly but did not quickly decline as did the English-language publications.
The first trend is understandable and has already been explained by the fact that Quebec has been the main sender, receiver and regulator of discourse related to Quebec nationalism. Since the referenda were held in Quebec, one would expect that more works on this and related topics would be published within the province. And, given that the issues raised by the PQ—including protection of the French language and recognition of Quebec’s distinctiveness—focus primarily on francophones within Quebec, one would also expect that most of the works on such subjects would be written by and published for Quebec’s francophone population.

The second trend is more intriguing. It illustrates the different attitudes of French and English Canadians toward the question of Quebec sovereignty. While Quebec’s francophones obviously maintained an interest in questions related to Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda after the No result in the 1995 referendum, the interest in these issues by anglophones became nearly non-existent in the same period.

Thus, even as late as 2000, works such as Penser la nation québécoise\(^{82}\) (Venne 2000)—a collection of texts originally published in Le Devoir and reflecting on the “Quebec nation”—and Pour une politique de la confiance (Pettigrew 1999)—written to contribute to the debate on Canada’s future (1999: 13)—were still being published in French in Quebec. While comparable works were also released by English Canadians, (Constructing the Quebec referendum: French and English Media Voices (Robinson 1998), Rethinking Nationalism (Couture, Nielsen & Seymour 1998), and Caught in the middle: Montreal and the Quebec-Canada Impasse (Thomas 1997)\(^ {83}\), for instance), such English-language publications were far fewer in number. The steady publication of nationalism-, independence- and referendum-related works in French-speaking

\(^{82}\) Translated in 2001 as Vive Quebec! New Thinking and New Approaches to the Quebec Nation.

\(^{83}\) Works such as Couture, Nielsen & Seymour (1998) and Thomas (1997) were not translated into French and therefore do not appear in either the appendices or the bibliography. They are listed only as examples of works of the 265 English-language texts published between 1968 and 2000.
Quebec shows that, far from resolving the sovereignty issue, the referendum simply caused
debate over these issues to continue, albeit to a much greater extent within Quebec than outside
it. Anglophones and francophones alike analyzed independence movements or the referendum
and its results, explored the possibility and nature of future referenda, studied the ramifications
of recognizing Quebec as a distinct society, assessed the implications of the Clarity Act, etc.

Similar themes are also found in the works published prior to the 1995 and even the
1980 referenda: in both the English and French sets of works, one finds texts supporting
sovereignty, arguing against sovereignty, analyzing federalism and/or exploring alternatives and
tracing the roots of nationalism and nationalists.

Clearly, these trends reveal that not all anglophones are against sovereignty-association
or other forms of independence and that not all francophones support it. Several publications by
English Canadian authors argue that Canada and Quebec should separate (or at least form a new
type of partnership similar to that proposed by the PQ), including Forster’s self-published Let
Quebec go! (1983) and a publication entitled Questions & Answers on Sovereignty-Association
by the Committee of Anglophones for Sovereignty-Association (1979). Other mainly pro-
independence English-language works, including Scowen’s Time to Say Goodbye: The Case for
Getting Quebec out of Canada (1991) and Bercuson & Cooper’s 1991 work, Deconfederation:
Canada without Quebec—were translated into French. While these works represent the opinions
of a minority of English-speaking Canadians,\(^4\) they illustrate the importance of remembering
that diverse opinions on nationalism and independence exist across Canada and among all

\(^4\) Polls in the early 1990s, for instance, showed that while most Canadians outside Quebec were against the idea
of granting Quebec additional powers (75% against) or of decentralizing the Canadian government (71% against) (Johnson
1994: 277), a sizeable majority of Quebeckers (75%) believed the Quebec government should have more constitutional
power to protect and promote the Quebec identity, especially in language, demographics, education and immigration (Fortin
1991: 1). Fortin (1991: 2) puts the proportion of Canadians outside Quebec who were against the idea of granting Quebec additional
powers at 70 percent.
actively censored by a central institution: both anglophone and francophone Quebecers were able to publish works for and against the PQ proposals, both the Liberals and PQ published arguments in support of their opposing positions, and authors outside Quebec were also able to express support for or criticize sovereignty-association, independence or other changes to the current form of federalism. To better illustrate these arguments, the narratives in the delimited catalogue—i.e. the stories told about Canada by various writers during the 1968-200 period—will be explored in the rest of this section.

2.2.2 Narratives in the Source Texts

Because the goal of this thesis is to explore the paratextual material used to frame the translations in the delimited catalogue, the analysis of the narratives in the ST/TT pairs must necessarily be short. Since more than fifty French texts were translated into English and approximately twenty-five English texts translated into French, an in-depth analysis of each narrative would be beyond the scope of this thesis. This section will therefore provide a brief overview of the ST narratives as a segue to Part 3, which analyzes the paratextual material framing the TL narratives. While this section does not discuss every ST, it does discuss most of them: the narratives most commonly found in the STs are grouped together and explored. Although each work has been listed under one group of narratives, that does not necessarily mean it falls under only this one group. The narratives in the delimited catalogue are varied, and many works could fall into several groups. For instance, Poliquin’s *Le roman colonial: essai* (2000), which has been grouped with nationalism narratives, could just as easily be described as a narrative about Canadian society, or an autobiographical narrative. But, since most of Poliquin’s book reflects on nationalism in Quebec, it has been listed with others that share this
theme. Thus, the groupings in this section are intended to exemplify the stories that were found in the delimited catalogue rather than to definitely classify each work as having one particular theme.

For the purposes of this thesis, the term *theme* will be used as per Prince (1992; 2003) who, after reviewing the various ways in which the term can be defined, notes that “theme expresses a relation of being about” (1992: 3). Unlike the plot of a work, which is linked to given events, the theme of a work consists of general and abstract entities, including thoughts, ideas and beliefs (1992: 5). Illustrated by multiple textual elements (rather than a single one), a theme helps to raise questions and “is contemplative rather than assertive” (Prince 2003: 99). More generally, the theme is “the main idea in a text, a central thread, [...] what a text or part thereof is about” (Prince 1992: 2). And, just as all narratives are told from the point of view of the narrator, rendering them subjective representations of “reality,” so is the “theming of a text” dependant “not only on the ‘text itself’ but also on the themer” (1992: 13). The thematic categories outlined in the next sections are therefore not the only ones that could be used to describe the works in the delimited catalogue. However, these themes have been chosen because they seemed general enough to encompass as many works as possible, but specific enough to describe what these works were about. Within the thematic categories are a variety of theses. The term *thesis* will also be used in the sense offered by Prince (2003), who defines it as “[t]he doctrine or ideological context of a text; the (philosophical, moral, political) views advanced by that text” (2003: 99) and notes that “[t]he thesis of a work could be distinguished from its theme: it promotes an answer instead of raising questions and asks to be agreed with rather than thought about” (ibid).

So, this section will describe five themes commonly found in the delimited catalogue ST
narratives, as well as two theses. Works that are listed under one of the five thematic categories (e.g. speculative, nationalism or Canadian society narratives) may share or have differing theses. For instance, within the narratives that share the theme of speculation about the future of Canada, some works argue that if separation were to occur, Quebec would be better off than it is now, while others argue against this thesis. Many works in the delimited catalogue share the same theme, but fewer share the same thesis, as this section demonstrates. STs listed under one of the two thesis categories did not quite fit into one of the thematic categories, but had a very strong pro- or anti-independence thesis.

2.2.2.1 Themes in the source texts

The narratives found in the source texts can be split into five general, thematic groups: speculative narratives, nationalism narratives, Canadian society narratives, FLQ or October Crisis narratives, and (auto)biographical narratives.

Speculative narratives

The works that fall into the speculative narrative group are generally conceptual narratives from the fields of economics, sociology and political science. Among these are Freeman & Grady’s *Dividing the House: Planning for a Canada Without Quebec* (1995) and Harbron’s *Canada without Quebec* (1977). *Globe and Mail* economics reporter Alan Freeman and economics consultant Patrick Grady—who has a PhD in economics and worked as an advisor to the Liberal Party Platform Committee in 1993—state that they “are not suggesting Quebec separation is inevitable” but have written *Dividing the House* “as an exercise in contingency planning rather than forecasting. Facing the possibilities, however grim, is just
common sense” (1995: xii). As with most of the speculative narratives, both Freeman & Grady and John Harbron, who worked as a foreign analyst for Thomson Newspapers from 1972-1990, use the future and conditional tenses frequently to narrate events that they feel should or would occur if Quebec were to separate from the rest of the country. But while Freeman & Grady and Harbron do explore events that would likely transpire were Quebec to secede from Canada, they do not favour secession. The former feel that “Quebec’s departure will be an occasion for sorrow rather than rejoicing” (1995: xiv) and state that “[a] vote to stay in Canada as it is with no promise of renewed federalism would be the best possible outcome for Canada” (1995: 7). Moreover, they depict sovereignist Quebecers and the Bloc Québécois unfavourably, labelling Parizeau “wily” (1995: 29), declaring that separatists are “schizophrenic about Canadian trade” (139) and explaining that “every issue is twisted by the Bloc to show what a bad deal Quebec gets out of Confederation” (1995: 12). Similarly, Harbron asserts that “[i]f separation occurs, the political fabric that we wrought in 1867 will be badly damaged. Ottawa will be a forlorn city, stripped of its credibility as the federal capital, separated by only a river from the enthusiastic new republic on the other shore” (Harbron 1977: 133).

Another speculative narrative, *Thirty Million Musketeers: One Canada for all Canadians* (1995), explores what should happen in Canada in the event that Quebecers do not vote to secede. In this narrative, Gibson, a Senior Fellow in Canadian Studies at the independent non-partisan Canadian research institution The Fraser Institute, argues: “I am convinced that [the 1995 Quebec referendum] will ‘fail,’ in the sense of not leading to the breakup of Canada. But if it also ‘fails’ in the sense of giving aid and comfort to the proponents of the status quo, that would be a tragedy indeed. Canada needs improvement, and the aspirations of Quebec are...

---

85 Gibson has also worked as an assistant to the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Prime Minister of Canada. Moreover, he has been a member of the BC legislative assembly, serving as leader of the BC Liberal Party from 1975-1979.
part of making that happen. The message of this book is not about the referendum. Indeed, it is not a book about Quebec at all, except incidentally. It is a book about re-inventing Canada, with Quebec as a part of that” (1995: xii-xiv). In Gibson’s narrative, the federal government is sinking further and further into debt: “by the year 2000, federal program expenditures must be cut back by over 20 percent and, except for a form of equalization, cash transfers to the provinces will cease. Even then, over a third of our federal tax dollars will go to dead-weight debt servicing, and we won’t be very happy with Ottawa” (1995: 1). Then, like Harbron (1977) and Freeman & Grady (1991), he speculates on the new Canada, narrating future events that could, should or may happen in the next fifteen or twenty years, following a No result in the referendum.

Political science professor Robert A. Young, in the *The Secession of Quebec and the Future of Canada* (1995) analyzes a number of possible outcomes related to sovereignty and hypothesizes about the effect Quebec secession would have on both Canada and Quebec, based on what has happened in other countries, such as Czechoslovakia. He concludes, after a careful study, that sovereignty would not be to Quebec or Canada’s advantage: Quebec would be in a difficult situation economically, while Canada would likely see its interest rates rise and its dollar depreciate. In this sense, Young’s narrative is similar to that of Harbron, since he compares events in Canada’s history with those in other countries that have experienced separatist movements. Harbron’s narrative, however, narrates events in Quebec by comparing them to events in Brazil, Venezuela, and other former Spanish and Portuguese colonies in North and South America.

Among the French-language STs, perhaps the most important speculative narrative, given that it is written by the party that would initiate the 1995 referendum, is *Le Québec dans*
un monde nouveau, which the Parti Québécois wrote in 1993. As Parizeau explains in the *avant-propos*, the work explores what issues such as education, business, sustainable development, equality of the sexes, and culture will be like in a sovereign Quebec. It also defines the term *sovereignty*. Unlike in the English-language speculative narratives, sovereignty is considered in the best interests of Quebec: “[I]a souveraineté donnera au Québec la capacité d’agir. Elle ouvrira à sa population des perspectives nouvelles de progrès” (1993: 33); “[...] la souveraineté fournira un cadre propice à l’épanouissement de notre modèle particulier de développement économique [...]” (1993: 40); “[I]a souveraineté fournira un cadre et les outils propices à la consolidation et au rayonnement de la culture québécoise” (1993: 55). In the final section, the PQ answers such questions as what the territory of a sovereign Quebec will be (its current borders (1993: 70)), who will become a Quebec citizen (any Canadian citizen living in Quebec when it secedes and then any children of a Quebecer (1993: 68)), and what the Quebec constitution would contain (the Charte québécoise des droits et libertés would be constitutionalized and expanded (1993: 67)). Because the PQ speculates that Quebec’s future will be greatly improved by secession, this work has a pro-independence thesis.

Another speculative narrative, one that views independence more negatively than the PQ, is Marcel Côté’s *Le rêve de la terre promise: les coûts de l’indépendance* (1995). As Côté, the founding partner of the management consultancy SECOR Consulting and former senior aide in the Prime Minister’s Office in Ottawa and the Premier’s Office in Quebec City, explains, this work was written because “nous nous devons d’être concrets et d’évaluer les conséquences, bonnes et mauvaises, pour chacun d’entre nous” (1995: 10). To help determine whether Quebec would be better off independent than it is within Canada, Côté begins by describing what an

---

86 As mentioned earlier, this is the only example of a delimited catalogue ST that was prepared by an official political party. For the reasons explained in Section 2.1.2.1, this work has been included as one of the STs studied.
independent Quebec would be like, focusing on, for instance, the number of inhabitants and level of wealth in comparison with other countries. He opines that an independent Quebec would not necessarily be more efficient than it is now (1995: 17).

Côté spends much of the work speculating about the events that would occur after a Yes vote. Stressing, at one point, that the negotiations would drag on, he hypothesizes that then-Prime Minister Jean Chrétien would have to be replaced, a new prime minister would have to be elected, the new PM would have to consult Canadians—by holding a referendum—before proceeding to negotiate with Quebec, the remaining provinces would be more interested in their own problems than in negotiating with Quebec, and Canada would want to ensure that aboriginal rights would be protected before Quebec could secede (1995: 38). Finally, Côté focuses on “quelques principes qui pourraient nous guider, comme Québécois, dans la poursuite d’une réforme du fédéralisme canadien” (1995: 219). Near the end of the book, Côté asserts that:

Nous, Québécois, devons accepter le Canada pour ce qu’il est, c’est-à-dire notre pays. Ceci ne veut pas dire que nous ne sommes plus des Québécois et que nous nions notre statut de peuple maître de sa destinée. Mais si nous décidions de vivre dans le Canada, nous devons en accepter aussi les limites. On peut être à la fois québécois et canadien. [...] (1995: 227).

Thus, even though Côté’s work is a speculative narrative, it also has an anti-independence thesis like most of the English-language speculative narratives.

*Nationalism narratives*

Very few English-language STs narrate events related to nationalism, the nationalist
movement and the history of nationalism in Quebec. *The Last Cannon Shot: A Study of French-Canadian Nationalism, 1837-1850*, written in 1969 by Father Jacques Monet, Director of the Canadian Institute of Jesuit Studies, is one example. This text explores thirteen years of Quebec’s history, beginning in November 1837, when “the patriotes, urged on by Louis-Joseph Papineau, rushed to arms, and reaped only crushing distress” (1969: 11), and ending in 1850, with the election of Jean Chabot in the Quebec City by-election and the defeat of the idea of annexation to the United States (1969: 391). His narrative encompasses such events as the Project of Union, campaign for responsible government, and the question of annexation. Monet explores French-Canadian nationalist opinion on these issues and briefly profiles prominent figures in late-nineteenth-century Lower Canada, including Lord Sydenham, Louis-Joseph Papineau, and the “ardently patriotic, stubborn, introverted, and [...] supreme realist” Louis-Hippolyte Lafontaine (1969: 396).

Four French-language STs study nationalism or nationalists: Clift (1981), Gougeon (1993), Delisle (1992) and Poliquin (2000). Dominique Clift, whose 25-year career as a journalist led him to write for such newspapers as *Montreal Star, La Presse*, and the *Globe and Mail, Toronto Star* and *Canadian Press*, wrote *Le déclin du nationalisme au Québec* in 1981.\(^7\) Originally published as a series of articles, this work focuses on nationalism in Quebec at different periods of time or with a different groups of people: e.g. Quebec under Maurice Duplessis, nationalism during the Quiet Revolution, the PQ and the 1980 referendum, and anti-nationalism led by Trudeau.

Another French-language ST to explore nationalism within Quebec society is Esther

---

\(^7\) Like Daniel Poliquin, Dominique Clift is listed in the delimited catalogue as both an author and translator. He translated Georges Mathews’ *L’Accord : comment Robert Bourassa fera l’indépendance* into English and Graham Fraser’s *PQ : René Lèvesque & the Parti Québécois in Power* into French. Moreover, he self-translated *Le Déclin du nationalisme au Québec* into English.
Delisle’s *Le Traître et le Juif: Lionel Groulx, Le Devoir et le délire du nationalisme d’extrême droite dans la province de Québec 1929-1939*, which is a 1992 adaptation of her doctoral thesis,\(^8\) Delisle stresses early in *Le Traître et le Juif* that “nulle part dans ma thèse il n’est question de l’antisémitisme des Canadiens français. Il n’y est question que de l’antisémitisme de Lionel Groulx, de l’Action nationale, des Jeune-Canada et du Devoir de 1929 à 1939” (1992: 27). While she does note that these four voices weren’t the unanimous opinions of the era, since *Le Canada* and *Le Jour* “s’oppos[ai]ent à l’antisémitisme” (1992: 31), she declares that “[c]e serait pourtant une erreur que de réduire ces locuteurs à l’insignifiance absolue, ce qui est une manière de nier qu’un courant de pensée violemment antidémocratique et antisémite ait pu exister au Québec en dehors du parti fasciste d’Adrien Arcand” (1992: 31). Delisle asserts that the antisemitism she has found in *Le Devoir* “n’est ni discret, ni honteux: il s’affiche à la vue de tous” (39), and that Groulx “n’est pas l’aimable historien du terroir aux égarements passagers et sans conséquences dépeint par certains” (1992: 54). Among the passages Delisle cites to support her conclusions are those that make reference to the “nez crochu” (1992: 148) of Jews, those (in *Le Devoir*) that “mentionne fréquemment la qualité de «juif» d’une personne” (1992: 166), and those that hypothesize “que Prague constitue le point de départ de la conquête du monde par les Juifs”

---

8. When her thesis was submitted, Delisle had to wait 25 months before the defence. In an interview with the *Globe and Mail* in 1993, Delisle noted that “[s]ome people have decided that I am attacking the whole of Quebec, and if you attack the whole of Quebec then you are a traitor. That is the best way to silence anyone: to make them a traitor” (Gee 1993: E1). The following excerpt from an article published in *Saturday Night* helps illustrate this controversy: “That same summer, the unknown PhD candidate talked with a reporter from L’actualité, Quebec’s news magazine, about her controversial ideas and the problems she was encountering with the thesis at Laval. The resulting article, and a follow-up piece titled “Who’s Afraid of Esther Delisle?” thrust her, and her work, into the spotlight. The media, especially the French press, challenged her conclusions, while the more conspiracy-minded, largely off the record, equated her criticisms of Lionel Groulx and *Le Devoir* with an attack on Quebec itself. Delisle’s association with Mordecai Richler, begun when she sent him chapters of the thesis after the appearance of his *New Yorker* piece on the province’s sign laws, led a member of the Lionel Groulx foundation to accuse her of “hitching her wagon to the locomotive” of the maverick author.” (Foran 1993: 30). The political science department at Université Laval later wrote to *L’Actualité* to deny that any sort of stymying was occurring with respect to Delisle’s defence (Crête 1992: 4).

Of the texts in this group, translator and author Daniel Poliquin’s (2000) work is perhaps most like a narrative in the sense of a representation of events or series of events (Abbott 2002: 12). Although Le roman colonial is labelled “essai,” Poliquin has created two fictitious protagonists—one an outspoken Quebec nationalist, the other more indifferent to politics—and narrates events in their lives to delve into the thoughts of Quebecers. Interspersed between the narratives of the two fictitious Quebecers are biographic details of Poliquin’s own life and his reflections on Quebec nationalism and independence. Charles-Olivier Lesieur, the nationalist protagonist, is often painted unflatteringly. This character makes statements intended to demonstrate his nationalist principles, even if these supposed principles are not always the real reason for his actions.

The other character, Frank Labine, is complex. While he is rather indifferent to politics, given that he votes “mais sans grande conviction” (2000: 34), Labine, after asking himself whether he was—or should be—unhappy within Canada, “a bien été obligé de répondre que non, et d’ajouter que, s’il y a des mendians à tous les coins de la rue Saint-Denis, ce n’est pas la faute de la Constitution” (2000: 35). He did vote Yes in the 1995 referendum, though not because he believed in “la démagogie péquiste qui garantissait à tous le porc et le cochon” (2000: 36), but rather because he was among the voters “qui se trouvaient plus fins que les autres et tenaient au moins à un oui fort pour l’avenir du Québec. Afin de mieux négocier...” (ibid.). Moreover, Labine (like Poliquin himself) supports Bill 101 (2000: 39).

The rest of Le roman colonial are Poliquin’s reflections on independence, nationalism, and the French language in Quebec. While he does begin by describing the efforts he went to to fight for Franco-Ontarian rights when he was younger, Poliquin is essentially against the

In his final chapter, Poliquin reflects on nationalism, briefly touches on the history of Quebec since the mid-1600s, and concludes the story of Lesieur and Labine. Finally, he wishes his friends in Quebec “un indépendantisme rafraîchi qui aurait fait litière de ses ressorts victimes, paternaliste et collectiviste [...]. Autrement dit, un indépendantisme qui ne serait plus nationaliste, délesté de ses vieilles hantises, de ses complexes dépassés, de ses haines révolues” (2000: 253).

Canadian society narratives

Canadian society narratives are those that narrate events in Canadian history to tell a story about Canadian society. While many texts are conceptual narratives from the fields of Canadian studies or sociology, some are personal narratives. Of these, novelist Mordecai Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country* (1992) is perhaps the most well known. Richler’s narrative, which explores Quebec society and is critical of the sovereignty-association proposal and Quebec nationalists, is outlined in detailed in Part 4, so it will not be summarized here. Other narratives include Susan Mann Trofimenkoff’s *The Dream of Nation: A Social and Intellectual History of Quebec* (1983), which recounts the history of Quebec, beginning in the 1530s with the French arrival in New France and ending with the 1980 referendum. Trofimenkoff, an historian and university professor, explores the rise of Quebec nationalism in the 18th and 19th centuries.

---

89 Part 4 details the controversy generated by this book when it was first published.
Globe and Mail journalist and former Alliance Quebec president William Johnson, in *A Canadian Myth: Quebec, Between Canada and the Illusion of Utopia* (1994), also explores Quebec society. Every chapter narrates a different set of events, including the Quiet Revolution, Bill 22, the 1980 referendum, Constitution patriation, Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords, and the decades in which Mulroney, Clark and Trudeau were in power. According to Johnson, trying to accommodate “a French ethnic state of Quebec” can only “strengthen separatism, increase regional conflicts, accentuate instability, weaken the country politically and economically, and bring about precisely what well-meaning people sought to avoid: a polarization between Quebec and the rest of Canada” (1994: 16). Using his narratives of events in Canadian history, Johnson argues that “[...] the root cause of Quebec’s discontent in Confederation has never been political. It was and is ideological—or more accurately, mythological. Therefore, no mere political solution, however ingenious, generous, or dramatic, could ever assuage Quebec’s discontents and restore stability to the federation” (1994: 400).

In 1984, Graham Fraser, who has worked as a journalist for *Maclean’s*, the *Gazette*, *Globe and Mail*, *Toronto Star* and *Le Devoir* and is now the Commissioner of Official Languages, wrote *PQ: René Lévesque and the Parti Québécois in Power*. This book relates events taking place largely between the late 1960s and early 1980s. While particular focus is placed on Lévesque, *PQ* is not a biographical narrative. Other members of the Parti Québécois, including Minister of State for Cultural Development Camille Laurin and Minister of Finance Jacques Parizeau, have entire chapters covering their early lives and events taking place after the PQ’s 1976 win. Most of the photographs complementing the narrative are of Lévesque, but also included are portraits of PQ ministers: Pierre Marc Johnson, Minister of Labour, Claude

---

Morin, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and Jacques Parizeau. This book was a finalist for the 1984 Governor General’s Award in the non-fiction category.

In *Lament for a Province: The Tragic Costs of Quebec’s Flirtation with Separation*, former journalist and past president of the Canadian Club of Montreal Monty Berger (1995) explores the effects the separatist movement has had on the Quebec economy. Rather than studying just the costs that might be associated with actually separating, which would make *Lament for a Province* a speculative narrative, Berger explores the costs Quebec has *already* had to pay for thinking about separating. While he concludes that “Québec would survive if it ever did separate,” he argues that the Quebecers currently living in the province would have to face “10 or 15 or 20 very lean years” (1995: 80). To support his arguments, he lists the corporate head offices that left Quebec from 1977 to 1980 and provides examples of international companies that decided not to establish an office in Quebec due to political uncertainty and the language situation. He also lists arguments to debunk many of Parizeau’s claims about the advantages of independence and the ease with which Quebec could become independent (1995: 35-38).

Another narrative exploring the nature of Canada is *Misconceiving Canada: The Struggle for National Unity*. In it, political science professor Kenneth McRoberts (1997) uses narratives of historical events to argue that Trudeau’s national unity strategy, which “was an attempt to implant a new Canadian identity” and meant that “all Canadians must see their country and their place in it in exactly the same way,” “failed abysmally to change the way Quebec francophones see Canada” (1997: xii). Beginning early in Canada’s history, with the Royal Proclamation, Quebec Act and Constitution Act, and exploring the first century since

---

91 The mission of the Canadian Club of Montreal, from their website: To be the leading forum in Montreal for leaders in business, politics, sports, culture and international affairs to state their positions on important current issues and trends. See: [http://www.canadianclub-montreal.ca/en/about/](http://www.canadianclub-montreal.ca/en/about/)
Confederation, McRoberts spends the bulk of the narrative on the second half of the twentieth century, analyzing Trudeau’s national unity strategy, as well as the official bilingualism and multiculturalism policies. In his conclusion, he studies alternate strategies for Canadian unity.

Parts of McRoberts’ narrative are not unlike the speculative narratives described earlier. Given that he spends part of his conclusion exploring what English Canadians should or could do in the event that Quebec ever does vote in favour of sovereignty, he joins Freeman & Grady and Harbron in speculating about the future of Canada after a Yes vote in a future referendum. However, the speculative narrative does not constitute the majority of McRoberts’ work, and his main focus is to explore the role that the national unity strategy has played in the Quebec sovereignty debate.

Finally, University of Regina sociology professor John Conway (1992), in *Debts to Pay: English Canada and Quebec from the Conquest to the Referendum* reexamines Canadian history with a sympathetic eye to Quebec.92 Noting that a large part of the problem between French- and English-speaking Canadians “is that English Canada and Quebec premise their actions of two very different versions of the same history” (1992: 7), Conway goes on to stipulate the thesis he supports throughout the work:

Whatever the grievances and the regional oppressions faced by English Canadians, we must never forget what sets the oppression of the Québécois apart. No other province or region has faced the routine use of military force, or the threat of such force, throughout its history. No other province or region can claim to be the political and constitutional homeland of a unique nation with its own language, culture, and history. The Québécois nation exists, justifiably festering with

---

92 Conway, Professor and Head of Sociology and Social Studies at the University of Regina, has also written *The West: The History of a Region in Confederation* (1983, 1994, 2006) and *The Canadian Family in Crisis* (1990, 1997, 2001, 2003). Two revised editions of *Debts to Pay* have been published, one in 1997 and another in 2004.
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historical grievances and resentments arising from the unjust treatment by English Canada. These are the facts that English Canada refuses to face and avoiding them has been the object of an elaborate constitutional dance begun long before 1867. The dance must end; the facts must be faced. And we in English Canada must set about paying our debts if we want Canada to survive (Conway 1992: 9).

Over the course of the next seven chapters, Conway retells narratives of Canadian history: the Conquest, the rebellions of 1837-38, the Riel rebellions, the conscription crises in WWI and WWII, the Quiet Revolution, 1980 referendum, Constitution patriation, the Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords, and the 1992 referendum campaign on the Charlottetown Accord. On several occasions, he emphasizes how English Canadians view events differently than French Canadians and recounts a narrative that he believes differs from those circulating in English Canada, such as the uprising in Lower Canada and the St. Léonard School crisis.

Conway later lists a series of myths that have “concealed the reality of Quebec as the political and constitutional home of the Québécois nation, while providing a false but reassuring sense of Canadianism” (207). These myths, he contends, must be abandoned because otherwise, reaching a settlement will be impossible. They are “the assertion that the Québécois are only one small piece in the Canadian mosaic, no more or less distinct than other groups in other provinces” (208), multiculturalism (208) and the notion that all provinces are equal (210). Further, Conway insists that the senate should be abolished and that proportional representation should be implemented. Conway’s narrative has a thesis similar to many of the French-language source texts: that fundamental changes need to be made to Canada.

In fact, a number of the French-language source texts explore Canadian society and various facets of Quebec society in particular, ranging from Quebec society or identity in
general (Dufour 1989, Jutras 1995, Maclure 2000 and Venne 2000) to anglophones in Quebec (Clift 1979) and ideologies in Quebec (Monière 1977). Several other French-language STs study the relationship between Quebec and the federal government (e.g. Morin 1972, Morin 1973), while still others focus on Pierre Trudeau and Canadian identity (e.g. Laforest 1992, Couture 1996).

Christian Dufour, who researches and teaches at the École nationale d’administration publique (ENAP) in Montreal, wrote Le Défi québécois in 1989. Like most of the Canadian society narratives in the English-language STs, Le Défi québécois begins with a historical narrative that opens with the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, “le seul événement que la plupart des Québécois retiennent généralement de la conquête de la Nouvelle-France par l’Angleterre” (1989: 21) and focuses on the 18th and 19th centuries. It then traces events in Canadian history until the 1980s, exploring nationalism and the French language throughout these years.

In Le développement des idéologies au Québec : Des origines à nos jours, Denis Monière (1977) traces, from New France in the 17th century to the early 1970s, the ideologies dominant during certain eras of Quebec’s history. In his book, this Université de Montréal political science professor argues against some widely circulating public or conceptual narratives, declaring, for instance, that “l’habitant de la Nouvelle-France, contrairement à certains préjugés bien ancrés, n’était pas particulièrement porté sur la religion” (1977: 66). Monière concludes that historically, the dominant ideology in Quebec “ne sera pas celle de la classe qui domine économiquement. [...] Ce sera la petite bourgeoisie professionnelle canadienne-française qui prendra la relève et se fera le porte-étendard de l’idéologie libérale et du nationalisme. Les membres de cette classe sont issus du peuple, ce sont les fils de paysans [...]” (1977: 363). Monière won a Governor General’s Award in the études et essais category for
this work in 1977.

Claude Morin’s *Le pouvoir québécois... en négociation* (1972) and *Le combat québécois* (1973) were translated into a single volume in 1976 under the title *Quebec versus Ottawa: the Struggle for Self-government 1960-1972*. Both *Le pouvoir québécois* and *Le combat québécois* include numerous photographs of political figures and reproductions of Canadian newspaper articles to support the narrative. In *Le pouvoir québécois*, Morin—who was an advisor to the Quebec government from 1963-197193 and then worked as a professor at the Université du Québec—tries to determine what gains Quebec has made from 1960-1970 in negotiations with Ottawa. Among his conclusions are: “aucun des ‘gains’ québécois réalisés au cours de cette période ne comportait de garanties de permanence [...]”, “les ‘gains’ québécois n’ont pour la plupart été réalisés qu’à la suite de conflits majeurs et déclarés avec Ottawa et n’ont presque jamais résulté seulement de négociations intergouvernementales régulières” and “certains ‘gains’ apparents du Québec ont en fait apporté à Ottawa des avantages supérieurs et à plus long terme” (1972: 189).


Morin is then able to conclude that only two options exist: “l’option canadienne” and “l’option québécoise” (1973: 178). He doesn’t believe in such alternatives as “les deux nations, 93 When the Union nationale and then the Liberal Party were in power. It is perhaps also worth noting that the Canadian Encyclopedia has the following remarks to make about Morin’s role as an RCMP informant during the 1970s: “In 1992 [Morin] was embarrassed by revelations that for several years during the 1970s he had been a paid informant of the RCMP under the code name ‘French Muet.’ Morin could not deny spying for the RCMP but he claimed that he did it only in order to find out what the RCMP were investigating and that he only turned over useless information” (Latouche 2000: 1524).
les deux sociétés, le fédéralisme coopératif, rentable, décentralisé ou véritable, le statut particulier, l’égalité ou l’indépendance, la confédération renouvelée, l’indépendance culturelle dans un fédéralisme économique, etc. A bien y regarder, toutes ces formules, et celles qu’on pourra encore inventer, ne réussissent qu’à masquer les choix à faire et à retarder le moment” (1973: 178). Logically, the Canadian option would involve recognizing a central government responsible for the economic, social and political orientation of Quebec, while the Quebec option would involve controlling Quebec’s social orientation from within Quebec, and inevitably lead to independence, since Ottawa would be perceived as “secondaire et suppléatif” (1973: 179). Morin does not explicitly support one option or the other. He concludes that this work was written “pour apporter une contribution à la réflexion des Québécois” and stresses that “le seul souhait de l’auteur est que, peu importe la voie qu’ils décideront de choisir, ils la choisissent en connaissance de cause, à la lumière des faits” (1973: 183).

In *La loyauté d’un laïc: Pierre Elliott Trudeau et le libéralisme canadien* (1996), Claude Couture—who is Professor of Social Sciences and Canadian Studies at the University of Alberta’s Faculté Saint-Jean—explores the contradictions in Pierre Trudeau’s thinking by examining the articles Trudeau published in the journal *Cité libre* from 1950-1960.94 Couture explores Trudeau’s visions of French Canada, the history of nationalism (and French-Canadian nationalism in particular) and considers that “la façon déterministe et historiciste avec laquelle il a articulé sa vision du Canada français a totalement contredit cette idée d’une stratégie individuelle et collective libre” (1996: 74). Later, Couture explores Trudeau’s time as prime minister to determine whether the same ambiguities were visible when he was in power as when he wrote about French-Canadian nationalism (121). Later, he asserts that because Trudeau’s post-1939 articles were republished over the years, and “il est évident que Trudeau n’a pas

---

94 This is the review Trudeau founded with Gérard Pelletier in 1950.
étudié les œuvres des philosophes politiques contemporains entre autres John Rawls, Charles Taylor ou James Tully” (140), Canadiens—particularly English-speaking Canadians—were offered “des textes datés, dépassés, et [...] caractérisés par une approche réductrice, voire simpliste. Par conséquent, s’il y a dans toute l’histoire politique canadienne, aussi bien française qu’anglaise, une entreprise de grande noirceur intellectuelle, c’est bien dans cette industrie du recyclage du trudeauisme” (1996: 140).

Université Laval political science professor Guy Laforest (1992), in Trudeau et la fin d’un rêve canadien, argues that “[s]’il y a crise, c’est au fond parce que monsieur Trudeau l’a emporté dans son combat contre les idées dualistes des politiciens et des intellectuels du Québec. La fin de la dualité, selon moi, est porteuse de la fin du rêve canadien des Québécois” (1992: 13). He further argues that the effort made to create a Canadian identity from one ocean to the other, a campaign targeting primarily Quebecers is “rien de moins qu’[’une] tentative pour subordonner la fidélité au Québec à l’allégeance au Canada (1992: 16). Laforest studies, for instance, Trudeau’s use of the term renewed federalism, arguing that Trudeau was purposely ambiguous when speaking about this concept. In fact, “Pierre Elliot Trudeau, fils du Québec et plus important leader politique de la fédération canadienne, a choisi d’être ambigu au moment sans doute le plus important dans l’histoire du peuple québécois [the 1980 referendum]” (1992: 50).

Finally, Laforest lists several “conditions à l’émergence d’un véritable partenariat entre le Québec et le Canada”, which are as follows: “un nouveau partage des pouvoirs, la dualité des systèmes judiciaires et des Chartes des droits, la reconnaissance pleine et entière enfin de ce que le Québec représente un peuple, une société nationale distincte” (1992: 263). Laforest christens this new partnership, or political union, “du nom de Canada-Québec” (ibid.). With the exception
of the last condition, Laforest’s conclusions are not dissimilar to those of McRoberts (1997), who, as discussed earlier, explores how Trudeau’s national unity vision affected the Quebec sovereignty debate and argues that this vision must be abandoned for Canada to become united again. The target text, *Trudeau and the End of a Canadian Dream*, was a finalist for the 1995 Governor General’s Award for translation, the only target text in the delimited catalogue to be shortlisted for this award.  

La passion du Québec (Lévesque 1978) consists of a series of interviews with René Lévesque conducted by French journalist Jean-Robert Leselbaum between 1977 and 1978. This work is eclectic in nature, in that Lévesque explains the sources of his nationalism, reflects on the Quiet Revolution and the future referendum, but also narrates events in his life, as well as his war experiences (1978: 27-28) and his time as a minister under Jean Lesage (1978: 34). Yet the interview is not quite a biographic narrative, since it does focus on issues important to Canada in general and Quebec in particular. These issues include the referendum, the French language in Canada, and the consequences of October Crisis. In addition, the book contains a timeline “de la Nouvelle-France au Québec indépendantiste.” As a conclusion, Lévesque’s 1977 speech to the members of the French National Assembly is excerpted.

Another Canadian society narrative is that of Jean-François Lisée (1990), who was a journalist for twenty years and has acted as an adviser to both Premier Jacques Parizeau and

---

95 No TTs actually won a Governor General’s Award in the translation category.
96 This work was originally published in Paris in 1978. However, a revised edition was published in Montreal by Québec/Amérique that same year. While the *présentation* in the Paris edition asserts that “René Lévesque accepta la proposition d’un livre d’entretiens. Sans doute avait-il été séduit à l’idée de commencer son mandat en s’adressant à la France, et donc à l’Europe, la souche de peuplement du Québec (1971: 10), the *note de l’éditeur* in the Québec/Amérique edition states that “pour le lecteur québécois, il fallait modifier quelque peu la substance de l’ouvrage. Nous avons donc repensé la formulation de certaines questions, nous en avons éliminé d’autres et, pour mieux adapter le texte à la réalité québécoise, nous avons ajouté une quarantaine de pages inédites grâce à la collaboration de M. Lévesque.”
97 The Paris edition contains several other appendices, including a section on Quebec culture that details songs, films, directors, novelists known in Quebec, and another that outlines Quebec political parties. However, these have not been included in the edition published in Canada.
Premier Lucien Bouchard. In *Dans l’œil de l’aigle : Washington face au Québec*, Lisée explores Canadian society through the eyes of Americans. Using declassified US documents that describe American opinions and studies on Quebec separation and nationalism, Lisée shows that Washington’s preferred outcome to the 1980 referendum was the *status quo*. While the United States would not have intervened if Quebec had separated, it considered the *status quo* most beneficial to the US. For this work, Lisée won a Governor General’s Award in 1990 in the *études et essais* category.

Finally, some of the French-language STs that narrate events occurring in Canadian society take an activist’s stance on these events, interpreting them for readers as a reason to rise up against oppression. In 1968, for instance, Vallières wrote *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* to tell readers that “[n]ous devons arracher les richesses immenses et les possibilités gigantesques de ce siècle (dues, en grande partie, aux découvertes technologiques contemporaines) des mains des businessmen [...] par une action pratique, révolutionnaire et collective” (1969: 17). Like Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*, Vallières’ narrative will be studied in detail in Part 4, so it will not be summarized again here.

Another work demonstrating activism is by Léandre Bergeron, who founded les Éditions Québécoises and les Éditions de l’Aurore with Victor-Lévy Beaulieu, has taught French at Concordia and authored the *Petit manuel d’histoire du Québec*, a popular re-narratization of Quebec history. In *Pourquoi une révolution au Québec*, Bergeron argues in support of revolution in Quebec. Written in the form of questions and answers between the narrator and an imaginary interlocutor, *Pourquoi une révolution au Québec* argues that the social order of

---

98 See the biography available on Centre d’études et de recherches internationales, where Lisée is now Executive Director [http://www.cerium.ca/_Lisee-Jean-Francois](http://www.cerium.ca/_Lisee-Jean-Francois). According to the website, the mandate of CÉRIUM is to “favoriser le développement des connaissances sur les questions internationales.”

99 This book is not part of the delimited catalogue, as it is not listed in the Library and Archives Canada catalogue under any of the three subject headings used to compile the delimited catalogue.
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Quebec needs to be changed. Although the majority of the work focuses on class differences in Quebec, with the narrator encouraging the interlocutor to speak “québécois” rather than French and to reverse the social order by overthrowing the bourgeois to the benefit of the worker class, Bergeron does support the independence of Quebec. For instance, he states that “il y a des Canadiens qui ont compris. Ils veulent lutter pour le socialisme et l’indépendance du Canada comme nous on lutte pour le socialisme et l’indépendance du Québec” (1972: 174). Bergeron also explains how his nationalism differs from the “vieux nationalisme anti-anglais, anti-canadien-anglais, pro-just-nousôtres. […] C’est un nationalisme dynamique, ouvert sur le monde, qui reconnaît l’existence des autres peuples comme il reconnaît l’existence de son propre peuple. C’est un nationalisme qui comprend que ce ne sont pas des gens pris individuellement ou comme groupes ethniques qui sont les ennemis mais plutôt que c’est la structure sociale qui est le problème” (1972: 175). The English TT was published by NC Press, which “publishes books and pamphlets that will be of assistance in the Canadian People’s struggle for national liberation” (Bergeron 1974: n.p).

*FLQ or October Crisis narratives*

One English ST narrated events related to the October Crisis or the FLQ. Ron Haggart & Aubrey Golden (1971) relate, in *Rumours of War*, events such as the kidnappings of Cross and Laporte, the arrests of the members of the two FLQ cells, rumours of plots to take over the federal government, the *War Measures Act*, the arrests of those suspected of involvement or association with the FLQ. They explore the consequences of and reasons behind the proclamation of the *War Measures Act*. Golden was at this time a general counsel and now works as an arbitrator of labour disputes, while Haggart produced and co-created the *Fifth*

Morf (1970), a psychiatrist and Jungian analyst, analyzes the FLQ leaders and narrates the events related to the FLQ. Published in January 1970, *Le terrorisme québécois* does not explore the October Crisis, but the English adaptation\(^\text{100}\) does. Morf analyzes the people associated with the FLQ, including Georges Schoeters, Raymond Villeneuve and Gabriel Hudon (alias Roger Dupuis). He considers Schoeters, “à cause de son âge, de son expérience de la vie, de sa supériorité intellectuelle,” to be the father of the FLQ (1970: 15). Villeneuve is one of the “leaders principaux du terrorisme québécois de 1963” (1970: 22), while Hudon is considered the third-most important figure (1970: 25). Morf then divides FLQ activity into waves, outlining five such waves beginning in 1963 and ending in February 1969. In addition to writing a chapter each on FLQ members Pierre Vallières, Charles Gagnon, François Schrim and le groupe Schrim, Morf includes a chapter on “la psychologie du révolutionnaire québécois.” He concludes that “le terrorisme du FLQ n’a pas obtenu l’effet escompté. Il n’a pas dressé le peuple contre le gouvernement. Loin de provoquer une ‘radicalisation des masses’, l’opinion publique n’a cessé d’exiger l’arrestation et la condamnation des auteurs des attentats” (1970: 145).

Section 2.2: Narratives in the Delimited Catalogue

In *La crise d’octobre*, Gérard Pelletier—a former editor of *La Presse* (1961-64), co-founder of *Cité libre*, secretary of state for external affairs (1968-72) and minister of communications (1972-75) under Prime Minister Trudeau—precedes his narrative with an avant-propos stressing that “je ne parle qu’en mon nom et n’engage que moi-même” (1971: 7) because he thinks readers may expect him, as a member of the federal government, to have written an “official” account or an apology for the government’s actions during the crisis. He then paints a portrait of the FLQ, which he argues has 40-50 core members ready to bomb, kidnap and murder, a slightly larger group of propagandists and writers who avoid violence, another group of 200-300 sympathisers who are ready to financially or otherwise support FLQ terrorists, and approximately 2000 or 3000 individuals who are not members, but who “souhaitent sa victoire et approuvent ses méthodes” (1971: 57). According to Pelletier, the FLQ has no central leadership or even any strategic planning among the cells (57); moreover: “le FLQ a-t-il cherché à ébranler le pouvoir établi, à perturber momentanément l’ordre public et à forcer le pouvoir à poser contre son gré certains gestes précis” (1971: 59).

Later, in his conclusion, Pelletier wonders whether “nous [allons] nous installer dans ce climat d’injures et de basses suspicions” (219), but he refuses to believe that “l’intelligentsia québécoise, dans sa majorité, va perdre le sens de l’État au point de réduire ses rapports avec lui à des échanges d’insultes et sa réflexion sur le pouvoir à des stéréotypes écoulés. [...] Je refuse enfin d’admettre que la communauté québécoise ait oublié le sens de la solidarité, parce qu’une faction de furieux a poussé jusqu’au meurtre son entreprise de division” (1971: 221).

Louis Fournier, who worked as a print and radio journalist for fifteen years and later became director of external communications at the Fédération des travailleurs et travailleuses du Québec, was the first journalist to broadcast the 1970 FLQ manifesto, which, according to the
back cover of *FLQ: histoire d’un mouvement clandestin*, “lui a valu d’être arrêté par la police.”

In this book, he recounts the events related to the FLQ, beginning in March 1963 and ending during the 1980 referendum, with the last manifestation of violence attributed to the FLQ: “trois bombes explorent à Montréal sous des panneaux-réclame du mouvement Pro-Canada vantant les mérites du fédéralisme” (1982: 472). The book also contains a chronology outlining “les faits saillants de l’histoire du Front de libération du Québec” from 1963 to the October 1995 referendum.

Former FLQ member Francis Simard (1982), with the collaboration of the rest of the Chénier cell—Bernard Lortie and Jacques and Paul Rose101—narrates the events of the October Crisis from his point of view in *Pour en finir avec Octobre*. The first part recounts the events of October 5 to October 17, 1970, while Parts 2 and 3 focus on events leading up to and events following the October Crisis, respectively. As Simard explains, he, Lortie and the Rose brothers were initially against the bombings and kidnappings that the Liberation cell supported, since it would attract police attention and make setting up an organization more difficult, but they changed their minds once the Liberation cell kidnapped James Cross since, “là, nous étions devant un fait accompli” (1982: 27). Much of the narrative focuses on the how emotionally difficult Simard and the others found the kidnapping and killing of Laporte. For instance, he states that “tu hésites avec toutes tes émotions, ta sensibilité, tes peurs... Les autres aussi. Nous sommes des humains, pas des machines. Et les maudits qui croient ou qui pensent que nous avons pu faire cela froidement, sans réagir, sont dans les patates jusqu’aux oreilles” (1982: 35).

At other times, he is critical of the government and the social order:

> Pour sauver la démocratie, on sort une vieille loi datant de la Première Guerre mondiale. La Loi des mesures de guerre. On la met en application en pleine nuit,

---

101 These are the four members of the FLQ cell that kidnapped and killed Pierre Laporte.

In Part 2, Simard narrates events from his childhood until 1970. He discusses the debts the group accumulated trying to fund the organization, and, later, the bank robberies they carried out once they could no longer get out of debt. Part 3 describes some events that were not mentioned in Part 1, such as why they chose the name Financement Chénier for their cell. Simard then recounts events following Laporte’s death, including the four cell members hiding in secret compartments and tunnels until their arrest in late December 1970. As in the first part of the work, Simard objects to the government’s implementation of the War Measures Act in the middle of the night, the “folie d’arrestations, de perquisitions” (1982: 196), and adds to these objections complaints about police behaviour when they raided the apartment where Simard, Lortie and the Rose brothers were hiding. In his concluding remarks, Simard notes that “[i]l reste encore l’indépendance à faire. [...] Au Québec, le nationalisme, avant d’être une théorie, c’est un fait, une réalité. C’était la réalité de nos grands-pères. Ça va être la réalité de nos enfants. La dope, le disco, les sectes, ça va passer. Le besoin d’un pays, non !” (1982: 219).

The narrative elaborated by Vallières (1977) differs from the others in that Vallières seeks to unveil a conspiracy of sorts. In his book, he argues not only that the government took advantage of Laporte’s death to implement the War Measures Act and completely eliminate the separatist threat (1977: 154), but also that it was involved in Laporte’s death to turn public opinion against the movement, and return Quebecers to the status quo (1977: 155). According to Vallières’ narrative, the FLQ cell Chénier did not kill Laporte. Instead, “Le 17 octobre, Pierre Laporte est ‘exécuté’ par une cellule fantôme, Dieppe (Royale 22e)” (1977: 153). Moreover:

102 They did so because “financement” was a reference to the group’s experience robbing banks to finance their activities.
“Déjà convaincu que le Québec ne méritait aucune forme de ‘statut particulier’ au sein de la Confédération, le fédéral n’hésita nullement à ‘sacrifier’ Pierre Laporte pour parvenir à ses fins, c’est-à-dire essentiellement soumettre le gouvernement du Québec à ses diktats et éliminer ‘la menace séparatiste’ (1977: 154). Vallières’ narrative therefore depicts events very differently than Francis Simard’s, or even Gérard Pelletier. In fact, in Pour en finir avec Octobre, Simard directly comments on L’exécution de Pierre Laporte, stating that “[...] il y a les idioties, carrément malhonnêtes, du genre L’exécution de Pierre Laporte de Pierre Vallières” (1982: 191), so here is an example of two contrasting public narratives about the October Crisis within the same language group, illustrating that the narratives about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda should not necessarily be grouped by language.

(Auto)biographical narratives

Finally, a number of the STs consist of personal narratives, namely biographies that tell the life story of politicians or other figures related to Quebec nationalism or the referenda. Many such works fall into the personal narrative category outlined by Somers & Gibson (1994) and Baker (2006). Here are the works by Horton (1992) and Desbarats (1976), for instance. University of Waterloo history professor Donald Horton narrates the events of French-Canadian nationalist André Laurendeau’s life,\footnote{André Laurendeau was born in 1912 and died in 1968.} explaining that the “different facets of [Laurendeau’s] life story have aroused considerable interest because they so closely reflect the stages of French-Canadian nationalism’s own emergence into the modern era” (Horton 1992: vii). As Horton narrates the biography, the federalists and separatists of Quebec “both tried to claim [Laurendeau] as one of their own. [...] But both are undoubtedly wrong. Unlike them,
Laurendeau never needed the security of a one-dimensional position” (1992: 232).

A former *Toronto Star* columnist and Global Television co-anchor before joining the School of Journalism at Western, Peter Desbarats, in *René: A Canadian In Search of a Country*, narrates the events that led to René Lévesque’s decision to lead the PQ to a referendum on sovereignty association. Dwelling only briefly on Lévesque’s childhood—just one of twenty-five chapters—the narrative encompasses Lévesque’s time as a radio announcer during and after the Second World War, his years hosting “a news analysis show called ‘Point de Mire’” (1976: 66), and his reaction to the 66-day strike against Radio Canada by a group of radio and television producers. According to Desbarats, this strike led Lévesque to become bitter with the federal government, whom Lévesque criticized in an article published in *Le Devoir*. The rest of the narrative focuses on Lévesque’s political career: nationalization under Lesage, the formation of the Mouvement Souveraineté-Association, creation of the PQ and its election results in 1970 and 1973. Published in 1976, however, the narrative ends before the PQ wins the majority of seats in the November 1976 provincial election. Desbarats also explores the history of nationalism in Quebec and Lévesque’s thoughts on independence throughout his career.

A few of the French-language STs are biographic. Pierre Vallières’ *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* (1968, 1969, 1979, 1994) is both an autobiography and a revolutionary tract, as Section 4.4 will show. Gérard Pelletier (1983) wrote a personal narrative when he published *Les années d’impatience: 1950-1960*. The narrative focuses on Pelletier’s friendship with Pierre Trudeau, René Lévesque and Jean Marchand, “organisateur en chef, puis le secrétaire général de la C.T.C.C. [Confédération des travailleurs catholiques du Canada]” (1983: 30), and details the period in which Maurice Duplessis was Premier of Quebec. Pelletier is very critical of Duplessis and the Union nationale government, noting for instance, that “[...] le portrait de l’Union
nationale ne serait pas complet si, à tous ses autres charmes déjà décrits, on n’ajoutait pas ici sa xénophobie virulente. Cela aussi faisait partie du nationalisme duplessiste” (1983: 86) and “l’incompétence [du gouvernement Duplessis] ne se limitait pas, hélas! au domaine économique; elle était générale et tenait d’abord à l’inexistence chez nous d’une Fonction publique digne de ce nom” (91). Pelletier also covers the creation of Cité Libre, of which he and Trudeau were two founders.

Thus, the biographies, though they do not directly touch on the referendum question, do address nationalism and sovereignty by narrating the life stories of figures linked to these issues.

2.2.2.2 Theses in the source texts

While many of the works already described have a pro- or anti-independence thesis, some of the delimited catalogue source texts are best categorized by thesis rather than theme. These STs merit special attention, because they are often most critical of TL readers.

Pro-independence narratives

The works that are described under the pro-independence label support various forms of independence for Quebec. This label was chosen for simplicity’s sake and is not intended to limit the types of sovereignty or independence supported in the narratives. The same applies to those works that have been grouped under anti-independence. Often, these works are not strictly narratives, but they do usually use narratives to support their thesis.

For instance, in the English-language STs, the pro-independence narratives argue, for a variety of reasons, that Quebec should separate from Canada. Often, they develop a narrative based on selectively appropriated events from Canadian history. Consider, for instance, Reed
Scowen (1999), who, in his polemical personal narrative *Time to Say Goodbye: The Case for Getting Quebec out of Canada*, argues that “Quebec represents a direct threat to the unity of the entire country, so long as it is a member of the federation” (1999: 7). To support his thesis that “it’s time to ask Quebec to leave the federation, for a single reason: because the political values of that province are fundamentally and permanently incompatible with those of the rest of the country” (1999: 60), Scowen, a former Liberal MP in the Quebec legislature and Alliance Quebec\(^{104}\) leader, narrates the events that led him to this conclusion. In his story, “French-speaking Quebeckers see no reason to have anglophones in the civil service. And so, today, there aren’t any” (1999: 15). And in fact, Quebec’s anglophone community “has been so narrowly defined and so tightly regulated in the laws which restrict its activities that it is declining and can only continue to decline” (1999: 15). Throughout the work, Scowen illustrates his arguments with personal narratives about his experiences as an anglophone public servant in Quebec and former member of the National Assembly who was told by René Lévesque’s *chef du cabinet* in 1977 that he “should resign, because there was no more place for anglophones in the Quebec civil service” (1999: 14).

Scowen’s narrative is not extremely different from others that support Quebec’s independence. Bercuson & Cooper\(^{105}\) (1991) state emphatically in their preface to *Deconfederation: Canada without Quebec* that: “[e]vents that have transpired in Canada since the death of the Meech Lake Accord [...] have proven to us that the Canadian experiment has failed. [...] Canada cannot survive when French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians relate

\(^{104}\) The association, formed in 1982, officially represents Quebec anglophones. William Johnson, another former leader of this association, led Alliance Quebec from 1998 until 2000.

\(^{105}\) A member of the Royal Society of Canada, David Bercuson was made Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies at the University of Calgary in 1989, and in 2004, he won the Vimy Award, which "recognizes one Canadian who has made a significant and outstanding contribution to the defence and security of our nation and the preservation of our democratic values." (see: [http://www.cda-cdai.ca/Vimy_Award/vimyaward04.htm](http://www.cda-cdai.ca/Vimy_Award/vimyaward04.htm)) Barry Cooper, also a member of the Royal Society of Canada, has been a full professor at University of Calgary’s Department of Political Science since 1981.
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to each other like two scorpions in a bottle. It is time to break the bottle, allow the scorpions to escape, and rebuild what is left” (Bercuson & Cooper 1991: vii). They stress that their opinion is politics, not emotions, and that they “wish Quebec to live up to its potential as an independent state” (1991: 4). Like Scowen, they rely on narration to support their arguments: the bulk of the work recounts events beginning with French settlement in North America and spanning the Plains of Abraham, rebellions of 1837, Act of Union, Riel-led rebellions, Manitoba schools question, conscription crisis of 1917 and Union nationale government before ending with an entire chapter focusing on the Meech Lake Accord. In their narrative, some English-speaking Canadians may have been intolerant or bigoted with respect to Quebec, but most:

“[…] have tried to reach accommodation with Quebec at every turn. […] Only infrequently did they use their raw power to foist their will on Quebec, and not once in the last half century! To balance that, they were prepared to elect a Quebecker as prime minister for approximately thirty out of the last forty-three years, to allow Quebec’s post-hoc reservations about the Charlottetown and Victoria agreements of 1964 and 1971 to delay constitutional reform for decades, to accept that Quebec’s bloc of MPs in the House of Commons carry far more weight in the making of government policy than the representatives of any other province, and to permit Quebec to receive far more largesse in transfer payments, federal contracts, social assistance, capital expenditures, and so on, than any other province. If Confederation was a business agreement more than a love-match—and we think it was—Quebec has gained far more from it than it has lost (1991: 175).

Several French-language works can be considered pro-independence narratives. For
instance, former PQ leader and Quebec Premier René Lévesque (1969), in *Option Québec*, supports sovereignty-association, outlining why it is necessary and what the terms would involve. Lévesque begins by introducing the ways in which Quebecers are disadvantaged. Emphasizing that “notre société a des maladies graves, dangereusement enracinées, et qu’il est absolument nécessaire de guérir si nous voulons survivre” (1988: 112), Lévesque argues that a small people, like Quebecers within an Anglo-Saxon continent, risks being subsumed within the greater whole, and the only way to avoid this fate is to create a place where Quebecers can use their language and feel like equals instead of inferiors (1988: 113). After predicting bleak futures, Lévesque rejects remaining in or reworking the *status quo*, and argues that “il faut se débarrasser complètement d’un régime fédéral qui est complètement dépassé. Et recommencer à neuf” (1988: 127). The second part of the work then describes what a sovereign Quebec associated with Canada would involve, including the monetary union and common market, as well as “le coeur d’un marché commun, […] l’union douanière” (1988: 150). Lévesque mentions that a transition period of two to three years would exist, but Quebec would finally take complete control over its fiscal resources (154) and invest in creating new jobs in previously unexploited sectors, such as forestry. In the third and final part of the book, Lévesque has included appendices, including a study of the Scandinavian union and European community to illustrate how the Quebec-Canada union could work.

Pierre Bourgault, who led the Rassemblement pour l’indépendance nationale (RIN) and was a member of the PQ until after the 1980 referendum, wrote a polemical work entitled *Maintenant ou jamais!* (1990), and in it he expresses his excitement that conditions are set for another independence referendum. Part 1 of his book explores the then-current situation,

---

106 The quotes in this summary are taken from the 1988 edition published by Les Éditions de l’homme. Note, however, that the original work was published in 1968.
explaining why it is favourable for a Yes win in a referendum on independence. For instance, he notes that in 1980 “le mouvement, de toute évidence, n’était pas assez puissant et la force de l’adversaire, sous-estimée, le brisa tout net. Les choses semblent différentes aujourd’hui” (Bourgault 1990: 11). The favourable signs include the youth movement in favour of sovereignty (1990: 27), the revitalized Parti Québécois (29) and the fact that the United States would not be aggressive toward an independent Quebec (38-39).

In Part 2, Bourgault then lists “[d]es suggestions. Des choix possibles. La volonté d’agir. D’agir vite” (1990: 69). He notes that the sovereignty, rather than sovereignty-association, should be the objective of the next referendum and also that “[...] l’objectif doit être défini avec une clarté absolue et que c’est avec une clarté absolue qu’on doit s’y rallier [...]” (82). Moreover, Bourgault cautions his readers that “[l]a plus grande erreur que nous pourrions faire à l’heure actuelle serait celle de surestimer nos forces et de sous-estimer celles de nos adversaires” (102). In the final pages, he stipulates what the referendum question should be. The two-part question is as follows: “1 Voulez-vous que le Québec devienne un pays souverain? 2 Voulez-vous que le Québec souverain soit, dans la mesure du possible, associé économiquement avec le Canada?” (1990: 179). Bourgault notes not long after, however, that the second part of the question could be dropped, since “il est évident que nous serons associés économiquement avec le Canada et avec nombre d’autres pays” (ibid.).

Anti-independence narratives

Several English STs argue against Quebec secession. These include school teacher Antoinette Taddeo’s Canada con passione: A Teacher’s Cry for Quebec, a work written to “rectify” the author’s mistake in remaining silent when Quebec nationalists were loudly
proclaiming that Quebec should be a new country (1997: 7-9). She wonders how ethnocentric nationalism has worked its way into the heart of a population and risks taking her country away from her (11). McGill management professor and Prix du Québec winner, Henry Mintzberg, in The Canadian Condition: Reflections of a Pure Cotton (1995), declares his “‘polemic’ in the traditional, and, I hope, positive sense of the term” to be a “labour of love concerning the people and places I care deeply about” (1995: viii). In it, he reflects on Quebec nationalism and sovereignty-association, while exploring why he feels Quebec should not separate from Canada. At times speculative (“I believe that, in the event of a Quebec separation, Ontario would refuse to negotiate seriously” (31)), the work explores and criticizes various aspects of the Quebec government’s sovereignty-association plan.

Finally, Mintzberg offers a “Constitution for Canadians” that includes such statements as “We are a nation of three founding peoples, the aboriginal peoples who first settled this land, the French-speaking people who followed, and the English-speaking people who followed them” (1995: 104) and “we are one nation politically” (105). His conclusion summarizes the argument raised throughout his work: “We have plenty of climbing left to do in this country. So we had better learn to appreciate it. But while we’re at it, let’s just slow down and stop puffing for a few minutes, and take a deep breath of that fresh air. Then have a good look around. Not bad...eh?” (108).

In the French-language STs, the anti-independence theses vary. Some oppose the separation of Quebec, while others are critical of specific types of independence. For instance, Senator and former secretary of state107 Maurice Lamontagne, in La réponse au livre blanc du PQ: Le référendum piégé (1980), considers that the Livre blanc sur la souveraineté-association published by the PQ is “une oeuvre de propagande” (1980: 9). As he argues, “le document

107 Under Lester B. Pearson.
noircit le passé de façon systématique et mensongère” (ibid.). Lamontagne compares the PQ’s version of events—e.g. the conquest, rebellion of 1837-38, Act of Union, provincial leaders and their attitudes toward federalism—with the version offered by historians. His objections to the PQ’s book centre around the party’s interpretation of history and its selective appropriation of events. The second part of Lamontagne’s work critiques the PQ’s sovereignty-association proposal. According to Lamontagne, the proposal has two contradictory objectives: sovereignty pure and simple, and an extensive economic association with Canada (1980: 67-68). He believes “la souveraineté pure et simple comporte des sacrifices substantiels que les Québécois, en très grande majorité, n’acceptent pas” (1980: 68), while the “association” proposal is vague (1980: 78), impractical (1980: 81) and dangerous (83). The referendum question itself he labels “une vraie fraude” (1980: 85) because it is not sovereignty pure and simple, as the PQ have said they support, and because an economic association with Canada would be out of Quebec’s control in the event the province seceded from Canada (1980: 88).

Like Lamontagne, the group Décision-Canada (1980) is against Quebec sovereignty; however this group, which in 1977 organized federalist meetings across Quebec, is not as opposed to sovereignty-association as it is to the Livre blanc itself. Each chapter of L’illusion souverainiste critiques a chapter of the Livre blanc. Like Lamontagne, the members of Décision-Canada object to the PQ’s use of selective appropriation in their version of Canadian history. For instance, they state that the PQ complains that Ottawa controls certain services, such as unemployment insurance, but neglects to mention that this area has been the federal government’s responsibility since Confederation, and Quebec, for many years, has been getting more out of this service than it has put in (1980: 26). Décision-Canada also uses statistics to show that the PQ has misstated the federal government’s share of Canadian taxes, which is less
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than that of the provinces (1980: 33-34). The final chapter lists reasons why voting No would not be detrimental to Quebec, contrary to what the PQ states in its book.

The narratives by Lamontagne (1980) and Décision-Canada (1980) differ, in some ways from the French-language public narratives circulating in Montreal at the same time. As Robinson (1998) demonstrates in her analysis of the Gazette and La Presse in November 1979, these two newspapers—both targeted at a “broad, middle-class readership” in English- and French-speaking Montreal (1998: 116)—depicted the Livre blanc negatively: “both papers,” she asserts, “declared their support for the NO side at the beginning of the campaign and thereby signalled their scepticism for the PQ project” (120); moreover, they adopted “an overwhelmingly negative tone in their White Paper coverage” (ibid.). One of the ways in which they did so was by using as spokespersons the “same group of provincial Liberal and English-Canadian politicians, all of whom favoured the NO side in the referendum battle” (1998: 123). On the televised news reports, however, French-language stations gave more coverage to YES supporters, while English-language stations again privileged NO supporters (151-152). In both cases, YES supporters were given fewer opportunities to speak directly, and “[t]his direct presentation of NO voices in both Montreal news discourses not only created a more sympathetic tone for this option but also assigned greater credibility to the NO than to the YES voices” (1998: 152). By contrast, the narratives by Lamontagne and Décision-Canada were much more openly negative about the Livre blanc than the public narratives in the written and televised press. This is perhaps due to the diverse francophone audience to which the public narratives were addressed: Robinson shows that La Presse, in most cases, focused on the

108 Note: Robinson’s work has not been translated. It is not a ST narrative and is cited here only to illustrate some of the other public narratives that were circulating in the Montreal press circa 1980.

109 This study focused on the following French-language newscasts: Ce soir, Téléjournal, Le Dix and Nouvelles TVA. It contrasted these with the following English-language newscasts: City at Six, The National, City Tonight, Pulse, CTV National and Late Pulse. All were aired in Montreal between November 1st and 5th, 1979 (Robinson 1998: 134).
content of the *Livre blanc*, reprinting excerpts rather than interpreting it because of the diversity of opinions shared by its francophone readership, while the *Gazette* made negative statements in its summaries and headlines (1998: 121-122). By contrast, Lamontagne and Décision-Canada reprint excerpts but spend much of the work commenting on, interpreting and refuting these cited passages. Overall, though, these two French-language STs, by depicting the *Livre blanc* negatively, were echoing public narratives circulated in several Canadian newspapers and newscasts, though they more closely matched those in the English-Canadian Press.\textsuperscript{110}

Other French-language works argue against Quebec sovereignty in general rather than sovereignty-association in particular. Canadian Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Kimon Valaskakis and Mediator/negotiator Angéline Fournier\textsuperscript{111} are one such example. Their 1995 book *Le piège de l’indépendance: Le Québec sera-t-il affaibli par la souveraineté?* begins by defining sovereignty and exploring globalization. They outline five lessons that can be learned from the “divorce à l’amiable vécu par l’ex-Tchécoslovaquie” (1995: 27), including that the threat of separation can accidentally lead to divorce and that after sovereignty, maintaining an integrated economic space, such as shared currency and a customs union, is more difficult than one would think (1995: 28-29). While some of the work is a speculative narrative, the majority is an argument against the independence of Quebec: the authors emphatically state that “ce livre ne cache pas ses couleurs. Il s’agit d’un plaidoyer contre l’indépendance du Québec, basé sur l’analyse des dix mythes indépendantistes” (1995: 9).

\textsuperscript{110} It is difficult to apply this conclusion on a wider scale to the French-language media, as Robinson’s study covers only one French-language newspaper from Quebec. However, her conclusions do provide better insight into newscasts as well as the English-speaking press in Canada.

\textsuperscript{111} Fournier is also the former vice-president of the Montreal-based Gamma Institute, which studies—among other fields—economics, government, the environment and the European Union. See: http://www.sfhgroup.com/ca/training/presenters/angeline-fournier.php
Finally, in *Plaidoyer pour les citoyens*, Bertrand (1996), a lawyer who was once a separatist himself, stresses that Quebec must be informed about the disastrous socio-economic consequences of separation (1996: 10) and emphasizes that this book has been written to share his reasons for saying No to separatism once and for all (1996: 11).

2.2.3 Narratives in the English-language collections

Most of the English-language collections have a variety of themes, given that every work is a collection of texts from one or more sources, often representing several differing opinions. For this reason, the collections cannot be grouped by narratives as the French- and English-language STs were. However, a comparison of the collections is still useful.


\(^{112}\) This is the Joint Commission established by Bourassa and Parizeau and headed by Jean Campeau and Michel Bélanger. Its goal was to study Quebec’s relationship with Canada. From November 6 to December 20, 1990, it received more than 200 briefs and 600 submissions.
consultant Richard Fidler (1991) has selected texts from the Bloc, PQ, Quebec and Federal Liberals and NDP, First Nations in Quebec, francophone and anglophone organizations, Quebec businesses, and francophones outside Quebec.

The three collections of texts by Laurendeau and Groulx, however, present more nationalistic viewpoints. Though published in the early 1970s, these collections contain mainly texts originally published from the 1930s-1960s. They also contain literary texts such as poetry, and for this reason do not quite fit the restrictions placed on the delimited catalogue. However, they have been included because they also contain non-fiction texts that do fit the restrictions of the delimited catalogue. The collection of essays by Quebec author Hubert Aquin, published in 1988, contains texts written between 1960 and the early 1970s, much closer to the time period studied in this thesis. And, like Laurendeau and Groulx, Aquin was a nationalist: in 1964, he was the Montreal-region vice president of the RIN. While these four collections would seem to fail to meet the criteria for inclusion in the delimited catalogue, they have all been included because, as commented translations (all of the English collections contain prefatory texts), they illustrate trends in English Canada during the 1968 to 2000 period; these trends are explored more fully in Section 3.2.3. In addition, because the catalogue includes all non-fiction, nationalism-, independence- or referendum-related works originally published between 1968 and 2000, these collections do meet this criterion, as no single French collection published prior to 1968 was used as the source text for any of these collections, making the collections “new” works originally published during the 1968-2000 period.

The themes in the English-language collections show that translations of polemical works by pro-independence and pro-nationalism writers were being published for English

---

113 Who refused a Governor General’s Award in 1969 for political reasons.
114 Rassemblement pour l’indépendance nationale.
Canadians. Four of the seven collections are translations of polemical texts written by Quebec nationalists and/or separatists, while a fifth, Beyond the PQ, contains texts originally written by the Centre de formation populaire and adopted by the Saskatchewan Waffle to support its socialist position.\textsuperscript{115} Because these collections contain essays that English-speaking readers might find more provocative than many of the others published during the 1968-2000 period, these collections contain lengthy prefatory texts to contextualize the works for readers.

2.2.4 CONCLUSIONS

The French and English STs depict Canadian “reality” in slightly different ways, but the narratives chosen for translation into French and English do share some similarities. Let us turn to each of the themes in turn to see what trends exist in the delimited catalogue STs.

First, the speculative narratives. Almost without exception, the English STs, after speculating on the future of Canada in the event of Quebec secession, conclude that independence would not be to Quebec’s advantage. One English ST also argues in favour of “re-inventing Canada” (Gibson 1995: xiv), which is a position supported by many of Canada’s francophones. The French STs, however, offer contrasting conclusions, with some speculating that Quebec would be disadvantaged by independence (e.g. Côté 1995) and others (e.g. PQ 1993) that Quebec would be better off after secession than it is within Canada. Thus, authors have written in both English and French about why independence would (not) be advantageous to Quebec, and their texts have been made available in translation. This means that through translation, French-speaking readers in Quebec were offered a variety of reasons why independence would not be to their advantage while English-speaking readers were offered

\textsuperscript{115} Readers are encouraged, in fact, to “join with our brothers and sisters in Quebec in demanding profound changes in the constitutional arrangements in this country” (1980: 6).
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contrasting points of view from French-speaking authors.

Of the STs with a nationalism theme, most are French-language works, so it seems that French-language nationalism narratives were chosen for translation more often than those written in English. One trend that is evident in this group of works is that several of the French STs translated into English are critical of Quebec nationalists or nationalism (e.g. Delisle 1992 and Poliquin 2000), so the English TTs reflect a point of view held by many English-speaking Canadians (cf. Part 1). This is one—of several—instances in which the works selected for translation match the opinions of many (or even most) TL readers rather than those of SL readers. This point will be discussed in greater detail in Part 3.

The English and French STs with a Canadian society theme were varied. In both the English and French STs, a wide range of narratives were selected for translation. The French STs consisted of narratives from the centre and periphery of francophone Quebecker opinion: Hélène Jutras (1995), a young Quebec francophone, explains her reasons for being dissatisfied with the province, Morin (1973) argues that Ottawa has not been allocating resources fairly and has been controlling sectors that should be under provincial control, Couture (1996) analyzes the contradictions in Trudeau’s thinking, and Laforest (1992) discusses how Trudeau’s policies have led to the political crisis between Quebec and the rest of the country. The English STs also contain a variety of theses, including Johnson’s (1994) argument that anglophobia exists in Quebec and that instability and regional conflicts will continue as long as Canada tries to accommodate the French ethnic state of Quebec, and McRoberts’ (1997) point that Trudeau’s strategies have failed to change how Quebec francophones see Canada. In this case, then, both the English and French STs chosen for translation represent a wide range of opinions from English and French Canada.
With the FLQ or October Crisis narratives—as with the nationalism narratives—French rather than English seems to be the language of most STs. More than ten percent of the French STs translated into English narrate events related to the October Crisis or the FLQ, while fewer than five percent of the English STs chosen for translation have a similar theme. The French STs offer a variety of views: the personal narrative of an FLQ member (Simard 1982), a conspiracy theory by a former FLQ member (Vallières 1977), a psychological analysis of FLQ members (Morf 1970) and a narrative by a member of the federal government (Pelletier 1971). By contrast, only one English-language work about the FLQ was translated into French,\(^{116}\) so this seems to be an example of translation being used to fill a gap in the TL: since so few of the works published in English on the subjects of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda addressed the October Crisis or the FLQ, translations of French-language works are more common than vice versa.

Finally, the (auto)biographical narratives show that biographies of Quebec francophones do not have to be written by French-speaking writers: the English-language biographies of André Laurendeau and René Lévesque were translated into French. This finding is supported by the conclusions of Simon (1989), who notes that: “Le Québec a longtemps été un objet de curiosité pour autrui (plus que d’autres collectivités?). Cette curiosité éveille un égal intérêt de la part du Québec qui souhaite connaître en traduction ce que les autres ont choisi de dire sur lui” (1989: 49, emphasis added). That English-language biographies of Quebec francophones were translated into French seems to support the idea that Quebec publishers have a tendency to translate into French works written about Quebec and Quebecers.

And now for the works with pro- or anti-independence theses. In the pro-independence

\(^{116}\) However, very few works on the FLQ or October Crisis seem to have been published in English. Of the 265 English-language texts in the delimited catalogue, less than half a dozen are narratives about the FLQ or October Crisis.
narratives, different theses were espoused by the French and English writers: in the English STs, Quebec needs to leave Canada because this is the best outcome for Canada (e.g. Bercuson & Cooper 1991 or Scowen 1999). The English pro-independence narratives also support complete independence for Quebec. By contrast, the French STs with a pro-independence thesis argued that Quebec should gain independence because it would be best for Quebecers (rather than Canadians) and these French STs usually supported various forms of independence, reflecting the larger trend in Quebec, where support for complete independence is lower than support for sovereignty-association. Thus, while the English STs did support a political position favoured by some French-speaking Quebecers, these STs (and their French translations) offered a point of view that differed from many of the French-language works: how Canada was being affected by Quebec’s desire to separate and how Canada would be better off without Quebec, rather than vice versa. This trend is true even when the English-speaking writer is from Quebec (e.g. Reed Scowen), and it is further exemplified in title changes, such as Canada without Quebec (Harbron 1977), which became Le Québec sans le Canada in French (cf. Section 3.2.5). The pro-independence narratives, then, are an example of translation being used to present new points of view to the TL audience.

In both the English and French anti-independence narratives, ST authors argue against various forms of sovereignty. Anti-independence narratives are common in English STs; moreover, most of the English speculative narratives conclude that independence is not in Quebec’s best interest. Thus, narratives with an anti-independence thesis comprise a significant

---

117 Claude Ryan (1978) states that when polls asked Quebecers whether they were in favour of Quebec as an independent country, just 15% of respondents agreed. Only when the concept of an independent Quebec economically associated with Canada was proposed did approval rise to 35% (1978: 90). The separatism entry in The Canadian Encyclopedia asserts that support for “full political independence” remained at 40 percent for most of the 1980s, and that while support for sovereignty rose to about 65 percent after the Meech Lake Accord was rejected, it declined “to its more normal level of about 40%” after the PQ’s 1994 win in the provincial election (Stein 2000: 2142).
number of the English STs, which reflects the larger trend within Canada but outside Quebec (cf. Section 1), where most people are against sovereignty and sovereignty-association for Quebec. However, the English STs with anti-independence narratives do not simply argue against independence for Quebec. In some cases, they are in favour of recognizing Quebec as a distinct society within Canada (e.g. Conway 1992) or of other changes, such as decentralization of powers and “major reforms” (e.g. Gibson 1995) or reconceptualizing the country (e.g. McRoberts 1997). Works such as these three, which do have an anti-independence thesis, are actually arguing in favour of reforms supported by many members of the TL audience.\footnote{Reforms similar to those proposed in the failed Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords, as discussed in Part 1. As discussed in Part 1, in the 1980s and 1990s, support for recognizing Quebec as a distinct society or for other changes to the country was strong among Quebec francophones.} One trend here, then, has been to translate works that do not necessarily represent the opinions of most English-speakers (the SL audience) but rather to publish works more representative of the opinions of the French-speaking TL audience. While a few polemical works strongly against Quebec sovereignty, such as Richler’s \textit{Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!} (1992) and Mintzberg’s \textit{The Canadian Condition: Reflections of a Pure Cotton} (1995) have been translated into French, most of the works published in French translation do not strongly express opinions with which a large percentage of the TL audience would likely disagree. Likewise, a number of very polemical activist or pro-independence French-language works were translated into English, including Bergeron (1972) and Bourgault (1995), but these represent a small percent of the fifty-three French-language source texts.

In general, then, the French and English STs offer a wide range of opinions and explore various facets of issues related to Quebec nationalism, independence and the referenda. But a common trend, in both English and French TTs, has been to publish translations that will appeal to large percentages of the TL audience, rather than translations that represent views commonly
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held by members of the SL audience: many of the works translated into French express an openness toward issues many francophone Quebeckers consider important, such as decentralization of federal powers and recognizing Quebec as a distinct society, while many of the works translated into English are critical of Quebec nationalism and nationalists or Quebec in general. Finally, some works likely to cause controversy or provoke many TL readers were translated into both French and English (e.g. Bourgault or Richler), but the overall tendency has been to publish less controversial works. The next section explores how the translations were framed for the TL audience, which helps to explain some of the trends noted here.
**PART 3: FRAMING NARRATIVES**

The purpose of this section is to explore my second research question, namely, how were the delimited catalogue translations—the ST counterparts of which were discussed in Section 2.2—framed for TL readers by translators, editors, publishers and other agents? This section will attempt to determine why the translations might have been framed in these ways, what these frames tell us about expectations of TL readers, and how the works most critical of the TL readers were reframed. Note, however, that the considerable number of peritexts in the delimited catalogue TTs means that this section can provide only limited answers to these three questions. It is the purpose of Part 4 to study these questions in more detail, through a closer analysis of two translations.

### 3.1 Defining Frames

To better understand how framing functions and of what a frame consists, let us return to the concepts addressed in Section 1.2.4. As discussed, frames are “structures of anticipation, strategic moves that are consciously initiated in order to present a narrative in a certain light” (Baker 2006: 167). Section 1.2.4 also stressed that framing is a way of presenting narratives, just as narrative is a way of presenting events. As Baker (2006) argues, framing is an “active strategy that implies agency” and a way for us to “consciously participate in the construction of reality” (2006: 106). Baker stresses that the same set of events can be framed in different ways to “promote competing narratives” (2006: 107), an idea that has intriguing applications for narratives—like those in the delimited catalogue—about controversial issues.

To a certain extent, TL readers are expected to interpret the TT according to what is said in introductions, prefaces or other paratextual material. Such frames, through labels and other
strategies, indicate that a work in the delimited catalogue is, for instance, a political analysis, biography or diary, that it is separatist or federalist, relevant or irrelevant to the current political situation, etc. and that it is expected to be received as such. Paratexts, particularly prefatory material, act as frames for the narratives they surround. By studying framing techniques, this section explores how the works from the delimited catalogue were framed for target-language audiences, how potential TL readers were addressed and what concerns they were expected to have about the SL authors and works and about the translations themselves. Some hypotheses about why the works were framed in this way will be presented as well.

Section 3.2 analyzes introductions, prefaces, book covers and other paratextual material found within the target texts, since TL readers are told how to interpret the TTs through this paratextual material. By analyzing the new paratexts that were written specifically for the target texts, this section explores the motives of publishers, editors, translators and other agents for creating or distributing the delimited catalogue translations. As will become evident, many of these paratexts address the target audience in an effort to contextualize the translation or express support for one of the nationalism-, independence- or referenda-related causes. Often, they provide a variety of reasons why TL readers should be interested in reading a work that was not originally intended for or addressed to them. Exploring these reasons helps illustrate expectations about the target audience and reveals perceived differences between various linguistic and cultural groups in Canada.

The theoretical framework for this section is two-fold. First, like the rest of this thesis, it centres around narrative theory and the notion of framing briefly explored in Part 1.2.4. It therefore focuses on the framing techniques described in Baker (2006), namely temporal/spatial framing, selective appropriation of textual material, labelling, titles and positioning of
3.1 Defining Frames

participants. The concept of *framing*, however, will be combined with the typology of paratexts proposed by Genette (1987; 2002), given that the term *paratext* is being used synonymously with *frame* in this thesis. Paratexts are, of course, examples of frames, in that they set the status of and/or disclose an attitude toward a narrative by explaining how and why a work should be read (cf. Young 2004: 77).

As Genette explains, the term *paratext* refers to elements that accompany, surround, prolong and present a work (literary or not).\(^{119}\) Paratextual material is the set of elements that are not part of the main body of a given work. These elements help ensure a text is received and consumed in a certain way (2002: 7),\(^{120}\) making them examples of narrative frames that recontextualize a narrative for readers. Paratexts can comment on or self-criticize a text (Crisaffulli 1996: 92) and can include such elements as prefaces, notes (in the form of footnotes or endnotes), illustrations, advertisements, blurbs, and even titles, subtitles, and the names of authors, editors and translators (Genette 2002; Crisafulli 1996: 92; Kovala 1996: 124-126). Such types of paratexts, which are found *around* the text but *within the same volume* are referred to as *peritexts*, while paratexts found *outside of* the text—interviews, correspondence and reviews, for instance—are referred to as *epitexts* (2002: 10-11). For reasons of space, this section focuses on peritexts in the TTs. However, both epitexts and peritexts are considered in Part 4, which studies two translations in more detail.

3.2 Peritextual frames

Paratextuality is one of five types of “transtextual” relations a text can have with other

---

\(^{119}\) Although Genette refers specifically to literary texts (1987: 7), paratextual material is found in non-literary works as well and appears in many of the texts and translations in my delimited catalogue.

\(^{120}\) This is a 2002 re-edition of *Seuls* published by les Editions du Seuil. The original work was published in 1987. Both editions are cited in the references.
texts. In *Palimpsestes*, Genette defines *transtextuality* as “tout ce qui met [un texte] en relation, manifeste ou secrète, avec d’autres textes” (1982: 7), noting that *intertextuality* (the presence of one text in another, e.g. quotations, plagiarism, allusions), *metatextuality* (“la relation, on dit plus couramment « de commentaire », qui unit un texte à un autre texte dont il parle, sans nécessairement le citer, voire, à la limite, sans le nommer” e.g. literary criticism), *architextuality* (categories into which a text falls—e.g. literary genre), *hypertextuality* (deriving one text from another, but transforming it into something new—e.g. James Joyce’s *Ulysses* and Virgil’s *Aeneid* are both hypertexts of the *Odyssey*) and *paratextuality* are the five ways in which one text can be related to another (1982: 7-11).

Genette’s typology of paratexts is not limited to texts like introductions, postscripts and book covers; it also includes such elements as dedications, author (or translator) names, and chapter/section divisions. However, these latter elements have not been studied in this thesis. They were deemed less relevant to the goals of this study, which are to explore how TL audiences were told to receive potentially controversial works and to determine what such frames reveal about the expectations of TL readers.

One type of peritext not included in Genette’s typology are appendices. Yet they can still be considered paratexts, since they fit the description of paratextual material: prolonging and surrounding the text, such material often helps ensure that a work is received in a certain way. For instance, a map of Canada added as an appendix would help readers situate the places mentioned. Appendices transmit both information and intention. When a new glossary is added to a target text, for example, its informational role is to tell readers that RIN stands for the *Rassemblement pour l’indépendance nationale*, while the title “glossary” itself tells readers that

---

121 Genette does include notes (footnotes, endnotes, etc.), but not glossaries or other appendices. In this study, notes and appendices, including glossaries, time lines, and maps, will be grouped together under the heading “notes and appendices.”
what follows is intended to be accepted as a list of words, abbreviations or terms the author, editor, translator or other source has decided the reader is unlikely to know (cf. Genette 2002: 16-17). When a new appendix is added to a target text, it helps indicate what expectations and perceptions publishers, translators or ST authors have of TL readers. This notion is explored in greater detail in Section 3.2.4.

One additional constraint has been placed on the type of paratexts studied in this section. Rather than examine the paratexts of the source and target works, this section analyzes only those appearing in the target texts. Moreover, only those paratexts that are new, that is to say, which were written specifically for the target text and did not appear in any previous source edition, are explored in detail. This decision has been made for the following reasons:

First, the second objective of this thesis, as outlined in the introduction, is to study framing devices for the delimited catalogue TTs, with particular focus on works that were critical of the TL audience. In the late twentieth-century Canadian context, one of the most significant controversial issues related to Canadian politics is the question of Quebec sovereignty—a question that culminated in, without actually being resolved by, the two referenda. As illustrated in Section 2.2, not all of the texts in the delimited catalogue are polemical in nature. However, they all address the often-controversial issues of Quebec nationalism, independence movements, and/or the sovereignty referenda. For this reason, the new paratextual material in the TTs often addresses perceived target reader concerns or needs, recontextualizing the works for an audience that is either criticized\textsuperscript{122} or not directly addressed in the source edition.\textsuperscript{123} So, to study the issues surrounding the translation and reception of

\textsuperscript{122} e.g. Richler’s \textit{Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!} (1992), which criticized Quebec’s sign laws and accused Quebec nationalists of anti-Semitism.

\textsuperscript{123} e.g. Bourgault’s \textit{Maintenat ou jamais!}, which explains to French-speaking Quebecers why the time is right for another sovereignty referendum in Quebec and why they should vote Yes.
controversial works, a focus on the TT paratexts seems to be appropriate. Perceptions and representations of the SL and TL audiences can be gleaned from these new paratexts, as this section demonstrates.

Second, the paratextual material in the STs—and any corresponding translations—may not provide much insight into how translations are adapted for a target audience during a period where tension between the many segments of the source and target language groups exists. Certainly, the ST paratexts do not provide the same insight as the paratexts written directly for the TL audience. Finally, given the significant number of paratexts in the source and target texts (over 50 paratexts in the English STs alone) an in-depth analysis of all texts would be beyond the scope of a single chapter. A sample has to be studied, and so the new TT paratexts have been selected. This paratextual material is most likely to answer the following questions: how were TL readers told to read the translations, what reasons were they given for reading a work on a controversial topic/a work that criticized them, and what did the agents who prepared the paratexts expect of the TL audience. With these questions in mind, let us begin the analysis.

What follows are a number of sub-sections exploring the types of peritextual material that has been prepared specifically for the translations in the delimited catalogue. Section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 explore statistics in the delimited catalogue, while Section 3.2.3 focuses on framing strategies in the prefatory and publisher peritexts. Translator notes and appendices are the focus of Section 3.2.4 and titles are explored in Section 3.2.5. Finally, book covers are analyzed in Section 3.2.6.
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3.2.1 Types and Functions of Prefatory and Publisher Peritexts

3.2.1.1 Prefatory peritexts

According to Genette, six fundamental types of prefatory peritexts exist\(^{124}\) and each determines which functions the preface is most likely to fulfil. These types are as follows:

i) original authorial preface (written by author, authenticity implied)

ii) original authorial postscript (by author, authenticity implied)

iii) later authorial preface/postscript \([préface ultérieure]\) (in 2\(^{nd}\) edition)

iv) delayed authorial preface/postscript \([préface tardive]\) (in re-editions after long periods of time)

v) authentic allographic preface (written by third party)

vi) fictional prefaces (those attributed to a fictitious person)

Genette asserts that prefatory texts do not all share the same functions; these will be determined by the type of prefatory text, its location within the work (e.g. beginning or end), and the writer (2002: 199-200).

The function of the original authorial preface is to ensure a text is read properly. Such prefaces tell readers \textit{why} and \textit{how} to read a work (2002: 200; original emphasis). This type of preface is the most common in both the English and French translations: fifteen of the prefatory texts found in the English translations and six of those found in the French are written for TL readers by the ST author.

As Genette explains, when prefaces explain \textit{why} a work should be read, they focus on value. In the case of authorial prefaces, the author gives the work and its subject matter value, explaining to readers that the work has documentary, intellectual, moral, religious or socio-

\(^{124}\) Genette does offer additional combinations in a section entitled “autres préfaces, autres fonctions” as well as an earlier section, “L’instance préfacielle,” but these six types cover the prefatory material found in the delimited catalogue translations. In fact, these categories will be further reduced for the purposes of this thesis.
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political usefulness, that it is new, or, at some periods of time, traditional, or that it is truthful—or at least that the author has tried to be truthful. Finally, in the case of collections or anthologies, the author may emphasize the unity between the textual elements as evidence that the entire work is valuable\textsuperscript{125} (2002: 201-209). Naturally, a single preface may contain several or even none of these themes.

As for the second function of authorial prefaces, that of explaining how a work should be read, Genette’s study of paratexts reveals that authors often describe how the work came about, outline the circumstances under which it was written, list acknowledgements, describe the intended reader, justify or comment on the title of the work, stipulate which chapters are most or least important, specify a reading order, explain that the book is a work in progress, provide an interpretation of the text, and/or define the genre to which the work belongs (2002: 212-228).

Though Genette states that the distinction between prefaces and postscripts is minimal and even groups the two together under the term \textit{préface} (2002: 164) (in this thesis \textit{prefatory material}), he distinguishes between introductory and concluding prefatory material when he describes their functions. \textit{Postscripts}, because they are placed after the text rather than before it, address an actual reader (who has presumably just finished reading the work) rather than a potential one (who may still be considering whether or not to read it). Because of their location, postscripts are therefore unable to guide the reader by explaining how and why to read the text. Instead, they have a corrective function, as the author can correct possible misinterpretations and discuss how the work should have been read (2002: 241-242). For the purposes of this thesis, however, both prefaces and postscripts will be considered a single type of paratext and will be referred to as either \textit{prefatory material}, \textit{prefatory texts} or \textit{prefatory peritexts}.

\textsuperscript{125} This latter theme occurs frequently in the English-language collections of the delimited catalogue: 6 of the 13 prefatory texts assert that the essays chosen for the collection are representative of the author’s larger body of work.
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The last two types of authorial prefatory texts have similar functions, since both appear after the first published edition of a work. In a later preface, the author can offer afterthoughts that were not included in the original preface, and more importantly, respond to comments or criticisms made by critics. Secondary functions of later prefaces include highlighting corrections or additions made to this new edition (2002: 242-243). Delayed prefaces are added to re-editions published many years after the original work and also provide an opportunity for the author to point to corrections. However, since delayed prefaces appear after the author has been detached from the text for a long period of time, they provide a venue for the author to analyze the text as just another reader. He or she can present second thoughts, rather than just afterthoughts, and, depending on the author’s age at the time of publication, these second thoughts may in fact be the author’s last word on the text (2002: 250-263).

Though many of the delimited catalogue translations contain new (and therefore later) prefatory texts, very few include delayed prefatory texts. As Section 3.2.3.1 demonstrates, nearly all of the French and English translations have been published within 5 years of the ST. This trend is likely due to the fact that the rapidly changing political situation often makes the source text—particularly the most polemical—seem outdated within a few years of its publication. Unless the work were being repositioned as a document of historical interest rather than a political, current text, its relevance to the TL audience would likely be limited within a short number of years. Consider a work like Maintenant ou jamais! (Bourgault 1990), which argues that Quebecers missed their chance for independence in 1980 but may soon have the chance for a second referendum. This text would be extremely dated after the 1995 referendum and not particularly relevant to either French or English-language readers. Accordingly, the English version was published in 1991, with a new authorial preface emphasizing Bourgault’s
feeling that “we are witnessing an unprecedented acceleration of history” and that some parts of his book “may already be obsolete” by the time English speakers read them (1991: Preface to the English edition, n.p.). With some parts potentially obsolete a mere one year after the source work was published, many more of Bourgault’s arguments would likely be so after another ten years.

In fact, this same point is repeated in Québec/Canada: les enjeux de la division,126 where translator Gérard Boulad notes: “L’ennui, cependant, avec l’actualité, c’est qu’elle évolue très vite. Les auteurs nous préviennent déjà, dans leur « Avant-propos »: certains aspects de questions traitées seront peut-être dépassés lors de la sortie de l’édition française” (Freeman & Grady 1995b: 15). And even in the 1978 English TT A Stable Society (translation of Une société stable), which contains essays originally published by Claude Ryan in Le Devoir up to ten years prior to 1978, emphasis is placed on the fact that the pieces have been “stripped of outdated details” and have “aged well” because Ryan discusses ideas rather than individuals (1978: Foreword to the English Edition, n.p.). So, while many translations include later prefaces or postscripts like that in Bourgault (1991), only three could have included a delayed prefatory text: Adalbert Lallier’s Sovereignty Association: Economic Realism or Utopia? (published in 1991, or 11 years after the French ST La souveraineté-association : réalisme économique ou utopie), Jacques Monet’s La première révolution tranquille : le nationalisme canadien-français, 1837-1850 (published in 1981, or 12 years after the English ST The Last Cannon Shot: A Study of French-Canadian Nationalism, 1837-1850) and Alain G. Gagnon’s collection Québec : État et société (published in 1994, or 10 years after the English ST Quebec: State and Society). Lallier (1991), the only English TT published more than 5 years after the ST, includes a new (and therefore delayed) preface, while Gagnon includes new acknowledgements along with a

126 A translation of Dividing the House: Planning for a Canada without Quebec.
new introduction and appendix, and Monet, a slightly modified introduction.

Both delayed and later prefaces were, however, found in some of the STs. The 1994 edition of Pierre Vallières’ *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*, for instance, contains four authorial prefaces: the “avertissement de l’auteur” and “en guise de présentation” that appeared in the original 1968 publication, the 1979 later preface, and the delayed preface written expressly for 1994 readers.

The rest of the prefaces outlined by Genette are written by sources other than the author. *Allographic prefaces*, for instance, are written by a third party such as a publisher, editor or friend. Such prefaces can be original, later or delayed (2002: 266-7), and are the second most frequently occurring type of prefatory material in the delimited catalogue TTs, given that seven peritexts in the English translations are prefatory texts prepared by someone other than the author or translator, as are six of the peritexts in the French translations, and more than half of the peritexts in the English-language collections. Like authorial prefaces, allographic prefatory material recommends the text or indicates why the work is valuable. Though recommendation is the most important function of these prefaces, they also describe how the work came about or provide biographic details about the author (2002: 267-269).127

The sixth category of prefatory texts, according to Genette is the fictitious preface, which is “written by” a fictitious character in the work. However, no examples of these prefatory texts have been found in either the source or target texts, which is understandable, given that all works in the delimited catalogue are non-fiction.

One type of prefatory text not specifically addressed by Genette, but which merits

---

127 Genette also describes *actorial* prefaces, a particular subset of allographic prefatory material, which are those written by a real (not fictitious) person who appears in the work. The main function, in addition to those just described, is to rectify factual or interpretation errors in the work (2002: 279). However, no examples of such prefatory texts are found in the delimited catalogue translations.
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special consideration, is the translator preface or postscript. Though at first glance such material might seem to fall neatly into the allographic category, given that it is written by someone other than the author, further reflection shows this classification is not quite appropriate. Translators are the authors of the translation and, due to the effort of rewriting the source text, are likely much closer to understanding the text than any other third party—e.g. publisher, editor, scholar, politician, friend—who could write an allographic preface. Since Genette argues that the main function of allographic prefaces is recommendation and translators are not in a position to objectively recommend their work, they are therefore distinct from all other third parties. Translator prefaces or postscripts are therefore considered a separate category for the purposes of this chapter.¹²⁸

Many of the functions of translator prefatory texts are similar to those of original, later or delayed authorial and allographic prefaces. First, the translator, as the author of the TT, is able to give the translation value and explain how and why it should be read (authorial preface). However, the translator is also able to comment on the ST as a third party, explaining how the work came about and (possibly) recommending the ST author (allographic preface). Finally, because translations are usually, though not always, published after the source text, the translator is able to point to changes or corrections that have been made to this new edition, respond to critics, etc. (later or delayed prefaces). But translator prefaces and postscripts also have a function not usually shared by the other types of prefatory texts. It is here that one often finds comments of a linguistic nature; translators are able to use prefatory material to explain or justify lexical choices, terminology problems, and to point to passages or concepts that were difficult to render in the target text.

¹²⁸ Indeed, they are considered a particular type of preface by Simon (1989), who, as part of her study on the discourse of translation in Quebec, analyzes translator prefaces in translated novels and essays.
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What Genette describes as the functions of various paratexts is similar to what Baker (2006)—who bases her explanation on Goffman (1981)—calls frame space. This term refers to the extent to which an agent can actively use a framing strategy, in much the same way that Genette has categorized each prefatory text by the agent who has written it and defined what each agent is likely to say in the prefatory text. Essentially, frame space is defined by the role an agent plays (i.e. whether the agent is an author, translator, editor or publisher), how the agent is engaged in the interaction (e.g. as a speaker, reader or eavesdropper), and his or her position in relation to the events (i.e. whether the agent is supportive of, critical of, indifferent to, or uninterested in these events) (2006: 109). According to Baker, a contribution (such as a preface or postscript) is deemed to be acceptable when it falls within the agent’s frame space (2006: 109-110), which means that a translator, for instance, is able to make comments in footnotes, a translator’s preface, an interview or within the text itself. But a translator who has used a translator’s preface to express a political position with respect to the narrative that follows would be outside his or her frame space if the translation clearly showed that the opposite position had been supported throughout the body of the work.

3.2.1.2 Publisher peritexts

A publisher peritext (pérìtexte éditorial), on the other hand, consists of those paratextual elements that have been prepared by the publisher: the format of the work (e.g. pocket, oversized edition), the cover (e.g. hardback, paperback), the collection to which it belongs (e.g. Les Éditions Balzac’s Le vif du sujet), cover pages (which may contain the author/translator’s name or biographic information, title of the work and/or collection, price, date and copyright notice), unnumbered title pages (which may contain such details as the title, number of copies
printed or the ISBN number), and font and paper choice (Genette 1987: 21-37).

Not all of these publisher peritexts will be studied here, to help make this chapter more focused. Only the publisher peritexts that most closely resemble prefatory texts have been selected for study: biographical material and series notes appearing on the unnumbered pages immediately before or after the main body of a work. Since the authors of these peritexts are not specified, the material has presumably been prepared by the editor or publisher. Biographies and series notes share many of the functions of prefatory texts, so all of these paratextual elements will be studied together in this section.129

Genette does not specifically describe the function of biographies and series notes, but the series notes and translator/author biographies added to the translations in the delimited catalogue fulfill functions similar to those of the prefatory material. These functions are explored in greater detail in Section 3.2.3.

3.2.1.3 A note on peritext categories

For the following section, several broad categories of peritexts have been considered. Publisher peritexts, on one hand, include the above-mentioned peritextual material that has presumably been prepared by the TT publisher or editor. Prefatory texts, on the other hand, have been divided into three categories. No distinction has been made between the types of prefatory material (preface, postscript, introduction, series note, etc.) or the time at which this material was published (original, later, delayed). This decision was made for several reasons. First, the functions of the various types of prefatory material are largely the same, as Genette’s typology illustrates, and few new trends are likely to be illuminated by rigorously categorizing each of the

129 Book covers are also prepared by the publisher, but these peritexts are studied separately in Section 3.2.6 and are therefore not included in the term publisher peritext as used in this thesis. This is for the sake of convenience only: the book covers described in Section 3.2.6 are, strictly speaking, publisher peritexts too.
prefatory texts. Second, distinguishing between original and later prefaces is difficult in the case of translations. While the new prefatory texts in the translations can be considered later peritexts, due to the fact that they did not appear with the source text when it was first published, these prefaces and postscripts are also original, as they were written for the first edition of the translation (an original TL text). These two distinctions therefore seem of limited importance, and so, for the purposes of this analysis, the only distinction has been based on who wrote the prefatory text (author, third party, translator). While these three categories (authorial, allographic and translator) are not exhaustively discussed throughout the next section, they are noted whenever the author of the peritext is particularly relevant to the analysis.

3.2.2 Details of the peritextual material in the source and target texts

Whether a given type of paratext is included in a work depends on historical and cultural conditions as well as the personal preferences of publishers, authors, editors or translators (Simon 1989: 34; Genette 2002:199). Thus, certain trends become evident as one studies a given group of texts published in a particular culture and time period. For instance, in the delimited catalogue, publisher peritexts were found only in the 1970s for English target texts and only in the 1990s for French target texts. This finding would seem to indicate that such peritexts were more popular among anglophone and francophone publishers at different times.

All of the English source texts and all but one of the French source texts contain some
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type of paratexal material.\textsuperscript{130} Of the 26 English source texts,\textsuperscript{131} 23 (or 88 percent) contained at least one prefatory text such as a preface, postscript, presentation or introduction, compared to 51 of the 53 French source texts (96 percent).\textsuperscript{132} These initial statistics show a marked tendency to comment on or contextualize the source work in some way, underscoring the fact that these works delve into controversial topics and may not be favourably received by all members of the SL communities. By adding a prefatory text to such works, editors, publishers, authors or other sources can explain to potential readers why and how the book should be read.

The problems with these works and their often controversial topics is compounded when the texts are translated. Many of these STs either study, comment on, or criticize particular TL communities or groups, which makes the addition of prefatory material to the TT even more appropriate. Simon (1989), in fact, argues that prefaces are indispensable when a work on a collectivity is later targeted at this same collectivity (1989: 49). Not surprisingly then, a large percentage of the TTs in both English and French contain new paratexal material intended for this new audience. Table 2 below summarizes some catalogue statistics.

\textsuperscript{130} In the rest of this chapter, the term paratexal material will be used to refer only to the material that was studied for this thesis: introductions, dedications, acknowledgements, postscripts and other prefatory material, author and translator biographies and similar publisher peritexes, appendices, footnotes/endnotes/translator notes, and titles. While Genette includes chapter headings, copyright notices, tables of content and other such material in his typology, I have not concentrated on these elements in my study. So, when I say that all but one of the French source texts contained some sort of paratext, I do not mean that this text did not have a table of contents, copyright notice, etc., but rather that it did not have prefatory material, author biographies, appendices or notes within its covers.

\textsuperscript{131} As mentioned in Part 2, one source text (Caldwell 1994) was never published, so it has been excluded from these statistics.

\textsuperscript{132} Same comment as above. In this case, the source text for Arnaud & Dofny (1977) could not be located.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51 English TTs</th>
<th>28 French TTs</th>
<th>7 English-language collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 English TTs with new paratexts</td>
<td>20 French TTs with new paratexts</td>
<td>7 collections with paratexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 new paratexts in the 36 English TTs, namely:</td>
<td>27 new paratexts in the 20 French TTs, namely:</td>
<td>17 paratexts in the 7 collections, namely:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 prefatory texts</td>
<td>17 prefatory texts</td>
<td>13 prefatory texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 publisher peritexts</td>
<td>2 publisher peritexts</td>
<td>0 publisher peritexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 notes and appendices</td>
<td>8 notes and appendices</td>
<td>4 notes and appendices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Paratexts in the English and French translations

3.2.2.1 New peritexts in the English target texts

Table 2 shows that of the fifty-one English target texts,\(^{133}\) a total of thirty-six have at least one new paratext (70 percent), and most have more than one. A total of fifty-nine new paratexts are included in these English translations, and of these, the majority are prefatory peritexts written by authors, translators, editors or third parties, such as politicians. Notes and appendices are also commonly found in the English translations. In fact, notes are the second-most-common peritext, as eighteen English TTs contain notes by the translator or an editor.\(^ {134}\) Additional appendices, including glossaries and time lines have been added to seven target texts, as have five publisher peritexts such as biographies or series notes. Notes and appendices are far more common in the English target texts than in the French, a trend that will be discussed in Section 3.2.4, as it aptly illustrates the expectations publishers, translators, editors and other agents have of English-speaking readers.

\(^{133}\) Which represent 53 French source texts.

\(^{134}\) The vast majority of such notes are signed by the translator. However, in two or three cases, (e.g. Léandre Bergeron’s *Why There must be a Revolution in Quebec*), a number of footnotes are included in the English version, while the French ST has none. These notes are not signed, but have been added for TL readers and are still indicative of expectations about anglophones, even if they are not marked as being prepared specifically for the translation. In several other cases, the TT notes are signed by the editor but do not appear in the ST edition (e.g. Pierre Trudeau’s *Against the Current*).
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3.2.2.2 New peritexts in the French target texts

A nearly identical percentage of the French target texts contain additional paratextual material, though the number of translations is much smaller: of the twenty-eight translations into French, twenty of them, or 71 percent, include one or more new paratexts. In all, twenty-seven new paratexts have been added to the translations and are divided as shown in Table 2.

Once again, prefatory texts are the most common type of paratext by far: they comprise 17 of the 23 paratexts (74 percent). A translator and an author biography have been added to one work (Gordon Gibson’s Thirty Million Musketeers), while translator notes have been added to seven. Only one text (Gagnon’s Québec : État et Société) contains a new appendix.

3.2.2.3 Peritexts in the English-language collections

Finally, the seven English-language collections published between 1968 and 2000 all contain at least one paratext. In fact, five texts contain two or more, as a total of seventeen peritexts were found in the seven works. The majority of these peritexts (76 percent) take the form of prefatory texts, though two appendices have been added to Canada Adieu? Quebec Debates its future (Fidler 1991), and translator (or editor) notes can be found in Abbé Groutz: Variations on a Nationalist Theme (Trofimenkoff 1973) and Canada Adieu?. All these peritexts have been studied because they are essentially new: they target English-speaking readers who were not the original intended audience. The fact that all of the English-language collections contain new peritexts, while just over half the English and French translations do is easily explained: given that no comparable French STs could be paired with the English-language collections, all peritexts in every collection had to be considered new, as they were written

135 Other texts did contain translator notes, but these notes simply indicated passages that were originally in French/English in the source text. Works with translator notes indicating this type of information were not counted as part of the translator note total, for either the French or English TTs.
expressly for the English-speaking target audience. Overall, the figures for the English-language collections are not actually that different from the ST/TT pairs, given that almost all the STs contained prefatory material—as do all of the English-language collections. Moreover, most of the TTs contained translations of this ST material, so prefatory texts were common in both the STs, TTs, and English-language collections. The only difference is that only the new paratexts written specifically for the TL audience have been selected for study in this section.

3.2.2.4 Comparisons with other studies

So how do the number of paratexts in the delimited catalogue compare to other studies of twentieth-century Canadian works? Michon (1990), who studies prefaces in fiction and poetry published in Quebec between 1940 and 1960, determines that 11 percent of these texts have prefaces (1990: 111-112). Simon (1989) cites a similar percentage for prefatory material in contemporary (1970-1989) translations of Canadian novels: slightly over 10 percent of the English and French translations in her corpus contain new prefaces (1989: 41). However, prefaces are more common in non-fiction translations prior to 1960, as Simon notes that nearly all of the translations into French of historical and ethnographic essays contain prefatory texts (1989: 45).136

Comparisons are therefore limited, since the years and types of texts in other studies do not closely match those of the delimited catalogue. As far as these studies illustrate, the percentage of delimited catalogue STs with paratexts is much greater than that of poetry or fiction published between 1940 and 1960, and the delimited catalogue TTs more often contain new prefaces than translated novels published between 1970 and 1989: while more than 90 percent of the French STs in the delimited catalogue have at least one prefatory text, only ten

136 Simon does not provide exact figures for the essays.
percent of the poetry or fiction published in Quebec between 1940 and 1960 do. However, the translations in the delimited catalogue contain fewer new prefatory texts than the non-fiction French translations in Simon’s corpus of pre-1960 texts. While most of the French and English translations in the delimited catalogue contain one or more peritexts (though not necessarily prefatory texts), close to 40 percent do not. The only set of delimited catalogue texts that matches Simon’s findings are the seven English-language collections of French texts, all of which contain prefatory material—although this set of texts are translations into English, while Simon’s corpus represents essays translated into French. Interesting, then, is the fact that the texts in the delimited catalogue often address controversial issues, yet they do not all contain new prefaces or postscripts to contextualize the work for the TL audience or to explain how or why it should be read. In a moment, these trends will be explored in greater depth. First, though, let’s begin analyzing the functions of the prefatory texts in the delimited catalogue so that better conclusions can be drawn about the use of paratexts in translations of works that address controversial issues.

3.2.3 Publisher and Prefatory Peritexts in the Delimited Catalogue Translations

Baker’s concept of framing strategies, discussed in Section 3.1, are similar to Genette’s argument that peritextual material discusses how and why a work should be read. Baker describes several devices that can be used to frame narratives. These include temporal and spatial framing, selective appropriation, labelling, positioning of participants, and titles (cf. Baker 2006: 112-139). Temporal and spatial framing is similar to the how function described by Genette: readers are given historical, text-related or agent-related context to frame how they interpret the work. However, this strategy can also be used to tell readers why they should read
the work. An agent may argue that given the upcoming referendum on Quebec sovereignty, English-speaking readers should read this English translation of a separatist’s work to understand his or her point of view. Likewise, selective appropriation, labelling and positioning of participants can all be used to tell readers how and why to read a work. Examples for each framing strategy abound in the delimited catalogue and will be explored in this section. In fact, all these framing strategies were found in most of the prefatory and publisher peritexts, and many of the peritexts incorporated more than one device. Titles are the only framing strategy that is not studied in this section. They are explored separately in Section 3.2.5 because book titles are another peritext. The examples that follow for each framing technique should be considered illustrations of the strategies found in the peritexts rather than an exhaustive list.

3.2.3.1 Temporal and spatial framing

Temporal and spatial framing “involves selecting a particular text and embedding it in a temporal and spatial context that accentuates the narrative it depicts and encourages us to establish links between it and current narratives” (Baker 2006: 112). By this, Baker (as well as Somers & Gibson 1994: 59) refers to the fact that the year and region in which a work is published will ultimately affect its interpretation. The time at which a text is translated and published in the target language is one method of framing the narrative for the TL audience: the fact that Pierre Vallières’ Nègres blancs d’Amérique (1968), for instance, was republished in 1979 and 1994, one year before each of the two independence referenda and in the midst of the sovereignty debates cannot be coincidental. The timing would appear to be a deliberate temporal framing strategy to situate an activist’s narrative within a particularly relevant political period. The opposite strategy can be seen in the publication of the English translation. Initially
published in 1971, one year after the October Crisis and three years after the book’s original publication (and subsequent banning), the English edition was not published again until 1988, twenty years after the original French text had been published, eight years after the referendum controversy had subsided and several years before the second referendum was proposed or indeed, before the PQ had even returned to power in Quebec.\footnote{137 The Quebec Liberal Party was in power from 1985-1994, when the PQ were re-elected and won 77 of the 125 seats at the National Assembly. Moreover, the Meech Lake Accord had been signed in 1987 but had not yet failed to be ratified.} This example illustrates how the choice of publication date and place can frame a narrative for the target audience and will be explored in greater detail in Section 4.

To help show how the year in which a source or target text is published is a way of reframing the narrative for readers, the delimited catalogue was organized chronologically by ST publication date. The vast majority of the translations in the delimited catalogue were published within 3 years of the source text. In fact, only one French TT and two English TTs were published more than five years after the source version, and one of these three TTs, \textit{Québec: État et société} (1994), was actually a translation based on an updated version of the English text \textit{Quebec: State and Society} (1984, 1993). So while it would appear that this 1994 translation was published ten years after the 1984 ST edition, it was actually published only one year after the second edition on which it is based.

As these data indicate, emphasis seems to have been placed on the time-sensitive nature of the publications. In most cases, particularly for the more polemical works, the ST author’s arguments and comments would not be very relevant to the current Canadian social and political situation many years after the ST was published. For instance, those works arguing for or against sovereignty prior to the 1980 or 1995 referendum would seem dated even a few months after the referendum had taken place and would therefore be likely to generate fewer sales to
cover translation and publication costs. The publication of translations within one or two years of the source work indicates a tendency to focus on new material rather than to look further back at possibly relevant texts from one or two decades ago.

While some works, such as Vallières’ Nègres blancs d’Amérique, were republished in both English and French, most were not. Moreover, even this work was not retranslated: the only translation available is the one by Joan Pinkham published in 1971. Nègres blancs also seems to be one of the few examples of a work published at the beginning of the delimited catalogue’s temporal limits and later brought back for a new audience as a “classic” text deemed particularly relevant to the then-current political situation.

Thus, it seems clear that the agents involved in the translation process considered delimited catalogue works most relevant to TL readers shortly after they were made available to SL readers: otherwise, a greater number of texts would have appeared in translation many years

---

138 An aside about grants award to the delimited catalogue ST/TTs would not be out of place here. A total of 16 (of 53) French STs and 6 (of 26) English STs received funding from the Canada Council for the Arts (CCA), usually in the form of block grants for the publisher. Of the 51 English TTs, nearly half (22) received funding from the CCA, as did 11 of the 28 French TTs, either in the form of block grants to the TT publisher or as a direct grant for the translation. No French-language STs with a pro-independence narrative received funding from the CCA, with the exception of the English translation of the PQ’s Le Québec dans un monde nouveau. The publisher of this TT received a block grant from the CCA. Interestingly, however, one pro-independence narrative from the English-language STs was published with the support of a CCA grant: both the ST and TT publishers of Reed Scowen’s Time to Say Goodbye: The Case for Getting Quebec out of Canada received block grants for their publishing program, and VLB, the French TT publisher, received a grant for the translation.

139 During my correspondence with Joan Pinkham, the translator of Nègres blancs, she acknowledged that both she and the publisher “were all aware, of course, that the book had an element of timeliness that was important” (See Appendix 2 for the full text of this interview), but the publisher trusted that she was working as fast as she could and did not enforce a deadline for her. Pinkham notes as well that the publisher’s own heavy schedule may not have allowed them to release White Niggers any more quickly. This point was also emphasized during my interview with Daniel Poliquin, who mentioned that Les Éditions Balzac, publisher of the French translation of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! was able to release the translation so quickly because they were a new publisher that—unlike more established houses—did not already have works scheduled for publication for the next few years. Poliquin believes any other publisher would not have been able to release the French version of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! the same year as the English version. So clearly, then, publishers were aware of the time-sensitive nature of the delimited catalogue works and attempted to publish the translations as quickly as possible, given translator schedules and the publishers’ own calendars.

140 This strategy is made clear in the ST covers. The 1994 French-language edition, for instance, has the following blurb on the back cover: “Nègres blancs d’Amérique, écrit en prison et, un certain temps, interdit par les autorités politiques, a été salué, dès sa parution, en février 1968, comme un ouvrage capital, une introduction indispensable à l’effervescence révolutionnaire des années soixante et soixante-dix.”
after the source text had originally been published. Such TTs would likely have been introduced to TL readers as works representative of the views circulating in Canada at an earlier time period. This same trend is not the case, however, for the English-language collections, as the following table illustrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Editor/ Translator</th>
<th>ST(s) publication date</th>
<th>TT publication date</th>
<th>Years between ST/TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbé Groulx: Variations on a Nationalist Theme</td>
<td>Trofimenkoff, Susan Mann (Ed. and Trans.); L’Heureux, Johanne (Trans.)</td>
<td>1910-1971</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2 to 63 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>André Laurendeau: Witness for Quebec: Essays</td>
<td>Stratford, Philip (Ed. and Trans.)</td>
<td>1942-1966</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>7 to 31 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Essential Laurendeau</td>
<td>Cook, Ramsay &amp; Michael Behiels (Eds.); L’Heureux, Johanne &amp; Howard, Richard (Trans.)</td>
<td>1933-1963</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>13 to 43 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Question: The Debate on the Referendum Question, Quebec National Assembly, March 4-20, 1980</td>
<td>Bergeron, Marie-Hélène; Brown, Douglas &amp; Simeon, Richard (Eds.); Fischman, Sheila (Trans.)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the PQ: The National Struggle and the Quebec Working Class</td>
<td>Saskatchewan Waffle (Ed.)</td>
<td>1977-1979</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Quebec: Selected Essays</td>
<td>Purdy, Anthony (Ed.); Gibson, Paul; Joshee, Reva &amp; Purdy, Anthony (Trans.)</td>
<td>1961-1977</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>11 to 27 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Number of years between publication of French-language source material and English-language collections

As Table 3 illustrates, most of the English-language collections were translations of texts that had often been published decades before the English translation. Only two collections were published in the same year as the entire set of French STs: Bergeron, Brown & Simeon (1980) and Fidler (1991). One other was published within three years of the STs: Beyond the PQ. In the
other cases, the source texts were published over a lengthy period ranging from 16 years in the case of Purdy (1988), to 24 years for Stratford (1973), 30 years for Cook & Behiels (1976) and more than 60 years for Trofimenkoff (1973). Because of this variance in the ST publication dates, the English-language collections often contained translations of texts much older than those published in the English TTs.\footnote{Note, however, that some French-language STs, including Ryan (1978) and Taylor (1992), are also collections of essays published over the course of many years. However, in each of these cases, fewer than 3 years passed between the publication of the ST collection and the publication of the TT collection. For this reason, the English-language collections are unique, as no comparable French-language collection was published prior to the English-language collection.} This means that English-speaking Canadians were offered not just contemporary works on Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda, but also older works by persons considered influential in or important to these subjects. Since no comparable French-language collections were published, it would appear that French-speaking Canadians were offered translations only of contemporary works from English-speaking Canada. However, this conclusion cannot be drawn definitely: one limitation of the delimited catalogue is that it does not include new translations of works published prior to 1968. This means, for instance, that a 1990 translation of a work originally published in 1945 would not have been included in the catalogue. For this reason, I cannot say for certain that French-speaking Canadians were offered only contemporary works in translation during the 1980 and 1995 referenda. Nonetheless, it is apparent that a wide range of French-language texts published from the early 1900s to the late twentieth century was available in translation to English-speaking Canadians, providing them with a selection of French-Canadian views on the Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda.

\subsection*{3.2.3.2 Selective appropriation}

Selective appropriation is found “in patterns of omission and addition designed to
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suppress, accentuate or elaborate particular aspects of a narrative” (Baker 2006: 114). Paratexts
that highlight or suppress certain events or certain aspects of a narrative are a means of
reframing that narrative. The most significant instance of this device occurs in the biographies
added to the English translations of L’exécution de Pierre Laporte : Les dessous de l’Opération
Essai (Vallières 1977) and Un Québec impossible (Vallières 1980).

During the 1960s and 1970s, Pierre Vallières was featured fairly frequently in the
English-Canadian press. A quick search through the Globe and Mail archives, for instance,
reveals that Vallières is mentioned in more than 40 articles in the three-and-a-half years between
September 20, 1966, when it was reported that police had obtained a warrant for his arrest in
connection with the death of Thérèse Morin, and February 28, 1970, when his sedition hearing
was mentioned briefly. By the early- to mid-1970s, his name appeared almost twice as often:
from April 24, 1970 to April 20, 1975 he is mentioned in slightly over 80 articles. In fact, his
name is still mentioned in the Globe and Mail in the late 1970s and early 1980s in brief articles
scattered throughout the paper at an average of four or five times a year.

Likely in response to the opinion TL readers may have formed of Vallières based on
articles such as these, a new biography written specifically for English-speaking readers follows
The Assassination of Pierre Laporte and precedes An impossible Quebec. Both are sympathetic
to Vallières and portray him as a man arrested for his political beliefs rather than for the actual
charges of manslaughter, sedition and conspiracy.

Vallières is said, for instance, to have been considered the “‘theoretician’ of the FLQ”
even though “[t]he FLQ in fact never had a central leadership or strategy” and it is argued that
he was put on trial for his political views (Vallières 1977: 191). The biography is quick to point
out that 1) Vallières did not know any of the members of the FLQ cells that claimed
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responsibility for kidnapping Cross and Laporte, 2) the conspiracy charges against him were “quashed” by the Quebec Superior Court, and 3) after receiving a one-year suspended sentence for three charges of counselling criminal acts, Vallières rejected terrorism, endorsed the PQ and became a part-time lecturer at the University of Sherbrooke (1977: 192). Vallières is therefore depicted as a very un-dangerous activist-turned respectable citizen who was persecuted for his political beliefs rather than any real wrongdoing.

An even more sympathetic biography precedes An Impossible Quebec (Vallières 1980). In this work, translator Jeffrey Moore describes Vallières as a man of belief who has been portrayed negatively by the press and the government for political reasons. In it, Moore argues that Vallières was “never […] the kind of man from which society needed protection” and that while Vallières may have been a radical, he was civil and compassionate rather than “the wild and irresponsible bomb thrower that many wanted to believe he was” (1980: 11). Moore likens the legal proceedings used to convict Vallières of manslaughter to “kangaroo courts” and “Tartufferie” that seem best suited to a “Costa Gavras142 scenario” (Vallières 1980: 8).

These two peritexts are being used to address anticipated reader concerns about the author and position his arrests, ostensible involvement with the FLQ and role in the October Crisis as the response of an overzealous government. Both of these biographies depict Vallières as a political prisoner rather than as a terrorist or terrorism advocate, with the likely intention of making English-language readers feel more inclined to read the works, given that they are supposed to represent the ideas of a man imprisoned more for his views than his actions. Therefore, Vallières is lauded for his “impassioned, flamboyant” court room performance that “drew plaudits from the University of Montréal law faculty” (Vallières 1980: 9), while his

seven-month sentence for contempt of court (Lebel & Seale 1970: 8) is not mentioned. Likewise, the fact that Vallières, after “highly publicized court battles”, won on appeal or was acquitted of “the main charges” (Vallières 1977: 191) is emphasized, while the fact that these “main charges” included manslaughter for the death of Thérèse Morin during a shoe factory bombing (Lebel & Seale 1970: 8) is omitted.

Selective appropriation can be used to generate reassurance and empathy among TL readers and is therefore an important technique for addressing TL audiences during times of political controversy. When the public narratives circulating in TL newspapers and institutions have portrayed the ST author negatively, as Vallières often was in the English Canadian press, selectively appropriated events can be used to reframe these narratives in a new light and attempt to make the TL audience more sympathetic to his or her writing, thoughts or personality.

3.2.3.3 Labelling

The use of a lexical item, term, or phrase to identify a person, place, event or other important element of a narrative is considered labelling (Baker 2006: 168). This technique is often used in conjunction with positioning but is considered separately for the purposes of this chapter. Two of the most common labels used in the peritexts are objective and honest. Five English target texts use these two labels to refer to the ST author or the work itself. In four cases, the ST author’s study of nationalism, independence movements or the referenda is said to be objective (Lallier 1991: preface, n.p.; Morin 1976: xi), sincere (Dion 1976: ix) or honest (Chaput-Rolland 1970: 8), while the Foreword to the English Edition in Claude Ryan’s A Stable Society describes the author as someone who has always “tried to include all the elements of a given reality” and who “shuns rash predictions and passionate judgments” (Ryan 1978b: n.p.).
3.2 Peritextual frames

Only one French translation uses similar labels: André Burelle, who wrote the Préface to *Trente millions de mousquetaires: un Canada pour tous les Canadiens*, considered Gibson’s language “honnête” (Gibson 1996: viii). These labels are used to create a story about the SL author that is expected to appeal to the TL audience. Authors are being labelled in a way that is intended to convince potentially unwilling readers: whether or not the TL readers agree with the SL author, they may be more inclined to read the “honest” and “sincere” words of a Canadian with a different point of view.

One of the more important applications of the labelling technique is its use by translators in their prefaces to refer to SL terminology and explain their lexical choices in the target language. In the delimited catalogue, the translators explain their lexical choices and justify the use of one label over another when referring to political positions or groups such as separatism or separatists (e.g. Robert Guy Scully, in the French TT *René Lèvesque : ou le projet inachevé* (Desbarats 1977: 13). Comments of this nature appear exclusively in the translator prefatory peritexts: approximately half the prefatory peritexts prepared by translators comment on labels by explaining their choice of TL equivalents for SL people, groups, and concepts.

When prefatory material is used to discuss linguistic issues such as terminology or other translation problems, it emphasizes that a gap exists between the source and target languages, ST author and TL readers, and SL and TL communities, particularly when translators state that conveying a particular source concept in the target language is extremely difficult or nearly impossible. It emphasizes the importance of labels when describing the various groups in Canada and points to the sensitivity to these labels within the context of the Quebec referenda.

Highlighting linguistic gaps implies that distance exists in other ways as well. Thus, the prefatory peritexts reveal that French- and English-speaking Canadians differ politically: terms
like *separatism* and *independence* are not defined the same way in English or French, nor are words like *Quebecer* and *Québécois* (e.g. Desbarats 1977: 13, Maclure 2003: xvii). Other conceptual differences are emphasized in Venne (2001), when translators Chodos and Blair point to the difficulty of translating numerous French words “whose full range of meaning is virtually impossible” to render into English. They explain that “expressions like *rêpères* [sic] *identitaires de la collectivité* and the *quębécisation de la société* reflect shifting perspectives on communal identity [...]]. Just as reflecting on these terms is a work in progress, translating them is too” (Venne 2001: ix-x). Almost as if to further emphasize the distance between English Canadians and the French ST, the translation contains numerous translator notes to explain untranslated terms such as *Québécois de souche* and *la survivance* (cf. Section 3.2.4).

Because half of the translator prefatory peritexts discuss labelling challenges, both English and French translators evidently feel that important gaps exist between French and English conceptualizations and definitions of terms related to Quebec nationalism, independence movements, and the referenda. Their comments seem intended to bridge these perceived gaps between the SL author and TL readership. On the French side is the term *Québécois*, for instance, with its double meaning of “people of Quebec” and “the French-speaking or francophone Quebecers, formerly called the ‘French Canadians’” (Maclure 2003: xvii), while on the English is the term *Quebecer*, meaning only “people of Quebec” (ibid.). And between the two is the translator, who feels compelled to point out these nuances to the English TL audience. But is this strategy effective? At best, it is a double-edged sword.

While they may aim to help TL readers better understand cultural, political or linguistic differences, comments about labels also highlight the fact that these differences do exist and imply that French and English Canadians are distinct in many ways. In fact, highlighting the
distinctions between the two communities gives credence to the distinct society argument that was to be included in the Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords. Had the Charlottetown Accord passed, Quebec would have been recognized as distinct because it has a “French-speaking majority, a unique culture and a civil law tradition.” In other words, because its French-speaking inhabitants conceive Canada differently than anglophones and use different terms to do so.\textsuperscript{143}

The linguistic comments in the prefatory peritexts, then, actually help support distinctions between various Canadian groups. They create a dichotomy between English Canada and French Canada rather than between certain groups of English-speaking Canadians and other groups of French-speaking Canadians, and they highlight difference in works that deal with key issues of Canadian identity. Anglophone readers are told that French-speaking Quebeckers are distinct because they define political terms such as sovereignty and independence differently than English-speaking Canadians or because they discuss political issues that English lacks the words to completely convey, making it difficult for anglophones to participate in the discussion (see Venne 2001: ix). Naturally, differences exist between any language pair and any two cultures, but because these translator prefaces are found in works that address controversial issues at a time when various forms of sovereignty were being debated, the translators are only emphasizing the extent of the differences without necessarily focusing on reasons why these differences are minor or not insurmountable, as several authors and third parties did in their prefatory peritexts. In fact, the translators did not seem to interpret the text for TL readers; their framing techniques consisted almost exclusively of comments on the use of labels in the TT.

\textsuperscript{143} And indeed, this is similar to how Stephen Harper considered Quebec in 2006, given the motion he introduced in the House of Commons stating that the House should recognize that “the Québécois form a nation within a united Canada” (cf. Thompson 2007: A3; Clark 2006: A1; Simpson 2008: A17)
3.2 Peritextual frames

3.2.3.4 Positioning

When Baker uses the term *positioning*, she refers to the way in which participants of an interaction are positioned—or position themselves—in relation to one another and outsiders (2006: 132). This technique, adopted frequently in the peritextual frames, is a means of establishing trust with intended readers. It allows the SL author, SL groups, or the translation to be positioned in a way that makes them more relevant to the TL readers. The achievements of the author or translator can, for instance, be highlighted to show why he or she is particularly qualified to write the work, and biographical or other details can be made applicable to the TL audience. For instance, in Guindon (1990), a lengthy editor’s introduction had already been provided in the English source text and a translated version of it appears in the French edition. Because this introduction offers detailed information about Guindon’s life, career and publications, a new TT biography would have been superfluous. However, what the *préface à l’édition française* does detail is how Guindon’s work is “solidement ancrée dans la tradition des sciences sociales du Québec francophone” even though his thinking differs from Quebec tradition on certain points and is critical of certain aspects (Guindon 1990: ix). By comparing Guindon’s work to that of francophone Quebec sociologists, the new French preface adds additional authorial details that are directly relevant to the TL audience, while positioning the author as part of the TL community rather than an Other from the SL community.\footnote{The positioning strategy is also facilitated by the fact that Hubert Guindon has a French name rather than one that more clearly conveys Otherness.}

The positioning technique has been adopted in the TL paratexts for several different purposes, including reassuring TL readers, demonstrating a work’s uniqueness, promoting a work as a way to better understand other Canadians, supporting debate/dialogue among Canadians, acknowledging that TL readers would likely find the work provocative, and
positioning the work as an activist text that can help with a struggle in which TL readers are engaged. Each of these will now be examined in turn.

Reassurance

In some of the prefatory and publisher peritexts, the writer of the peritext obviously feels TL readers are likely to be apprehensive about the Other\textsuperscript{145} and require a response to their (perceived) concerns before they would read the translation. In many of the English-language prefatory and publisher peritexts that use the positioning technique, readers are assured that the work is not separatist or pro-independence and that the author is open-minded about Canada. In the French-language peritexts, the ST authors are positioned as open-minded toward Quebecers and open to compromise.

Consider, for instance, the Foreword to the English translation of Christian Dufour’s 	extit{Le défi québécois: essai}, which stresses that the upcoming work is “not a ‘separatist’ book” (Dufour 1990: 10), and the Preface to the English Edition that appears in 	extit{Quebec versus Ottawa: The Struggle for Self-government, 1960-1972}, which emphasizes that “[c]ontrary to what some might expect, my two books [...] do not constitute a plea for Quebec independence” (Morin 1976: xi).\textsuperscript{146} Likewise, Hugh MacLennan assures English Canadian readers in the Foreword to the English Edition written for 	extit{Quebec Year One} that although reviewers had labelled Chaput-Rolland (1968) unreasonable and even oblivious to “the great reservoir of clumsy goodwill” in English Canada, Chaput-Rolland “had been spending several months of every year travelling, lecturing and explaining Quebec from St. John’s to Victoria, [so] she must

\textsuperscript{145} The Other is simply all those the Self perceives as different (cf. Riggins 1997: 3). For readers of the target text, the Self is the TL reader, while the Other is the source language communities.

\textsuperscript{146} This same point is repeated in the new publisher peritext (A Note on the Translation), which precedes the preface.
have had a great deal more love for Canada than her exasperated words sometimes showed” (1968: 8). Chaput-Rolland’s friendship with late English-Canadian author Gwethalyn Graham is raised as further proof of the SL author’s openness to the TL community (1968: 8). Two years later, in a translation of a new work by the same author, Douglas Fischer positions Chaput-Rolland in a similar manner, telling readers that the “pan-Canadianism” running through the work is due to “the determination of Madame Chaput-Rolland to understand and, where she cannot understand, to feel Canada, to reach out to all of us” (1970: 10). His use of the title *Madame* is also an indicator of respect, which derives from the way she is referred to by francophones.

For francophone readers, ST authors are positioned as being open to the Other (the francophones reading the translation). Reed Scowen, in his *avant-propos à l’intention des lecteurs de la version française* states that “mon livre n’a pas pour but d’aider les Québécois à décider de leur avenir” and “[j]e tiens tout de suite à rassurer les lecteurs francophones : cette traduction ne cherche aucunement à modifier leur comportement” (Scowen 1999: 7). In other cases, the English-speaking ST author or various SL groups are positioned to show that they and francophone TL readers are not as different as one might expect. For instance, in the *Préface* to *Trente millions de mousquetaires: un Canada pour tous les Canadiens*, the author’s “libéralisme individualiste” is considered “pas celui d’un dogmatique fermé au droit à la différence du Québec” (Gibson 1990: viii), just as Léon Dion’s *Préface* describes the English-language writers in the collection edited by Simeon (1978) as being without “le moindre soupçon de dogmatisme fédéraliste, ni la moindre trace d’arrogance ethnique. [...] il est partout évident que l’on considère les Québécois comme des frères amis et qu’on ne veut rien d’autre que les comprendre et les rendre à l’aise au sein du Canada” (1978: viii). In these cases, Gibson and the
various authors in Simeon’s collection are depicted as open-minded individuals who are not opposed to accommodating Quebecers or working out a compromise to the current form of federalism.

The positioning technique has been used to implicitly assure TL readers that the ST authors are open to the Other rather than focused on issues that only SL readers would find relevant and interesting.

Uniqueness

One way for a translation to be given value, particularly when numerous publications on a similar subject are already available, is to position the target text as unique. This technique is found in nearly half the French prefatory peritexts and in two of the English-language collections. No English TTs are positioned in this way, but this difference between French and English translations is likely because more works were already available to French-language readers and so translations were positioned as unique to stand out from the rest, offering francophone readers a perspective not necessarily available in the works originally written in French. Thus, for instance, in the Préface à l’édition française in Tradition, modernité et aspiration nationale de la société québécoise (Guindon 1990), readers are told that though Guindon’s line of thought is anchored in the tradition of Quebec social sciences, it also “s’en distancie de différentes façons et souvent dans une prise de position critique” (1990: ix), making it stand apart from social science texts written by francophones. In the French translation Des comptes à rendre : le Canada anglais et le Québec, de la Conquête à l’accord de Charlottetown, Conway is said to be original “dans l’explication qu’il apporte de l’enfermement des Canadiens français à l’intérieur des frontières du Québec” (1995: préface, n.p.).

147 This situation was “provoked and encouraged by the institutional banishment of French from the West and

Two other works are positioned in a related way: in both cases, emphasis is placed not on how the author or work is unique in comparison to the target culture, but instead on how the author differs from others in the SL communities. Guy Rocher repeatedly emphasizes in the *Préface* to *Des comptes à rendre* that the author is not like the majority of English Canadians: “là où John Conway est original et en rupture avec son milieu, c’est qu’il perçoit comme normales et justifiées ce qui paraît à presque tous les Canadiens anglais comme des demandes exagérées et exaspérantes de la part du Québec” (1995: préface, n.p.). Similarly, Gibson’s source text is lauded because “nageant de nouveau à contre courant, [Gibson] publiait, en pleine campagne référendaire québécoise, *Thirty Million Musketeers*, un essai percutant qui claimait haut et fort la faillite du statu quo et tentait d’imaginer sur de nouvelles bases l’avenir du Canada avec le Québec” (Gibson 1996: vii).

All the French-language TTs that are positioned as being unique in some way target segments of the French-language audience. The first segment: an academic or scholarly readership who may have been interested in reading authors like Guindon or Gagnon and are being offered reasons why these two works are unique enough to merit attention. The second: a wider audience that does not support the political *status quo* in Canada. In these cases, anglophone ST authors are applauded for their open-mindedness toward issues important to many French Canadians. Distance is drawn between these English-speaking ST authors and
“other” or “most” English Canadians, who are depicted as less supportive of reconceptualizing the relationship between the provinces and federal government. Interestingly, none of these latter works are positioned as both a unique work and a source for understanding, which is appropriate, as better understanding between groups of differing opinions is less likely to occur when the STs chosen for translation already match the opinions of a large segment of TL readers.

**Understanding**

English target texts are often positioned as a source with which TL readers could improve their understanding of various issues. Readers are frequently told that the translation has been published to help them understand something about the Other, whether it be Quebec, French Canada or smaller segments of both. Fewer French TTs are positioned in a similar way. This tendency may have been part of a larger trend in Canada, as Simon (1989) notes that prefaces to English translations of French-Canadian novels often situated the translation within a political and ethnographic context and expressed the idea that “se traduire aide à se comprendre et donc à se rapprocher culturellement et politiquement” (Simon 1989: 35).

A publisher’s note in the French translation of Bercuson & Cooper’s *Deconfederation: Canada without Quebec* argues that given the then-current constitutional debates, “il nous est toutefois apparu d’une importance primordiale [...] de faire connaître le point de vue de nos interlocuteurs canadiens-anglais” (1991: n.p.), while Gagnon argues that one of the strengths of his work is that it would help Quebecers become informed about rivalries between federalists and nationalists, socialist-democrats and neo-liberals, centralist and decentralists, francophones and anglophones, and Quebec francophones and English Canadians (Gagnon 1994: 20). Finally,
the preface in Conway (1995) stresses that “la traduction française de ce livre mérite d’être lue et méditée comme un précieux témoignage d’amitié et de compréhension que nous apporte un vent favorable venu de l’Ouest” (1995: préface, n.p.).

By contrast, English prefatory peritexts offer a wide range of reasons why a work would help understanding. They express a hope that English-language readers would gain a better understanding of the following: what Quebec wants to be (Dumont 1974: xii); the aspirations of Quebec sovereignists (PQ 1994: xv), Québécois demands (Monière 1981: vii); sovereignty-association (Lallier 1991); the PQ’s proposal for sovereignty (PQ 1994: xiv); “upcoming events” (i.e. Quebec’s seemingly imminent independence) (Bourgault 1991); the problem of Canadian unity and Quebec’s relationship with the rest of Canada (Dufour 1990: 10); aspects of Quebec’s past and contemporary identity (Maclure 2003: xv); Quebec’s attitude to federalism, reasons for Quebec-Ottawa conflicts (Morin 1976: xi-xii); “the Québécois ideas of federalism [from 1963-1971] and of how people in Quebec can come to believe that sovereignty is essential” (Morin 1976: publisher peritext, n.p.); Québécois workers, so that both “Canadian” workers/students and “Québécois workers” can unite against their “common enemy, American imperialism” (Bergeron 1974: 8); the “depth of the ongoing crisis” and the way Quebecers see the situation (Dion 1976: xi); the sense of urgency surrounding the sovereignty debate in Quebec (Bergeron, Brown & Simeon 1980: 3); the nature and roots of the crisis in Canada (Fidler 1991: 2); and how Canada’s traditions (Aboriginal, European, French, English, etc.) can be accommodated with respect (Fidler 1991: ii-iii). Finally, the series note in Choose! (Vallières 1972) asserts that the series publishes first-hand documents to help English Canadians understand Quebec.

One other English target text contains a peritext that emphasizes not only understanding,
but also open-mindedness. In the foreword by Duncan Cameron to the pro-independence Quebec in a New World, readers are told: “People of good will, whatever their ultimate conclusions about the merits of the positions exposed here, can only welcome the opportunity afforded to deepen their understanding of the aspirations of Quebec sovereignists” (Parti Québécois 1994: xiv-xv). One implication to this statement is that English Canadians who do not want to read the target text are close-minded and impeding effective communication between a dissatisfied group of Canadians and the rest of the country.

The understanding positioning technique is found in polemical pro-independence works (e.g. Parti Québécois 1994; Bourgault 1991) as well as in works not arguing directly for or against independence (e.g. Monière 1981; Gagnon 1994). Not limited to a single decade, the focus on understanding is found in works published from the early 1970s (e.g. Dumont 1974; Bergeron 1974) until the early 1990s (e.g. Bourgault 1991). This latter trend is interesting, as it coincides with the date of the last independence referendum. English-language readers were being encouraged to be open-minded and understanding toward Quebec’s francophones (whether separatist or not) so long as a referendum seemed to be looming in the near future. In fact, this shift in focus away from understanding matches the larger trend found in the delimited catalogue (cf. Section 2.2.1), where it was noted that while French-language publications of works related to nationalism, independence movements and the Quebec referendum decreased after 1995 but remained stable in the post-1995 referendum period, English-language publications declined steadily from 1996 to 2000. It is as if, once the No side had won a second time, English-speaking Canadians saw little need to continue discussing or understanding the issues that were not yet considered resolved in Quebec, and the positioning technique in the prefatory and publisher peritexts reflects this larger trend.
3.2 Peritextual frames

The assumption by those who adopted this positioning strategy seems to be that English Canadians knew very little about (or were completely indifferent to) why some French Canadians were unhappy with the current federal structure. The translations were framed as a way for these anglophone readers to gain new insight about these issues. In fact, this lack of knowledge is directly mentioned in the prefatory material included in the English editions of Chaput-Rolland’s *Regards 1969: La seconde conquête* (1970), Dion’s *La prochaine révolution* (1976) and the English collections *The Question: The Debate on the Referendum Question, Quebec National Assembly, March 4-20, 1980* (Bergeron, Brown & Simeon 1980) and *Canada, Adieu? Quebec Debates its Future* (Fidler 1991):

This is written in the fourth week of the dragging crisis launched by the FLQ kidnappings. What can English Canadians know, rationally or intuitively, of what it means for Quebec and for a writer like Madame Chaput-Rolland? (Chaput Rolland 1970: 10)

Unfortunately, these developments [Quiet Revolution] are not sufficiently perceived and understood in English Canada, where the Québec concept of a Canada of two nations, English and French, stands discredited and forgotten. There is no appreciation of the French-Canadian felt need for protective constitutional structures, to make up for their minority status. If this unawareness and indifference persist in English Canada, the situation is bound to deteriorate and lead at last to a dramatic confrontation (Dion 1976: xiii).

Canadians outside Quebec have often been unaware of the significance and the
intensity of the debate [on the referendum question] in the province. They have not realized what profound questions are at stake (Bergeron, Brown & Simeon 1980: 3).

Our present lack of knowledge and understanding erodes the ties that bind us together as a country, leaving us vulnerable to prejudice and unaware of the benefits we risk losing through inaction or indifference. The simple fact is that we can no longer afford the luxury of remaining complacent, oblivious to what is happening in other parts of this enormous country (Fidler 1991: ii).

The works, then, are positioned as sources of understanding to help combat what is believed to be a lack of comprehension on the part of English-speaking Canadians. By contrast, this same technique is not adopted in the French-language target texts. This could be due to the way translation is valued in French and English at this time. Simon (2006) notes the following:

When languages are of unequal cultural status, the direction of translation dictates the value of what will be discovered. The “discoveries” of translation can be both positive and negative. Translating “up” (into a dominant language) is welcomed. It expresses values of curiosity and universality. Translating “down” (into the

---

148 An intriguing aside: a 1978 study conducted by the Globe and Mail found that “news from English Canada is given one of the lowest priorities by Quebec editors and reporters [at Le Devoir and La Presse]. In fact, sporadic is the coverage of English Canada that it appears Quebec’s French-language press is doing an even worse job than Radio-Canada of telling Quebeckers about what’s going on in the rest of the country.” However, the article also concluded that “the English-language press elsewhere in Canada [does not] always cover Quebec itself with adequate scope and dispassion. In the same month-long survey, three English-Canadian newspapers stressed political news, crime and labour disputes in Quebec to the near exclusion of economic, social and cultural developments” (Simpson 1978: 10). This narrative about which stories are available to English- and French-speaking Canadians would seem to indicate that the lack of understanding discussed in the peritexts is perhaps not limited to English-speaking Canadians after all, despite what the agents framing the delimited catalogue translations have to say.
“minor” language) elicits more complex reactions. It can lead to discoveries that are not necessarily positive, which reveal the oppressive and forced character of language exchange. Writers of self-perceived minority languages are hesitant to seek out foreign works before they have shored up their own defences and proven the viability of their own literary language (2006: 40).

The trend here seems to follow the phenomenon Simon is describing. In this case, the English target texts are “up” translations, and the paratext writers are urging understanding from English-speaking readers because they comprise the dominant language group in Canada and can therefore be more accommodating. The emphasis on understanding is not found in the French target texts because these are “down” translations, from the dominant official language into the less dominant. Interestingly though, because of the subject matter of the delimited catalogue works, the dominant/minority position is not quite the same as it might be with administrative or government texts. Here, Quebec—and French Quebec in particular—is the main sender and receiver of texts about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda—as evidenced by the number of publications in French in Quebec compared to the number published in English outside the province—meaning that French is, in a sense, the “dominant” language in which such topics are discussed. The English-language paratexts seem to agree with this point, given the number of prefatory and publisher peritexts that emphasize how little English-speaking Canadians know about these three topics in particular, and about Quebec in general. However, the fact that the peritexts also encourage English-language readers to be open-minded and understanding shows that French Quebec is seen in both a dominant and minority role at the same time: French-speaking Quebecers need to be understood, because they are a dissatisfied minority group in Canada, but at the same time, francophone Quebecers are
the most knowledgeable about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda and therefore have much to teach anglophones, who are in a weaker position in terms of information. This may not necessarily be the case, but the paratexts that focus on understanding evidence this assumption about anglophones and francophones in Canada.

**Debate and dialogue**

Fewer works are positioned as a source of debate and dialogue, but this technique still occurs fairly frequently in both the French and English translations. And unlike the understanding argument, the emphasis on debate and dialogue is found throughout the 1968-2000 period: translations from the mid-1970s until 2003 position works in this way. Many works that express an intention of increasing understanding among Canadians also stress a need for dialogue and debate.

Côté & Johnson (1995), in their preface to the English TT *If Quebec Goes*, assert that their book was written based on the assumption that “public, reasonable debate should guide collective decisions” (1995: xi). The authors then express their belief that this work will better influence the evolution of Canadian society (Côté & Johnston 1995: xi), a tall task indeed. Dion (1976) emphasizes his intention that his work “evoke interest and response among non-francophone readers” (1976: ix), while the publisher’s Foreword in Dufour (1990) states that the English translation, *Le Défi québécois: A Canadian Challenge*, had been published to “introduce Dufour’s questions to the public debate of issues that include […] the Meech Lake Accord” (1990: 9). Maclure (2003) argues that because the English version of his work, *Quebec Identity: The Challenge of Pluralism*, may help clarify some aspects of Quebec’s past and current identity, it might “remove some unnecessary impediments to the restoration of a
constructive dialogue between Quebec and the rest of Canada” (2003: xv). Finally, the Foreword to the Parti Québécois plan for independence acknowledges that “reaction outside Quebec to what is being presented here will not be without significance. The initial response is likely to cover the spectrum from astonishment to frustration, to indifference and disbelief, but some will want to engage in a dialogue with the PQ” (1994: xiv). It then promises that “there is much material here for debate” (xiv-xv). This strategy addresses probable TL reader objections to the work and provides them with a reason to read the translation, even if they disagree fundamentally with the PQ platform. In nearly all of the above examples, taken from French to English translations, the assumption about TL readers seems to be that they would be un receptive to ideas emanating from Quebec. The works are thus positioned as fodder for debates and discussions among Canadians.

Of the two French TTs that use this positioning strategy, one, *Le Canada face à son destin*, argues that the work will be part of the on-going debate on sovereignty-association (Simeon 1978: x) and the other, *Tradition, modernité et aspiration nationale de la société québécoise*, that the work should offer some readers the opportunity for dialogue and others the opportunity to debate (Guindon 1990: xii).

This emphasis on debate and dialogue represents a strategic positioning decision by the authors, translators and other agents. It is a way of anticipating the reactions of TL readers and providing an argument against not reading a controversial work with a potentially frustrating or unappealing thesis.

*Provocation*

Next, some works are simply positioned as provocative material: the writers of the
prefatory and publisher peritexts openly acknowledge that TL readers will likely consider the work provocative and disagree with its thesis. As with other positioning strategies, readers are told to pick up a controversial work because it will challenge their traditional beliefs about Canada, with the implication that doing so will demonstrate their open-mindedness or interest in understanding more about other segments of the Canadian population. In fact, some texts that are positioned as sources for understanding the Other also emphasize the provocative nature of the work.

In his foreword to Reflections II: The Second Conquest (Chaput-Rolland 1970), Douglas Fisher advises anglophone readers that Chaput-Rolland will jar readers’ complacency “if you tend to think that the skeptical feelings of French Canadians about us and Canada as we conceive it do not run deep or that they will quieten and phase themselves out in a pleasant accommodation to the majority will in Canada” (Chaput-Rolland 1970: 7). Similarly, Hugh Thorburn tells English-speaking readers that Léon Dion’s Quebec: The Unfinished Revolution will “serve to awaken English Canadians to the continued existence of a challenge to the national accommodation that they thought had been secured with the election of the Trudeau government” (1976: xiv), while Rod Dobell, in the Foreword to Canada Adieu, expects that “most readers of this compilation will find some of the views expressed here challenging, and some possibly downright infuriating” (Fidler 1991: ii).

The provocation positioning strategy is found only in the English target texts and not in the French translations or the English collections. Here, the TL readers are expected to be unreceptive to the translations either because of preconceived ideas about French-speaking Quebecers and referendum-related issues, or because they do not see a problem with Canada’s form of federalism. By positioning the target text as a provocative work, the agents responsible
for the peritexts are trying to directly address perceived reader concerns. However, it is intriguing that only anglophones are seen as hostile to ideas expressed by SL authors: since no French-language TTs are positioned as provocative, francophones are evidently not expected to be offended by the translations they were offered. This finding is in line with the conclusions of the *uniqueness* strategy, where it became clear that many French TTs supported opinions that matched those of a large number of French-speaking Quebeckers. It would seem, then, that the intended audience for many of the French TTs was in favour of changes to the *status quo*, but not necessarily in favour of complete independence. Because many of the translated works are federalist or support changes to the current form of federalism, the targeted French-speaking readers are expected be receptive to these works and therefore the *provocation* position strategy has not been adopted.

**Activism**

Finally, a few works are positioned as activist texts particularly relevant to a cause supported by the TL readers. This strategy was found in one English TT—Léandre Bergeron’s *Pourquoi une révolution au Québec (Why there must be a revolution in Quebec)*—and one English-language collection—*Beyond the PQ: The National Struggle and the Quebec working class*. The publisher’s note to Bergeron (1974) indicates that “NC Press publishes books and pamphlets that will be of assistance in the Canadian People’s struggle for national liberation” (1974: np). Later, readers are advised: “Any portion of this book may be used free of charge by anyone serving the cause of Québécois or Canadian liberation or the cause of the working people in any country.” And finally, the English translation includes a new introduction prepared by Bergeron, in which he notes:
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[...] I did not visualize an English translation, feeling that the discussion throughout the book was very specifically Quebec-based, and therefore could not be for others, the handbook that it was to be for many Québécois. But the editors of NC Press convinced me that by adding certain explanatory notes and modifying certain passages, Canadian workers in general would not only be able to see how things are developing in Quebec, but also apply to their specific situation the relevant content; since of course the fundamental contradiction is the same for both Québécois and Canadian workers.

[...] The national struggle going on in Quebec is not a struggle against Canadians but against a specific political structure that is alienating both Canadian and Québécois. We must keep in mind that the fundamental struggle is the same for both, the struggle against capitalists, local and especially foreign, U.S.-based since the latter are the big wheels of the system.

My hope is that this translation of Pourquoi une révolution au Québec will help Canadian workers and students understand Québécois workers so that the common interests of both will be a uniting force against our common enemy, American imperialism (Bergeron 1974: 7-8, emphasis added).

Clearly, this is an instance in which the values and ideas of the TT publisher and the ST author are very similar. The translation has been positioned in a way that makes it relevant to socialist struggles supported by the publisher and the target readers. This example will be discussed in greater detail in Section 4.2.5, when the motives of the publishing houses that released the English translation Nègres blancs d’Amérique are explored.

In the second example, Beyond the PQ The National Struggle and the Quebec Working
Class, both a new preface and a new introduction for the English translation show a positioning strategy similar to the one in Bergeron (1974). As the preface indicates:

The following articles are translations of documents from the Centre de Formation Populaire. We believe these articles are of vital importance to the English Canadian working class.

[...] the national aspirations of the Quebec people are not directed against English Canadian workers but rather, on the contrary, are directed against the common enemy of both French and English speaking workers, namely the Canadian bourgeoisie and their U.S. Allies (Centre de formation populaire 1980: 1).

The introduction, much lengthier than the preface, builds on this idea and explains how the activists in Quebec are fighting for a cause that will benefit English-speaking TL readers in the rest of the country:

[...] Further, we must learn to take advantage of any situation which will weaken bourgeois dominance, and to resolve any political or economic crisis which will provide a net gain for the popular movement. The present political crisis in Quebec presents such an opportunity.

[...] The present struggle in Quebec poses no threat to the working class in English Canada or to its allies, actual or potential, among the urban poor, agrarian petite bourgeoisie, native people or other exploited minorities. In fact, the people of Quebec are in the forefront of a struggle which can benefit all of us.

[...] We should join with our brothers and sisters in Quebec in demanding profound changes in the constitutional arrangements in this country. Whether Quebec remains in Canada under a new constitution, or opts to go on its own is a
secondary question for the working class in the rest of the country. We must extend and build the struggle against monopoly capitalist and imperial control of the Canadian state and demand a more equitable democratic constitution while preparing for the day when we can put socialism squarely on this country’s agenda (1980: 3-6, emphasis added).

Here again is a set of peritexts that frame the accompanying texts as relevant to a struggle in which English-speaking Canadians are engaged, despite the fact that these texts are written to inspire action from French-speaking Quebecers. The frames reposition the collected texts as activist works that should inspire action on the part of English-speaking readers, making them relevant to the TL readers.

3.2.3.5 Conclusions

The positioning strategies used in the prefatory and publisher peritexts depict English Canadians as having a more limited understanding of the political views of French-speaking Canadians than vice versa. In these peritextual frames, anglophones are not expected to understand the reasons, emotions and arguments behind the referendum question. And, because the prefatory peritexts make frequent references to understanding, open-mindedness and open dialogue, English Canadians are being urged to be more accommodating to points of view commonly held by various French-Canadian groups: a need for renewed federalism, sovereignty-association, or a different relationship between Canada and the provinces. This is perhaps an imagined relationship between the two linguistic groups, as it does not accommodate the many anglophones who have researched and written about Quebec nationalism,
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independence movements and the referenda, nor does it account for the many bilingual Canadians who can read both English and French. Moreover, it offers a limited picture of Canada, as understanding may be something generally lacking across Canada, with residents of each province being more likely to be informed about events happening close to their homes and less knowledgeable about events taking place in other provinces. And so, even if anglophones are indeed less knowledgeable than francophones about events in Quebec, the inverse may also be true: francophone knowledge of English-Canadian feelings toward Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda may very well have been limited.\footnote{As discussed in an earlier footnote about the 1978 \textit{Globe and Mail} study (cf. Simpson 1978: 10).}

The fact that the works are positioned as a means of understanding the Other, however, does not mean that the works would actually be received as intended. In fact, this strategy may not actually attract any of those readers who are unlikely to pick up the book in the first place: those who are very hostile to the idea of Quebec independence and nationalism are unlikely to be convinced by the argument to be more open-minded. In a way, the prefatory and publisher peritexts that emphasize comprehension are merely reaching those English-speaking readers who already want to learn more about the issues. The positioning strategies that focus on dialogue, debate, and provocation or adopt the strategy of selective appropriation to generate empathy for ST authors and their causes may be more effective techniques, as they at least address and acknowledge the potential concerns of TL readers.

French Canadians, on the other hand, are often offered texts whose theses complement arguments already available in French Canada. Many of the works translated from English into French are presented as offering a point of view not normally held by English Canadians, though it is a view commonly held by French-speaking Quebeckers. Other TTs are positioned as unique works with new insight into nationalism-, independence- or referendum-related issues,
implying that francophones are already aware of many of the arguments surrounding these issues and are looking for something new and unique rather than something to help them understand the essentials. Considering more than twice as many works were published in French than in English on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda, the above assumptions do not seem out of place. Even if French-speaking Canadians had read only a few (or none) of the available French-language works, the vast number of publications (more than 700 over the 32-year period) point to the fact that discussions about independence-related issues were common in Quebec (where virtually all the French-language works were published), so French speakers would likely have been at least passively aware of the main arguments. But it does seem hasty to conclude that they were as likely to be aware of the various English-Canadian opinions on these issues, as the authors of the prefatory and publisher peritexts frequently argue, even if some of these opinions may have been shared by francophones. And, while the French-language prefatory and publisher peritexts do acknowledge that a francophone reader might be apprehensive about the ST author’s thesis or arguments, they do so by reassuring the reader that the author is open-minded toward Quebecers.

The prefatory texts and publisher peritexts indicate a clear trend, in English-language works at any rate, to emphasize communication and understanding among Canadians. Pro- and anti-independence works, as well as those that critically assessed both sides of the sovereignty question, clearly focus on how the translation could help increase knowledge of the controversial topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda.

And though francophones may have been no more aware of English Canadian views on Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda than English speakers were of
French-Canadian opinion, only the English peritexts position the work as a source for better understanding the Other. Moreover, French prefatory peritexts show a clear emphasis on the fact that the English ST differs from what TL readers might have expected of English Canadians. With the exception of Simeon (1978), no work is positioned in the French-language peritexts as a “typical” example of the point of view common to most English Canadians. Instead, the ST author’s openness to compromise is highlighted for francophone readers, who are often offered works that conform to widely held TL political positions (renewed federalism, reconceived relationship between the provinces and the federal government). It would seem, then, that English-speaking Canadians were often expected to be more open to compromise, while French-speaking Quebeckers were not.

To further explore this idea of indifference and lack of understanding by anglophone Canadians, let us now turn to the second most common type of peritext in the delimited catalogue TTs: appendices and notes.

3.2.4 Functions of the Translator Notes and Appendices

In this section, for the sake of brevity, the term notes includes endnotes and footnotes, while the term appendix encompasses paratextual material labelled appendix, addendum, timeline or glossary.

Both notes and appendices are quite common in the English translations, but are found less frequently in the French TTs. Approximately one third of the new French paratexts consist of notes or appendices, which means that approximately one quarter of all French TTs include translator/editor notes or a new appendix. In the English TTs, however, approximately forty percent of the new English paratexts take the form of appendices and notes. The twenty-five

150 In Simeon, the authors were said to represent the opinion of the English-Canadian elite.
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English TTs that contain new notes and appendices\textsuperscript{151} represent more than fifty percent of all English TTs—this figure is nearly twice that of the French target texts. These figures are significant because they help show what perceptions of English and French TL readers are held by publishers, editors, translators and/or ST authors.

First, the fact that far more English TTs contain appendices and notes reveals an assumption that English-language readers are unfamiliar with Quebec history, society, politics or figures such as politicians and writers, as these subjects are frequently cited in the notes. And in some cases, the appendices provide information about Canadian history in general rather than about Quebec in particular. This same assumption is not made about the French-language readers, as the French translations do not usually contain comparable information. In the English translations, translator notes or new appendices are found in both personal narratives (e.g. Vallières’ \textit{White Niggers of America}; Jutras’ \textit{Quebec is Killing Me}) and conceptual narratives (Maclure’s \textit{Quebec Identity: The Challenge of Pluralism}, Fournier’s \textit{FLQ: Anatomy of an Underground Movement} 1984).

Not only do more English TTs contain notes or appendices, these notes and appendices are also lengthier and occur more frequently. For instance, while most of the French TTs with translator notes have just one or two notes (e.g. Harbron’s \textit{Le Québec sans le Canada} or Trofimenkoff’s \textit{Visions nationales: une histoire du Québec}, both of which have just one note, or Scowen’s \textit{Le Temps des adieux}, which has three), dozens of notes appear in many of the English TTs. For instance, more than two dozen notes—some more than six lines long—are found in Vallières’ \textit{The Impossible Quebec}, Vallières’s \textit{White Niggers of America} and Gougeon’s \textit{A History of Quebec Nationalism}, ten notes have been added to Bergeron’s \textit{Why There Must be a

\textsuperscript{151} Two texts (Venne’s \textit{Vive Quebec! New Thinking and New Approaches to the Quebec Nation}, and Vallières’ \textit{Choose}) contain both new appendices and translator notes.
Revolution in Quebec, a dozen to Vallières’ Choose!, and seven lengthy notes are included in Rioux’s Quebec in Question.

The English translator notes also differ in another respect. With few exceptions, the translator notes in the English TTs are used to provide additional information about Quebec organizations, figures, literary allusions, or legislation. While some do comment on citations, indicate new passages or highlight those that appeared in English in the ST, the primary function of the notes is to provide definitions or explanations for terms and concepts with which English-speaking TL readers are expected to be unfamiliar. For instance, the notes in Quebec is Killing Me (Jutras 1995) explain allusions to figures, plays and organizations, including Pierre Bourgault, Les belles soeurs, and CEGEP, while those in George Matthews’ The Quiet Resolution (1990) explain references to Cité Libre and Speak White, define terms like étapiste and profitable federalism (Bourassa’s slogan during his first term as premier), and provide details on figures such as Richard French, Gordon Atkinson, and former premier Adélard Godbout. Similar examples can be found in Quebec in Question (Rioux 1971), White Niggers of America (Vallières 1971), An Option for Quebec (Lévesque 1971), Choose! (Vallières 1972), A History of Quebec Nationalism (Gougeon 1984), Years of Impatience, 1950-1960 (Pelletier 1984) and Vive Quebec! New Thinking and Approaches to the Quebec Nation (Venne 2001), among others.

By contrast, the translator or editor notes in the French TTs almost invariably comment on linguistic issues rather than provide informational details about the figures, events or literary works mentioned in the text. For instance, La sécession du Québec et l’avenir du Canada (Young 1995) has only three translator notes. The first advises readers that the English term ROC has been used in the French text because it is “relativement répandu dans les journaux
francophones du Québec” (1995: xiv), the second, that the French version of the phrase “‘the impact of the hole [sic] on the parts’ […] se prête à un double sens que n’a certes pas voulu l’auteur” (1995: 63), and the third that “to the crown in right of Quebec” is an “expression juridique consacrée” (1995: 107). Le Québec sans le Canada (Harbron 1979) includes just one note to correct what the translator believes to be a factual error, Visions nationales: une histoire du Québec (Trofimennoff 1986) contains one note to translate the Reform Party’s slogan Rep. by Pop (1986: 151), and Le Temps des Adieux: Plaidoyer pour un Canada sans le Québec (Scowen 1999) has three notes to indicate what English term was used in the ST for the corresponding French TT (1999: 12, 77). In most other cases when translator notes are included in the French TTs, they simply indicate which passages were originally in French in the ST.

A variety of appendices have been added to the English translations. These include glossaries explaining organizations like the FLQ or RIN (e.g. F.L.Q.: The Anatomy of an Underground Movement (Fournier 1984), Choose! (Vallières 1972)), time lines (e.g. The Assassination of Pierre Laporte (Vallères 1977)) and biographies about Quebec figures (e.g. Quebec Identity: The Challenge of Pluralism (Maclure 2003)). Appendices were not usually prepared for French translations however: only one appears to have been added to a French TT. The Charte québécoise des droits et libertés de la personne is included in Québec: État et société, since, as Gagnon explains, this text is largely unknown, despite its importance (Gagnon 1994: 20).152

Throughout the three decades of the delimited catalogue, then, both notes and appendices are offered to English-speaking readers to explain similar concepts, figures, terms and organizations. The notes seem to have been added to make the English-language TTs accessible to as wide an audience as possible. While English-speaking readers who have been

152 This appendix is included in both volumes of this French translation.
closely following the referenda or the question of Quebec nationalism are likely to be familiar with Bill C-20 (which became the *Clarity Act*), with important journals such as *Cité Libre*, key figures such as René Lévesque and Mordecai Richler, or controversial statements such as those made by Parizeau following the 1995 referendum loss, notes have been provided by several translators on all of these topics. Clearly, the main audience for these works is not anglophones in Quebec, who would presumably already be familiar with Quebec institutions and figures, nor anglophones who have been closely following Canadian political events, but anglophone Canadians outside Quebec, who are assumed—by various angophone agents—to know very little about the province, its history and its people.

The French TTs include translator notes that are intended for a very different purpose than the notes in the English TTs. French-speaking readers are expected to be knowledgeable about the issues discussed in the translations; by contrast, English-speaking readers are not. In fact, the English-language notes echo the theme of understanding found in many of the prefatory and publisher peritexts. English TL readers are expected to have a limited understanding of Quebec—particularly francophone Quebec—and the notes and appendices are provided to help overcome this lack of understanding. Not surprising, then, is the fact that few French translations contain notes or new appendices, given that the French texts are targeted at French-speaking Quebecers, who are expected to already be familiar with terms, concepts, institutions and figures related to nationalism, independence and the referenda—as evidenced in the prefatory and publisher peritexts.

### 3.2.5 Titles

Genette states that the function of titles is threefold: to identify a work, promote it, and
indicate its content; however, he stresses that every title does not necessarily fulfill all three functions. In fact, only the identification function is obligatory. Note, though, that multiple works sometimes share the same title, so the identification function is not always entirely fulfilled (1987: 73).

For the most part, the titles of the delimited catalogue TTs are literal translations of the source work, or differ in minor ways while still conveying the meaning of the source title. These titles will not be studied in detail for the same reasons that Section 3.2.3 explores only new peritexts in the TTs rather than all peritextual material. Essentially, the few cases where TT titles have been adapted for TL readers reveal perceptions about the readership and strategies for targeting the new audience—perceptions and strategies that are central to the goals of this thesis.

The titles of six English STs have been changed for the French versions. In Harbron (1977), Canada without Quebec becomes Le Québec sans le Canada, placing the focus on what Quebec would be like without Canada rather than vice versa. Clearly, Quebecers, rather than French Canadians in general are the intended audience. A similar English title for Bercuson & Cooper (1995), Deconfederate: Canada without Quebec again focuses on Quebec: Goodbye—and bonne chance! Les adieux du Canada anglais au Québec. In this case, Canada is labelled “English Canada” and is contrasted with Quebec, presented as the only non English-speaking part of the country. In addition, the ST authors are depicted as representative of all SL speakers in Canada, as Bercuson & Cooper are offering the goodbyes of all English Canadians.

Other adaptations include Berger (1995), where a modification of Quebec’s Je me souviens motto has been added to the TT title so that Lament for a province: The Tragic Costs of Quebec’s Flirtation with Separatism becomes Je ne me souviens pas: n’oublions pas les coûts tragiques du flirt avec le séparatisme. In this case, the addition of the nous further
emphasizes the translated work’s place within the target culture: together, Quebecers must remember that separatism has cost Quebec investments and business.

In two other works, the differences between the SL and TL titles reveal the various political interests of many English and French Canadians. For instance, the English ST for McRoberts (1999) emphasizes the struggle for national unity, while the French target text instead reads un pays à refaire: l’échec des politiques constitutionnelles canadiennes. This change reflects trends highlighted in Section 1.1. While many English Canadians—and indeed many federal politicians—have tended to echo Trudeau’s vision of a united, bilingual Canada, many francophones in Quebec are in favour of renewed federalism or reconceiving the country. The French title of McRoberts’ book focuses on the failure of current constitutional policies and the need to rebuild or remake the country, while the English mentions only the struggle for national unity.153 Similarly, in Desbarats (1977), René Lévesque is A Canadian in Search of a Country in English, while the French TT title has been shifted to René Lèvesque ou le projet inachevé, as a focus on Lévesque as a Canadian rather than as a Quebecker has not been deemed necessary or desirable for a work targeted at Quebec readers. These changes are similar to the relevance positioning strategy found in many of the English- and French-language peritexts.

English works have also been retitled to make them more pertinent to the TL audience. Rioux & Crean (1983) entitle the English version of Deux pays pour vivre: un plaidoyer (1981) Two Nations: An Essay on the Culture and Politics of Canada and Quebec in a World of American Pre-eminence, placing the focus on America’s cultural eminence in North America rather than the provincial-federal struggle in Canada. Moreover, pays has become nation, illustrating the assumption that French-speaking Quebecers are open to the idea of Quebec as a

153 Both the English and French versions do, however, accurately refer to the content of the work. McRoberts argues that the roots of the sovereignty crisis lie in Trudeau’s national unity strategy.
country, while English-speaking Canadians would be willing to go as only as far as considering Quebec a nation, which—unlike a country—can still exist within Canada. Note, however, that Rioux & Crean co-wrote both the English and French versions and targeted each at English- and French-speaking Canadians respectively. Finally, Matthews (1996) has changed from *L’Accord: comment Robert Bourassa fera l’indépendance* to *The Quiet Resolution: Quebec’s Challenge to Canada*, placing the focus on the English-speaking Canadians—outside of Quebec—who are the intended audience. What is interesting in these titles is that by contrasting Quebec with Canada, the argument that Quebec is a nation is presupposed, and English speakers are equated with Canada while French speakers are equated with Quebec.

Other reasons why titles have undergone a change include providing more details on the content of the work, reflecting sociopolitical changes or referencing a work that was published after the source text. In the first case, two English TTs have been given new subtitles to categorize the content of the work. Thus, Bourgault’s (1991) work is a *Manifesto for an independent Quebec*, while Poliquin’s (2001) is an *Essay on Quebec Nationalism*. In the second case, *L’illusion souverainiste: Lecture critique du Livre blanc*, published prior to the May 1980 referendum becomes *The Impossible Option: A Post-Referendum Comment* to reflect the English TT’s publication in September 1980, after the No side had already won.\(^{154}\) Finally, when Couture’s 1996 work *La loyauté d’un laïc : Pierre Elliott Trudeau et le libéralisme canadien* was translated in 1998, the title was changed to *Paddling with the Current* in reference to Trudeau’s 1996 work *Against the Current* and reflecting Couture’s intention to show the contradictions in Trudeau’s thinking (1998: 16). These changes help the target text to be better accepted by the TL readership, as they define the type of work (manifesto, essay, etc.) and create

\(^{154}\) The content of the work remains the same, however. The new title helps make the English version relevant to TL readers now that the outcome of the referendum is known.
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relevance with respect to recent political events or publications, in a sense providing a reason for TL readers to consider reading the work.

3.2.6 Visual frames: front and back covers

The visual frames of the French and English texts are perhaps an even more important framing device than the written peritexts studied in Section 3.2.3, because the cover of a work is the first aspect that will be visible to readers and potential readers. It is a frame in its own right, as its colours, images, and text together present the story told inside. Together, these elements reframe the interior narrative for potential readers.

Unlike Section 3.2.3, this section focuses on both the ST and TT covers. Wherever possible, the front and back covers of every edition of every ST and TT have been collected. The covers for some works have not been included, either because the work had been recovered or because it was not easily available; however, the vast majority were accessible and have been scanned for analysis.¹⁵⁵

Some general trends in the book covers are explored in this section, and then several examples are studied in more detail. In Part 4, the various covers of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! and Nègres blancs d’Amérique are also analyzed.

One aspect of the covers that will be explored here is the use of national symbols on front and back covers.¹⁵⁶ This is because national symbols help form and maintain national

¹⁵⁵ A total of 171 ST and TT covers needed to be scanned and analyzed. This figure includes multiple editions of the same work. For instance, both the 1968 and 1997 editions of René Lévesque’s Option Québec, as well as the 1971 translation An Option for Quebec were located so that the covers could be scanned. Of these 171 covers, a total of 15 have not been analyzed either because the book had been re-covered at all of the five libraries that were consulted, or because the work was not available at any of these libraries and therefore could not be scanned. An online search was conducted for these 15 missing book covers, but no cover images seemed to be available on the Internet.

¹⁵⁶ This, and the following four paragraphs have been slightly modified from the version that appears on pages 7-8 of a previously published article: McDonough, Julie. (2006). Beavers, Maple Leaves and Maple Trees: A Study of National Symbols on Localised and Domestic Websites. Localisation Focus: The International Journal of
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identity, mark a nation’s collective memory, preserve its shared past and represent the power of a state to define a nation (Geisler 2005, pp.xv–xvi). National symbols represent a nation’s key values and are chosen because they have special significance for the nation and its members. As Smith (1991: 77) notes, national symbols, customs and ceremonies make the concepts of a nation visible for all members and appeal to their emotions.

However, what exactly constitutes a national symbol is not unanimously agreed upon. Smith (1991, ibid.), for instance, groups symbols, customs and ceremonies together and considers flags, anthems, parades, coins, capital cities, folk costumes, folklore museums, war monuments, passports and borders to be “obvious” examples. Cerulo (1995: 13) adds mottoes and shrines to this main list, and Smith later expands his initial examples with a series of “hidden” ones, including popular heroes or heroines, fairy tales, educational practices and military codes. He asserts that these symbols, customs and ceremonies are the ways of acting shared by a “community of historical culture” (1991: 77). Geisler, on the other hand, argues that Smith’s typology may be too broad. He suggests that a narrow typology of important national symbols would minimally include the flag, anthem, national holidays, currency, capital and major national monuments, with the flag being the most important and the others ranked somewhere below it (2005: xxi-xxii).

These symbols, according to Geisler, serve to support and reinforce a nation’s identity, both within its borders and to the outside world. Each time such a symbol is “actualized”—whenever an anthem is sung or a flag is raised, for instance—it theoretically reminds members of the nation that they share a common past and are bound by a collective identity. In fact, only through constant repetition of a symbol in the media, political speeches, public ceremonies, or other outlets do members of a nation become attached to it (Geisler 2005: xxvii). Similarly,

*Localisation, 5(3), 7-14.*
David Bell (2001: 95, following Anderson 1983) suggests that nations are imagined communities and that symbols are essential for this community to become a nation, since members can interact with others only through shared ‘things’ such as an anthem or flag and a set of customs and rituals. Likewise, Hall (1996) argues:

[...] national identities are not things we are born with, but are formed and transformed within and in relation to representation. We only know what it is to be “English” because of the way “Englishness” has come to be represented, as a set of meanings, by English national culture. It follows that a nation is not only a political entity but something which produces meanings—a system of cultural representation. People are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the idea of the nation as represented by its national culture. A nation is a symbolic community [...] (1996: 612).

National symbols play a considerable role in the formation and transformation of national identity. The use of such symbols on book covers, then, conveys to readers that the text inside the covers addresses issues relevant to the people represented by the national symbol, who are deemed to belong to the same imagined community, share the same collective identity, and be bound by the same common past. The symbol helps forge a link between the author, who is writing about these issues, and the reader, who is expected to find such issues relevant to his or her own concept of the nation.

The Canadian federal government officially recognises three national symbols in addition to the flag, colours, seal, and anthem: the beaver, maple tree and maple leaf (Government of Canada, Canadian Heritage 2007). Though these symbols may be accorded official State-recognised status, several others could be considered to have semi-official status,
even if one follows only the narrow typology of symbols offered by Geisler (2005). One could reasonably include the caribou, found on the twenty-five cent piece; the loon, depicted on the one-dollar coin; the polar bear, which appears on the two-dollar coin; and the Bluenose, a fishing schooner built in the 1920s that is featured on the ten-cent coin. And since Geisler also includes major national monuments, one might add to this semi-official list the Canadian Parliament buildings or the War Memorial in Ottawa, where Remembrance Day ceremonies are held each year. An analysis of the book covers, however, indicates that national symbols on the French and English book covers are limited to the maple leaf, Canadian flag, and several monuments, including the Parliament buildings.

Like the federal government, the Quebec government officially recognizes a number of symbols, in addition to the Quebec flag, as official symbols: the blue flag iris;\(^{157}\) the snowy owl, which symbolizes “la blancheur des hivers québécois, l’enracinement dans un climat semi-nordique et l’extension sur un très vaste territoire” (Gouvernement du Quebec 2008b); and the yellow birch tree. Probably the most important symbol of Quebec, however, is the fleur de lys, found on the flag and coat of arms. It is also the only one of the province’s official symbols to appear on the ST/TT book covers.

Next to national symbols, colour choices are probably the most significant aspect of the visual frames, although the meaning of various colours is not always agreed upon, as Kress & van Leeuwen explain:

The literature on the ‘emotive meanings’ of colour is quite inconsistent. Some psychologists have reported that ‘people’ prefer saturated colour over unsaturated colour; others, that they prefer unsaturated colour over saturated colour. Blue has

\(^{157}\) Until 1999, however, the provincial flower for Quebec was the white lily. See also Gouvernement du Québec (2008a).
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been described as ‘depressing and sad’ and as representing ‘calm pleasure’.
Goethe called yellow ‘gay and softly charming’, Kandinsky said it ‘never contains
a profound meaning and is akin to utter waste’ (Kress & van Leeuwen 2006: 269).
Moreover, colour preferences and significance change over time, with some colours
being more popular in certain eras. Kress & van Leeuwen give an example of how trends
change over time, noting, for instance, that:

In the Middle Ages, pigments had value in themselves. Ultramarine, as the name
indicates, had to be imported from across the sea and was expensive, not only for
this reason, but also because it was made from lapis lazuli. Hence it was used for
high-value motifs, such as the mantle of the Virgin Mary. Such pigments were not
mixed, but used in unmixed form, or at most only mixed with white. [...] Around
1600, in Dutch painting, the technology changed. New techniques allowed each
particle to be coated in a film of oil, which insulated it against chemical reaction
with other pigments and made more extensive mixing possible. As a result, the
status and price of specific paints went down and colour became to some extent
disengaged from its materiality. [...] What then, of meaning? Of course, colour has
always been used as a semiotic resource. In the Middle Ages there were many
theoretical and practical debates about colour symbolism. Should monks wear
black (penitence, humility) or white (glory, joy)? But there was no unified system.
Green could mean ‘justice’ as well as ‘hope’, red ‘charity’ as well as ‘life’ and so
on. [...] But as in the Middle Ages, contemporary ‘colour codes’ have limited
domains of application, and specific colours can have very different meanings in
different contexts (Kress & van Leeuwen 2006: 227).
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Associating a meaning with certain colours is very clearly not an easy task, given the lack of consensus on the symbolism of colours. The significance of a particular colour is not even agreed upon within a given culture at a single point in time, so one can hardly expect to find common agreement among multiple cultural groups over a longer period of time. Yet in the context of the delimited catalogue book covers, two colours have particularly obvious significance: red and blue, which are the official colours of Canada and Quebec, given that they appear on the official flags. Moreover, red and blue are also the colours associated with the Liberals and the Parti Québécois, the two parties that are often the focus of the delimited catalogue works.

And clearly, national symbols and colours are an important aspect of the source and target text covers. Roughly half of the 171 covers include blue, red or both as the main colours, nearly one third include a fleur de lys or a Quebec flag, while approximately fifteen percent incorporate a maple leaf or a Canada flag, and several (about three percent) include national or provincial monuments such as the Parliament buildings in Ottawa, the Assemblée nationale and the Wolfe monument in Quebec City. Some covers, of course, contain more than one of these official symbols, colours or monuments. Several examples of the most common national symbols and colours on the ST/TT covers—red/blue, maple leaf/fleur de lys, and Canada flag/Quebec flag—will suffice to determine how their use in the covers frames the delimited catalogue narratives.

A total of six covers have both a Canada and Quebec flag. Another eighteen include only fleur de lys (without a maple leaf), eleven include both a fleur de lys and a maple leaf, while four have only a maple leaf and no fleur de lys. Fleurs de lys are therefore the most common

---

158 Only one cover, *Reflections II: The Second Conquest*, includes a fleur de lys and a Canada flag. In all other cases, official symbols were not used on the same cover as a flag.
national symbol to appear on the book covers. This trend reflects the fact that Quebec is the
main subject of nearly all the delimited catalogue works—given the subject headings that were
used to compile it—so the official symbols of Quebec seem to have been deemed to better
represent the content of the books.

Interestingly, official symbols are more common on English covers than French, even
though more French works were published. Of the covers with a fleur de lys, almost two-thirds
are English source texts or English target texts. The same is true of the covers with maple
leaves, although the trend shifts when the flags are considered: Canadian flags are evenly split
between English and French covers, while Quebec flags are slightly more common\textsuperscript{159} on French
ST or TT covers.\textsuperscript{160} However, Quebec flags, as well as maple leaves and fleurs de lys are
commonly included on English target text covers when none appears on the source text cover.
This is not true for the French translations.\textsuperscript{161} It seems, then, that publishers expect national
symbols to be more relevant to anglophones, for any number of reasons: English-speaking
Canadians may be expected, for instance, to feel a greater emotional attachment to official
symbols or to more easily identify the subject of a work by associating it with the symbols on its
cover. Certainly the English ST authors are depicted as writing about issues relevant to all
Canadians, given that the maple leaf is incorporated in the covers of seven English STs but only
one French ST; moreover, four translations of English STs also include a maple leaf on the
cover.

\textsuperscript{159} Six English-language covers and eight French-language covers included a Quebec flag.
\textsuperscript{160} Of the works that had a Quebec or Canadian flag, six covers depicted both. Four of these six covers were for
French-language works: two French STs and two French TTs.
\textsuperscript{161} For instance, of the ten English TT covers that included a fleur de lys, eight included this symbol when no fleur
de lys was found on the French ST cover. Only two of the five French translations included a fleur de lys on the
French TT cover when none was included on the English ST. Similarly, three English TT covers included maple
leaves, and none of the three corresponding French ST covers did, while two of the four French TT covers with
a maple leaf corresponded to English ST covers that also included maple leaves. Similar trends occurred with
the inclusion of Canadian and Quebec flags in the target text covers.
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A closer look at some examples of French ST covers and their English TT equivalents helps illustrate this point. What follows are two sets of source and target text covers, which will be analyzed in turn. They exemplify two trends: Figure 2 shows an instance where a French ST cover does not contain any national symbols—although it does use blue and white as its main colours—and Figure 1 shows the English edition of this work, where a variety of symbols appear: the fleur de lys, a modified Canadian flag, the Liberal and PQ symbols, as well as two chess pieces. Figures 3 and 4 show an English ST/French TT pair in which a maple leaf is the only national symbol on the English ST cover, and a maple leaf and fleur de lys are depicted on the French TT.

First, Figures 1 and 2. Here, the ST and TT covers have a similar layout. According to Kress & van Leeuwen (2006), in layouts where the elements are structured along the vertical axis, then what has been placed on the top is presented as the Ideal, and what has been placed at the bottom is put forward as the Real. For something to be ideal means that it is presented as the idealized or generalized essence of the information, hence also as its, ostensibly, most salient part. The Real is then opposed to this in that it presents more specific information (e.g. details), more ‘down-to-earth’ information (e.g. photographs as documentary evidence, or maps or charts), or more practical information (e.g. practical consequences, directions for action)

162 Layouts along the vertical axis are those in which the principle elements have been placed in the top and bottom, in contrast with a layout structured on the horizontal axis, where the principle elements are placed on the right and the left.
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They continue, describing layouts—such as that of Figures 1 and 2—in which the text is on top and the image on the bottom. In such cases, “the text plays, ideologically, the lead role, and the pictures a subservient role (which, however, is important in its own way, as specification, evidence or practical consequence, and so on)” (2006: 187).

And so, Figures 1 and 2 clearly both have a vertically structured layout. The text is on top, meaning that the title and author’s name are considered more important than the illustration below. Where the two covers do differ, however, is in the way they have visually framed the narrative. The source text (Figure 2) depicts a narrative about Quebec—through the use of blue and white as the main colour scheme—but also about the world itself—through the image of the globe. This is not unlike the emphasis in the TT (Figure 1), where a political game is in the process of being played out before viewers. Two political parties are at play: the PQ and the Quebec Liberals, and both are in danger of being taken by chess pieces: the PQ by a pawn, and the Liberals by a rook. The only symbols not currently in danger by the chess pieces are the Canada flag and the United Nations logo. The frame constructed for this English TT, then, is one in which negotiation, compromise and cooperation (represented by the UN\textsuperscript{163}) are elements in a delicate game that some players are in immediate danger of losing. At the moment, though, the overall picture for Canada is positive, as the Canada flag is the only relatively safe player. The TT cover, then, places emphasis on Canada’s role in Quebec nationalism, independence movements, while the ST cover focuses primarily on Quebec.

In this example, the visual frame mirrors that found in the prefatory and publisher peritexts. As noted in Section 3.2.3.4, in the foreword to Reflections II: The Second Conquest, 

\textsuperscript{163} The United Nations logo also likely has a literal meaning, as Chapat-Rolland was an observer at the UN in 1969, the same year that is the focus of this book.
Chaput-Rolland is positioned by Douglas Fischer as a francophone author who “believes she is a federalist, although she’s candid about her doubts.” He continues: “Put too coarsely, she’s closer to René Lévesque and the spirit of the Parti Québécois than she knew as she wrote her diary. Let me be fair. In my conclusions I am ignoring the warmth of pan-Canadianism which runs though The Second Conquest. This, I would argue, comes from the largeness of heart, the determination of Madame Chaput-Rolland to understand and, where she cannot understand, to feel Canada, to reach out to all of us” (1970: 9-10).

The use of symbols on the cover of this work, then, becomes clearer when the other paratexts are considered. Here, the chess game represents not just the struggle between the various political parties and between the provincial and federal government, but also the author’s struggle between federalism and the PQ. This example clearly illustrates the use of national symbols to reposition a TT as relevant to TL readers because it incorporates symbols TL readers are expected to be most familiar with and feel the most affiliation to, namely the Canadian flag. The Other is not hidden, though; just as Chaput-Rolland is clearly a French-speaking Quebeccer in Douglas Fisher’s Foreword—but a Quebeccer who nonetheless considers herself part of Canada and writes works in which “pan-Canadianism” is apparent—so is the book itself positioned as one in which Quebec figures predominantly—symbolized by the fleur de lys, and PQ and Quebec Liberal logos—but which is still relevant to all Canadians. Visual frames such as this one are also found on French TTs, such as Figures 3 and 4, below.
3.2 Peritextual frames

In Figures 3 and 4, the maple leaf of the English source text (Figure 3) has been changed to a fleur de lys and maple leaf on the target text (Figure 4), showing that the maple leaf is deemed most relevant to English-speaking ST readers, and the fleur de lys equally important to French-speaking TT readers. The images on the French cover show a much more extensive framing strategy, however. Inversion of colours has been used on Figure 4 to show that Quebec is a part of Canada—since Quebec’s official symbol is both red and inside the maple leaf. Moreover, Canada not only encompasses Quebec—literally, since Quebec is a Canadian province, yet also figuratively, since the maple leaf envelops the fleur de lys in the illustration—but is also comprised of Quebec, given that the maple leaf has blue borders and a centre composed of a collage of newspaper headlines that mention the words Quebec, Canada and Canadian. This cover therefore frames the TT as a federalist narrative, or at least one in which the author does not espouse a separatist point of view. And the maple leaf also positions the ST author as a Canadian, but the fleur de lys has been added to further mark the author as someone who speaks about Quebec, or is perhaps from Quebec. Figures 3 and 4 are an example of how
the visual frame can be used to replace written paratexts, as the French TT does not contain any new peritexts to present the work to TL readers. However, visual frame does position *Les propos d’un « pur coton »* in much the same way as other French-language TTs have been presented (e.g. Guindon, who is positioned as an author anchored in francophone Quebec social sciences (cf. Section 3.2.3.4).

These two examples help illustrate the use of national symbols and colours on the source and target text covers, and demonstrate the ways in which these symbols have been adapted for francophone and anglophone readers, positioning the translations as relevant to the TL readers. Moreover, these covers have shown how the visual and written frames position the TTs in similar ways. This is not always the case, however.

Let us turn, then, to another colour scheme prevalent in both the English- and French-language covers: black, red and white. These three colours are often used together to emphasize conflict, struggle and dissent. This pattern is almost equally common in the French- and English-language covers overall, but the French STs and English TTs use these colours more than the French translations and English source texts. This would seem to indicate that the French narratives are more often framed as dissenting, polemical or activist narratives and are depicted as such both in the original French texts and a number of English translations. This colour scheme, particularly the use of a red wash over a black and white photograph, is most common in the 1970s, as half the covers with these colours have been published between 1970

---

164 Naturally, not all the covers with black, red and white as the main colour scheme reflected these themes. Trudeau’s *Against the Current: Selected Writings 1939-1996*, for instance, has a white background, red title and, black subtitle and black signature by the editor, along with a sepia photo of Trudeau above the title. The composition is such that Trudeau, at the top of the cover, is positioned as the Ideal: with his hands clasped around his legs, looking out at the camera from his perch on a stool, he is the ideal politician or intellectual, and the title and subtitle of the book are the Real: they are the specific “down-to-earth” information, as is the name of the editor, Gérard Pelletier (cf. Kress & van Leeuwen 2006: 187). In this case, the colour red has probably been chosen for its association with the Liberal party and its status as one of Canada’s official colours. The examples listed in this section are intended to illustrate some of the framing techniques used in the book covers rather than categorize each cover as falling into a particular colour or composition pattern.
and 1979.\textsuperscript{165} The two following examples illustrate the ways in which these colours are used to
construct narratives of conflict and dissent in one English ST (Figure 5) and one English TT
(Figure 6). Figure 7 is a second edition of the English TT depicted in Figure 6 and illustrates an
interesting contrast between the use of red, black and white, on one hand, and pastel colours on
the other. All three works are reproduced below.

In Figure 5, conflict is portrayed through the ripped strips of red at the top of the cover.\textsuperscript{166}
As discussed earlier, vertical compositions such as this one place the objects in the upper
portion in the leading position, and the images below as less important (cf. Kress & van

\textsuperscript{165} Another third were published in the 1990s, while a few were published in the 1980s, and none were published
in 1968 or 1969.

\textsuperscript{166} Rips/tears are another image commonly found in the book covers: approximately ten covers included some sort
of rip or tear as part of the cover image (e.g. a ripped maple leaf, a jagged tear separating maple leaves and fleur
de lys, jagged edges separating red, blue and white vertical blocks). Rips and tears were slightly more common
on English-language STs, as six of the ten covers were English STs, none were English TTs, three were French
TTs and only one was a French ST. This would seem to indicate that English-language covers, along with
covers for translations of English texts, framed some of the delimited catalogue works as narratives about
events that were tearing Canadians or Canada apart. Since these images were less common on works originally
written in French (and indeed appeared almost exclusively on French TT covers rather than French ST covers),
it would seem that nationalism, independence and referenda narratives written by French speakers were not
often framed being about the tearing apart of Canada or its symbols: only works written by English speakers
were framed in this way.
Leeuwen 2006: 187). Here, the ripped red strips are the most important and striking feature of the cover, given that they are the only portion of it in colour. Below this is a black and white illustration of two soldiers guarding a hearse with a coffin inside. Both are dressed for combat (army fatigues, weapons and helmets) and one seems to be readying his gun to aim it at the crowd of people standing nearby. Obviously, this is a tense moment, as the armed soldier appears ready to fire at unarmed civilians. The soldiers, looking at the other actors in the illustration, do not directly interact with the person viewing the cover. And, since the viewers of the cover have an unobstructed view of both soldiers and hearse, they are looking at the scene from an upper angle. TL readers looking at this image are less involved in the scene than if it had been depicted from a front angle. Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) elaborate:

The difference between the oblique and the frontal angle is the difference between detachment and involvement. The horizontal angle encodes whether the image-producer (and hence, willy-nilly, the viewer) is ‘involved’ with the represented participants or not. The frontal angle says, as it were, ‘What you see here is part of our world, something we are involved with.’ The oblique angle says, ‘What you see here is not part of our world; it is their world, something we are not involved with’ (2006: 136, original emphasis).

Of course, as Kress & van Leeuwen emphasize, viewers do not have to accept the point of view presented to them. English-speaking Quebeckers (who comprise part of the targeted English-Canadian ST audience) may feel they were part of the October Crisis rather than an outsider looking in, but “either way, we first need to understand what is meant [by the viewpoint encoded in the photo]” (2006: 137).

Figure 5 therefore frames the text inside as one that narrates a conflict that has happened
to the Other, to French-speaking Quebecers, rather than an event in which all Canadians were involved. Armed troops are not something that all Canadian crowds will face and are not part of a historic event shared by all Canadians—just the group of Canadians in the narrative about the October Crisis, namely Quebecers.

A similar framing strategy is adopted in Figure 6. Here, the red, black and white colour scheme is used to convey a close-up illustration of a soldier, whose image has a red wash over it. Like Figure 5, the soldier is in full gear, with a helmet on his head and a weapon in his hands. Unlike Figure 5, however, the viewer is at the same level with the soldier and at very close distance. As Kress & van Leeuwen explain, it does not matter that the viewer does not actually know the soldier: “The relation between the human participants represented in images and the viewer is once again an imaginary relation. People are portrayed as though they are friends, or as though they are strangers. Images allow us to imaginarily come as close to public figures as if they were our friends and neighbours - or look at people like ourselves as strangers, ‘others’” (2006: 126, original emphasis). This relation is portrayed through the distance placed between the people in the image—in this case, a soldier geared for combat—and the viewer. Because the soldier is depicted from the shoulders up rather than from the waist or lower—which the viewer would have to step back to see—the viewer is placed at close personal distance (cf. Kress & van Leeuwen 2006: 125) from the soldier. He is depicted as someone with whom the viewer is close enough to engage in a conversation, rather than someone who is too far to interact with, as the soldiers in Figure 5.

This change illustrates a larger trend: that of positioning a work to show its relevance to the TL audience. Figure 5 is positioned as being about the Other because it is discussing issues deemed relevant to mostly French-speaking Quebecers. Although this is an English ST, it is
positioned in the same way as many of the English TTs: readers are expected to step back and look at the overall picture rather than feel involved as one of the participants in the narrative. Here in Figure 6, however, the opposite strategy has been adopted. Both TL readers and the soldier in the illustration are on the same level, are able to engage with one another because the narrative is about Quebec. The deep red background and the soldier’s weapon and grim expression, however, do not invite conversation between him and the viewer. Instead, the cover depicts conflict (represented by the soldier) that touches the viewer directly rather than at a distance, as in Figure 5.

Figure 6 is an interesting example of the red, black and white colour scheme because it is the first English edition of *La Question du Québec*. A second, revised edition was published in 1978, and a new cover was created for it (Figure 7). This last cover helps show how the visual framing strategies change over time. First, the colour scheme in Figure 6 differs markedly from Figure 7. Instead of red, white and black, the cover is mainly pastel yellow, with a black and white photo of the author. The order of the text and image is reversed: whereas in Figure 6 the text was in the lower half of the cover, placing less importance on the title than on the image of the soldier, in Figure 7, the title, author and translator names are above the photo of the author. Emphasis is no longer on armed conflict, but rather on a dialogue with the author, who is shown, like the soldier, at close personal distance from the viewer; unlike the soldier, however, the author invites conversation. He is smoking a cigarette, and his mouth appears ready to open, as if he is discussing something with an unseen interlocutor on the right. It seems, then, that the change between 1971 and 1978 has been a shift from conflict to dialogue. Quebec is no longer seen as a force threatening English Canadian readers, but rather as a figure with whom TL readers can engage in a discussion. This change can be compared to the larger trend in the
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catalogue, where English-speaking Canadians were urged to be more understanding of Quebecers until the early 1990s, when the second referendum had ended. In this 1978 cover, a similar emphasis on discussion seems to be present, perhaps reflective of the change from a very tense period of conflict (recent October Crisis) in 1971 to an imminent referendum on Quebec sovereignty in 1978. The cover image, like the written peritexts, urges understanding and dialogue from English-speaking readers.

Like Figures 1/2 and Figures 3/4, Figures 6 and 7 illustrate positioning strategies similar to those in the prefatory material. In this case, they illustrate provocation (Figure 6) and debate/dialogue (Figure 7). As discussed in Section 3.2.3.4, the provocation positioning strategy is found only in the English TTs and not in the French TTs or the English collections, so it is interesting to note that images of conflict such as rips, tears, soldiers, and protestors are evenly split between French and English covers, while the red, black and white colour scheme is found on an equal number of English TT and French ST covers. In all cases, though, these images of conflict are less common on the French TTs than on French ST or English ST/TT covers. It would appear, then, that the provocation positioning strategy in these visual frames does correspond to that of the prefatory and publisher peritexts: few French translations are positioned as provocative works in the prefatory texts, and few French target texts contain images of conflict and dissent on their covers. While a number of French ST covers do incorporate images of ripping, tearing, fists, mobs or soldiers, and thus position the work as potentially provocative, these covers may match positioning techniques in the ST prefatory texts. Since Section 3.2.3 does not explore ST prefatory texts, the visual and textual frames cannot be compared in this regard. Nonetheless, the book covers and prefatory texts clearly show that between 1968 and 2000, francophone readers were not offered translations of works
that were deemed to be provocative, although anglophone readers were. However, both French and English TTs were framed for francophones and anglophones in a way that made the work more relevant to TL readers. And through book covers and prefatory/publisher peritexts, French- and English-speaking readers were encouraged to engage in debate/dialogue about Quebec nationalism, independence movements, and the referenda.

3.3 Conclusions

The prefatory texts, publisher peritexts, appendices and notes indicate a clear trend, in English-language works at any rate, to emphasize communication and understanding among Canadians. A focus on how the translation could help increase knowledge of the controversial topics of Quebec nationalism independence movements and the referenda can be found in pro- and anti-independence works as well as in those that critically assess both sides of the argument.

The comprehension argument is most evident in the English prefatory and publisher peritexts, where the author or other agent clearly expresses a desire to further understanding among Canadians. However, new appendices and translator notes also indicate the agent’s intention to improve understanding and his or her assumption that TL readers know very little about Quebec figures, history and politics. What is intriguing is that agents who prepared the English TTs seem to expect that French speakers are more aware of independence and nationalism-related issues than English speakers, given that they are immersed in an environment where these issues are widely discussed. This is because notes and appendices in the English TTs comment on issues/figures/events that were not explained in the French ST. When they see such notes or appendices, English-speaking readers of the TT might therefore assume that the translator or editor is trying to explain a concept that the SL audience would
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have already understood (given that no note about it appeared in the ST). Yet surely not all French-speaking Quebecers are aware, for instance, that the “Rossillon affair” refers to a 1968 “five-day visit paid by Philippe Rossillon, secretary general of the High Committee for the Defense of the French language to St. Pierre, Manitoba without the knowledge of the Canadian Government,” an incident that “created a minor crisis in Ottawa.” However, a note to this effect has been added to the English TT *The Second Conquest* (Chaput-Rolland 1970: 23), even though mention of the Rossillon affair passed unexplained in the French ST. Nor is this an atypical example. New notes, particularly those for more obvious figures such as René Lévesque, may simply irritate well-informed anglophone readers, while notes to more obscure references may give the impression that a very wide gulf between SL and TL readers exists, since what is supposed to be known to French-speaking SL readers in Quebec requires an explanation for the anglophones in the rest of the country. And while translators prepared most of these notes, editors and publishers clearly agreed that such explanations were necessary, since the notes were not removed from the final target text.

Also important is the fact that francophones may have been no more aware of how English Canadian viewed independence and nationalism—and why they held such views—than English speakers were of French-Canadian opinions. Yet only the English TTs focus on the theme of understanding.

Finally, the comparison of the visual and written frames shows that similar positioning strategies were used in the covers and written peritexts: in both types of frames, French TTs were positioned as provocative works and as material for debate and dialogue. In some cases, TT covers used colour schemes, images and national symbols to position the work as dissenting. This is consistent with the fact that only in the English TTs did written peritexts position the
translations as provocative works. This fact indicates a general assumption that English-speaking readers were likely to consider works by French speakers about Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda provocative. But, as shown by some of the examples cited earlier, the framing strategies change over time, and a work positioned as provocative at a period of political tension (e.g. the October Crisis) may later be presented as a way to engage in a dialogue with the Other.

To further explore framing strategies and to help determine what role translators play in reframing narratives, Section 4 will study several framing techniques for two controversial works: *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country* (Richler 1992) and *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* (Vallières 1969).
PART 4: CASE STUDIES

4.0 TRANSLATING AND FRAMING CONTROVERSIAL NARRATIVES

So far, the two thesis research objectives at the base of this study have been explored in a general way. The overview of the delimited catalogue has demonstrated which works were published and translated between 1968 and 2000 on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the referenda, while the overview of the peritextual frames has illustrated how these translated works were framed for TL readers. However, because the earlier sections of this thesis examined such a large number of works, the extent to which the two research objectives have been achieved is necessarily limited. For that reason, this section will explore two works in greater detail 1) Mordecai Richler’s *Oh Canada! Oh Québec! Requiem for a Divided Country* and its French translation *Oh Canada! Oh Québec! : requiem pour un pays divisé* by Daniel Poliquin, and 2) Pierre Vallières’ *Nègres blancs d’Amérique : autobiographie précoce d’un “terroriste” québécois* along with its English translation, *White Niggers of America* by Joan Pinkham.

These two works have been chosen because they help answer the research question on which specific emphasis is being placed, namely: how were the works most critical of TL readers reframed for the TL audience? As the two case studies will illustrate, both STs extensively criticized the linguistic group for which the work was eventually translated. Moreover, *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and *Nègres blancs* generated considerable controversy when published, so they are good examples of how controversy can influence the way a work is framed.

The two case studies will not focus just on the question of how works critical of the Other were reframed for that same group. By exploring the ST narratives, incorporating
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biographical details about the authors and translators, the case studies can answer the three other research questions that are key to this thesis: why were Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! and Nègres blancs reframed as they were for the TL readers, what do these frames tell us about the expectations of the TL readers, and finally, what role did translators play in creating and disseminating these frames? In fact, this section has been included specifically to focus on the why question, since Part 3 explored in great detail the question of how TT works were framed but could only speculate about the motives behind these framing strategies. The interviews in this section illuminate not only why the TTs were framed as they were, but why certain paratextual frames were not included in the translated works.

Each case study therefore examines in more detail the framing strategies discussed in Section 3. The first, Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! explores translation as a frame, a point that was addressed by Baker (2006: 105-140) but which has not been studied in this thesis. Thus, Section 4.1 assesses how passages from Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! were translated in the French Canadian Press and in the Daniel Poliquin’s translation published by Les Éditions Balzac. By exploring the idea of translation as an interpretive frame for a source text, Section 4.1 is able to focus on one instance in which the same ST narrative was reframed in various ways and to explore the reasons why the translators may have reframed the ST in contrasting ways. Through an interview with translator Daniel Poliquin, this section analyzes translator motivations and studies translator agency in the construction of TL frames. The second case study, Nègres blancs d'Amérique explores the TT peritexts. The analysis is therefore similar to that of Section 3, where all new TT peritexts were explored. However, in the case of Nègres blancs d'Amérique, particular focus is placed on why the peritexts framed Vallières’s narrative as they did. For this reason, Section 4.2 includes an interview with translator Joan Pinkham, her
Canadian consultant Malcolm Reid, and this information, combined with details about the publishers and the political situation in Canada when the TT was published, helps illuminate the reasons why the narrative was reframed differently for Canadian and American readers, what role the translator and other agents played in creating these frames, and how the same work can be reframed over time as political events change.

The two case studies should therefore be considered a way to expand on the research objectives. By analyzing the frames surrounding two TTs, this thesis is able to draw conclusions about the role that translators play in creating and disseminating narrative frames. It also provides a way to assess translator agency in framing narratives through translation. Accordingly, the case studies differ in format from the previous chapters. Biographies of the ST authors and the TT translators are included to provide more context for the motivations behind the framing strategies, which are analyzed immediately after. And translated passages from epitextual sources (book reviews in newspapers and other periodicals), which could not be explored in Part 3, are here examined in detail to help illustrate how translation itself can reframe a ST narrative. Naturally, another researcher, working under different conditions (location, era, field of study) might arrive at different conclusions. The findings of this study should be considered one way—but not the only one—of analyzing the translations of two controversial narratives and examining the events shaping these translations to determine how such works are framed.

4.1 Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country

4.1.1 Mordecai Richler

Mordecai Richler was born in Montreal in 1931 to Lily, the daughter of a Hasidic Rabbi,
and Moses, a scrapyard dealer and the son of an orthodox Jew. Richler grew up on St. Urbain Street, which would later figure in several of his works, including *The Street* and *St. Urbain’s Horseman*. While an observant Jew as a child, Richler was not so later in life. Davidson (1983) states that Richler broke away from his formal religious training by about 14, when he stopped attending Jewish parochial school (1983: 12-13). Richler’s son Daniel asserted that their house had little religion or Jewish tradition in it (Posner 2004: 316), and according to Richler’s daughter Emma, Richler’s will had what she described as “a funny line about ‘No Rabbis!’” (Posner 2004: 353). In fact, in a letter to his friend William Weintraub while writing *Son of a Smaller Hero*, Richler stated that he didn’t consider himself a Jewish or Canadian writer, but simply “a writer.” He was, he said, “not interested in the fact that Jews can’t get into certain hotels or golf courses. [He was] interested in Jews as individual persons—and [he was] not writing a ‘Jewish problem’ book. [...] [He didn’t] believe there is any such thing as a Jewish outlook or a Jewish Problem or Jewish Spokesman. Each man has his own problem” (Weintraub 2001: 117). This point is interesting, in light of the fact that some reviewers have made reference to Richler’s religion in their critiques (cf. Lautens 1992: C17).

In 1950, when he was 19, Richler left Canada for Europe, spending time in France, Spain and Britain.167 It was here that he befriended such other Canadian writers as Mavis Gallant, and wrote *The Acrobats*, which would eventually become his first published novel.168 He returned to Canada two years later, in 1952, and worked as a writer with the CBC for a year, sending out his manuscript to publishers in an effort to have it accepted (Posner 2004: 57-74). *The Acrobats* was eventually accepted by a British publisher. Richler remained in Canada for

---

167 Davidson (1983) asserts that Richler left in 1951, but Posner’s work includes a statement from Richler that he “arrived one sunny autumn afternoon in 1950" (2004: 58). Richler also writes, in an article published in *Maclean’s*, that he left Canada in 1950 at 19, and didn’t return until 1972 (Richler 1992b), so Davidson appears to have the wrong dates in his chronology and narrative.

168 He had also written a novel entitled *The Rotten People*, but this work was never published.

He did not return to Canada permanently until 1972, when he arrived on the M.S. Alexander Pushkin with “a wife,\footnote{Richler is referring here to his second wife, Florence.} four children (a fifth, our eldest, staying behind to complete his O-levels), two budgerigars, two ring-necked doves, eighteen wooden cases, and a mountain of suitcases and doubts” (Richler 1984: 5).

Richler was aware that his narratives might upset certain people. Writing to Weintraub in 1954 about Son of a Smaller Hero, Richler acknowledged that “[t]here’s a lot of ‘dangerous’ stuff in it, and André and I will see a lawyer abt possible libel suits...” (Weintraub 2001: 119).\footnote{\textit{André} refers to Richler’s British publisher, André Deutsch.}

According to Bernard Baskin, a writer for the Canadian Jewish News, when The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz first appeared in 1959, the “largely immigrant Jewish community of [that time]—insecure and wary of ugly Jewish stereotypes—was resentful and outraged” (2001: 13). Richler’s aunt asserted that she threw Cocksure into the fire because it was “smut of the first degree” (Posner 2004: 154), and when Richler’s cousin Sam asked his family about Richler, he found few answers, “except for the reasons he was despised. (‘He writes against the family, against the religion, and he married a shikse’)” (Posner 2004: 160).

Elsewhere, too, Richler offended. After a 1985 article he wrote in the New York Times stating that if Canada were a house, Vancouver would be the solarium, Toronto the counting room, Montreal the salon and Edmonton the boiler room (reprinted in Richler 1992: 140), city officials from Edmonton phoned the Times to ask for a retraction. The editor of the Edmonton Sun then printed Richler’s home phone number, encouraging readers to voice their complaints to Richler directly (1992: 141). Later, in 1990, a group of parents in Essex, Ontario wanted The
Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz banned from high school reading lists due to its “vulgarity, sexual expressions and sexual innuendoes” (Globe and Mail 1990: C1). In 2000, Richler upset the premier of PEI by writing that if he were Prime Minister, he would auction PEI to Japan to settle Canada’s national debt (CBC News 2000: n.p.; Richler 2000: B1). And his comments about Quebec nationalism and nationalists, particularly his assertions that francophone Quebecers were more anti-Semitic than other Canadians, certainly caused controversy, as the next section will show.

Richler caused offense not just through unflattering descriptions of people and places, but also through the use of “obscenities.” In fact, when The Acrobats was first published in Britain in 1954, Richler wrote to his friend William Weintraub that: “Talking abt obscenities, there was a big fuss here. Printers refused to print [The Acrobats]. They got a lawyer. André got a lawyer. Richler was called in, charged with obscenity, blasphemy, and worse. Bang bang bang. Several minor changes have been made; e.g., tits to breasts, kick you in the balls to kick you where it hurts, bloody christ to christ. Nothing important really. All most amusing” (reprinted in Weintraub 2001: 99). Fourteen years later, his novel Cocksure was banned by several Commonwealth countries (Posner 2004: 157) and the W. H. Smith bookstore chain in Britain refused to sell it due to its sexually explicit language (Shapiro 1997: n.p.; Posner 2004: 157).

Richler’s response to reviewers who thought he was too critical was that he was simply being honest. In an essay originally written when he was fifty-nine, Richler asserted that his intent was “to be an honest witness to my time, my place, and to write at least one novel that will last, that will make me remembered after death” (Richler 1990: 6-7). In fact, he asserted that he was more interested in criticizing things he believed in or was attached to and that although this was a “very perverse kind of love,” it was the only kind of which he was capable.
(reprinted in Posner 2004: 198). And, of course, not everyone was against Richler’s writing: other readers and critics praised his works. In a letter from Richler to Weintraub in 1958, for instance, Richler includes the reactions of his agent and publishers who considered The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz “[r]emarkable, head and shoulders above anything you’ve done before” and “[c]learly the best thg you’ve ever done” (reprinted in Weintraub 2001: 221). Other critics changed their negative opinions over time: according to the Canadian Jewish News, Richler gained the respect of previous critics in the Jewish community after publishing Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! “because [Richler’s] political views concurred with their own” (Arnold 2001: 1). And Cocksure, the novel banned by W. H. Smith in Britain, won a Governor General’s Award in Canada that same year.

In fact, Richler’s works have won a number of awards for writing, including prizes for fiction and screenplays. In 1968, he was awarded two Governor General’s Awards: one for Cocksure in the fiction category and one for Hunting Tigers Under Glass, in the essays category. He won another in 1971 for St. Urbain’s Horseman (fiction category). His screenplay for The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz won Best Adapted Comedy from the Writers Guild of America in 1975, a prize he had to share with Lionel Chetwynd, who had written the first draft. In 1990, for Solomon Gursky Was Here, Richler was awarded the Commonwealth Writers’ Prize for best book and shortlisted for the Man Booker Prize. And in 1997, Richler beat out four other competitors to win the Giller Prize for Barney’s Version.

Richler died in Montreal on July 3, 2001 of cancer, leaving behind his wife Florence and his five children, Noah, Emma, Daniel, Jacob and Martha. Commentaries in the press after his death touched on various facets of his career. Some mention his skill as a fiction writer: “c’était

---

172 Richler had rewritten this draft and it was his version that was eventually filmed, so Richler was upset when Chetwynd was given an “adapted for the screen by” credit for the screenplay (Posner 2004: 186).
surtout un romancier surdoué, un grand maître de la fiction épique et satirique” (Baillargeon 2001: A1). One criticizes the fact that separatist poet Gaston Miron got a state funeral when he died, while Richler did not (Johnson 2001: A11). And, as if to underscore the effect that *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* had in Canada when it was first published, many of the obituaries and editorials printed shortly after Richler’s death, refer to the book and/or the reactions to Richler’s polemical remarks about Quebec’s nationalists, antisemitism in Quebec, and Quebec’s sign laws (e.g. Johnson 2001: A11, Baillargeon 2001: A1, Kellogg 2001: E8, Bauch 2001: B1).

### 4.1.2 Richler’s Narrative

*Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country* opens in Woody’s Pub, Richler’s favourite haunt in the early 1990s. This pub serves as the background for several parts of the narrative. The opening page sets the scene for the rest of the book:

...On a perfect summer day in Montreal, local raspberries in season, two tickets to that night’s ball game riding in my breast pocket, I went to meet some friends at a downtown bar I favoured at the time: Woody’s Pub, on Bishop Street. As I arrived, a solemn middle-aged man was taking photographs of the blackboard mounted on the outside steps. He was intent on a notice scrawled in chalk on the board:

**TODAY’S SPECIAL**

Ploughman’s Lunch

The notice happened to be a blatant violation of Quebec’s Bill 178, which prohibits exterior signs in any language but French, and the photographer was one of a number of self-appointed vigilantes who, on lazy summer days off from work, do not head for the countryside to cool off in the woods or to fish; instead, they
dutifully search the downtown streets for English-language or bilingual commercial signs that are an affront to Montreal’s *visage linguistique*—HIYA!

**Vermont baseball fans welcome here** say, or **happy hour 5 to 7** (Richler 1992: 1).

As this opening scene illustrates, *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* is clearly written to provoke. Richler deliberately sprinkles his narrative with words that many English-speaking readers would find offensive, including *WASP* (1992: 34, 72, 100), *wog* (1992: 100), and *Chinese coolies* (100). He caricatures well-known Canadian figures and organizations: Duplessis is a “shrewd but cruel man” (1992: 86), the Union nationale is “Duplessis’s band of bandits”, who, inspired by their “unshackled greed,” were particularly proficient in corruption (1992: 86), the RCMP is said to have “a gift for slipping over its own banana peels” (1992: 18), and the Mount Royal Club is the haunt of “insufferably boring WASP tycoons” who have also “condescended to accept [...] a number of toilet-trained French Canadians” (1992: 34).

He is particularly critical of Quebec separatists. Asserting that *Maintenant ou jamais!* is evidence that former Rassemblement pour l’indépendance nationale (RIN) leader Pierre Bourgault is an “appalling writer,” Richler condemns Bourgault for arguing that Quebec’s aboriginals should stop focusing on the past and instead remember that “a lot of things have happened in the last 300 years” (quoted in Richler 1992: 158). Richler points out that Bourgault’s criticism could easily apply to the same Quebec separatists Bourgault openly supports. Later, Richler asserts not only that a “good deal of the writing by *indépendantistes*” is “disfigured” by paranoia (1992: 159, original emphasis), but also that francophone nationalists engage in “injustice collecting” (1992: 160).

In addition to being critical of separatists in general, Richler also makes several references to *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*. In one passage, he lumps Vallières in with the rest of
the francophone nationalist “injustice collectors”: “Beginning with Pierre Vallières’ *White Niggers of America (Nègres blancs d’Amérique)*, which sued for French Canadians filling the office of blacks in the American South—a ridiculous conceit—there has been a tendency for the separatists to overstate their case wildly” (1992: 160). And he concludes his book with a comment on Quebec’s independence that makes a snide reference to Vallières’ thesis: “If I thought for a moment that Francophone Quebeckers were oppressed in Canada, I would be out there in the streets demonstrating with them. The truth is, I happen to believe the contrary. I believe that when Quebeckers, as they are often inclined to do, compare their plight to that of blacks in the United States, or less frequently, to Zionists, it is revealing of their unquenchable thirst for self pity and not, happily for them, a measure of their historical experience” (Richler 1992: 239).

Nor does Richler support the potential referendum and the indecision about the sovereignty issue. Openly mocking the debate surrounding the referendum, he declares: “As I write, late in September 1991, Quebec is pledged to definitely, but not necessarily, hold a referendum on sovereignty by next October. Or, on the other hand, the referendum could deal with the rest of Canada’s binding offer for renewed federalism. Or, if such an offer were near, the referendum could be delayed. Or, instead of a referendum, there could be an election in 1993 to settle the question once and for all, but only for another decade” (1992: 228). He later terms renewed federalism “a loot bag that would yield still more sweets to the Quebec Cookie Monster” (1992: 238). Sovereignty-association is deemed a “chicken-livered and sly” proposal

---

173 Richler’s view that French Canadians are not “les nègres blancs d’Amérique” is also elaborated in “Québec Oui, Ottawa Non,” an essay included in the 1984 collection *Home Sweet Home*. He argues that French Canadians, unlike Blacks in the Southern United States, had the right to vote, which meant that if the province had been “backward and corrupt” during the Duplessis era, “it was—no matter how artfully you slice it—a French Canadian electoral majority that put the government in office, and kept it there. The English-speaking community may have been more than pleased about it, and there is no doubt that they behaved slyly, shabbily, and even dishonestly, but the shame, such as it was, was largely French Canadian” (1984: 43).
that should be treated by Ottawa with “the contempt it so richly deserves” (1992: 239).

Richler reserves a large portion of his satire for Quebec’s language inspectors, Bill 101, and the “self-appointed vigilantes” (1992: 1) who spend their time searching for violations of Quebec’s sign laws and then reporting these violations to the Commission de protection de la langue française. Bill 178, which stipulates that all exterior signs must be written only in French, is described as “screwy” (1992: 244). He mentions that when he talks about Quebec’s sign laws at dinner parties, his listeners “have accused [him] of inventing the details” and warned him never to put them into a novel, because “nobody would believe anything so patently absurd” (1992: 256). After discussing the ruling that French signs would have to be twice as large or numerous as those in English, Richler describes the “Twice as Much Society” he and his buddies at Woody’s Pub formed in response:

The society, it was decided, would lobby for an amendment to Bill 178 that would call for French to be spoken twice as loud as English inside and outside. Inspectors from the language commission would be armed with sound meters to detect Anglophones who spoke above a whisper, sending offenders to the slammer. A Francophone hockey player scoring a goal for le Club de hockey canadien would have to be cheered twice as loud as a minority group teammate. A member of the collectivity, ordering a meal in a restaurant, would have to be served a double portion, and so forth and so on. We also drafted a letter to Premier Bourassa demanding that his fertility payola [a policy introduced by Bourassa offering parents a cash bonus for each new child] be made available only to Québécois de vieille souche, lest garlicky Allophones, driven by avarice, take to polluting the province with racially impure families of a dozen kids or more
Though critical of French Canadians, Richler also makes negative comments about English Canadians. For instance, on the same page, he refers to those running Montreal’s French Catholic school board as “zealots” for suggesting that immigrant children be punished for speaking English in the schoolyards, and to the English Canadians who stomped on a Quebec flag in front of TV cameras as “aging nutters” (1992: 3). He criticizes the Quebec chant of “Le Québec aux Québécois,”174 which he asserts does not include “anybody named Ginsburg, Or MacGregor, come to think of it” (1992: 77), but he declares the Reform Party “equally xenophobic” (101), and describes J. V. Andrews’ Bilingual Today, French Tomorrow as one of the “screwy, paranoid books” published by anglophones (101). Clearly, his barbs are aimed at both linguistic groups, though he is sympathetic to other Canadians. He is sure that Canadians of neither French nor English origin “are bound to be outraged by the mess they have inherited from our two foundering races” (1992: 102). In fact, his feelings are probably best summarized by a statement that begins chapter 12: “Impatient with our two founding races, I wonder why, instead of constantly picking at the scabs of their differences, they couldn’t learn to celebrate what binds them together” (1992: 108).175 His impatience shows throughout the work, but, as he asserts in his postscript, he wrote Oh Canada! Oh Quebec, as well as the New Yorker article that appeared prior to the book’s publication, because “this is my home and I care deeply about what

---

174 By this, Richler is referring to when an “estimated 25,000 Québécois nationalists, anticipating a Supreme Court decision that would declare the sign law illegal, took to the streets of Montreal to protest, chanting, ‘Le Québec aux Québécois!’ and a jittery Premier Bourassa, who could never forget that the nationalists had once burnt him in effigy, began to talk about the need to preserve the ‘social peace’” (Richler 1992: 27). This chant was repeated in 1995 by the crowd surrounding Parizeau after he spoke about losing the 1995 referendum due to “money and ethnic votes.” For more details, see Johnson (2001: A11) and MacPherson (1995: B3).

175 Topping this “short” list of what binds Canadians together, says Richler, is a propensity for bad taste, as evidenced by Canada’s nondescript cities filled with ugly, banal buildings (108), followed by hypersensitivity (138).
is happening here” (1992: 257).

4.1.3 Daniel Poliquin

Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country was translated into French by Daniel Poliquin in 1992. An author himself, Poliquin has published several works, including Le roman colonial : essai (2000) (cf. Section 2.2.2.2), a critical essay on Quebec nationalism, and L’écureuil noir; a novel that was translated into English in 1995 as Black Squirrel.

Poliquin was born in Ottawa in 1953 to francophone parents: his father was a translator with the Senate and Chamber of Commons before working as a writer and director of the literature page at Le Devoir and host of a TV show entitled La semaine parlementaire, while his mother was a nurse who eventually studied law at the University of Ottawa (Cyr 2005: 325). After receiving a Bachelor of Arts in German from Carleton University in 1975, Poliquin went on to complete a Master’s in German three years later at Carleton, a second Master’s from Carleton, in Comparative Literature, in 1982, and a doctorate in lettres françaises in 1987 from the University of Ottawa. He taught German at Carleton from 1975 to 1979 and translation at the University of Ottawa from 1984 to 1991. Made a Chevalier de l’Ordre de la Pléiade in 1999176 and a member of the Order of Canada in 2004, Poliquin also received the Queen Elizabeth II Golden Jubilee Medal in 2002, as well as an honorary doctorate from the University of Ottawa in 2006.

Like Richler, Poliquin has won numerous awards for his literary works. In 2001, Poliquin, along with his translator Don Winkler, won the Shaughnessy Cohen Award for Political Writing for In the Name of the Father: An Essay on Quebec Nationalism (cf. Section 3.2.3.1). His 1990 novel Visions de Jude won the 1990 Grand prix du roman du Journal de

Montréal, the 1991 Prix littéraire Le Droit and the 1991 Prix du livre de la Municipalité régionale d’Ottawa-Carleton. His 1998 novel L’homme de paille won the Prix Trillium, an award for Franco-Ontarian literature, that same year.\textsuperscript{177} While Poliquin has not yet won a Governor General’s Award, L’écureuil noir was nominated for one in 1994.

According to Poliquin, when he was approached by Les Éditions Balzac, the publisher of the French edition of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!, he “hated the book, of course. Then [he] read it” (Poliquin 2001: A13). Cyr (2005) asserts that Poliquin was chosen to translate Richler’s work because none of the other translators who had been approached could, would or dared do the translation (2005: 334). However, when I interviewed Daniel Poliquin in June 2008, he noted that this interpretation of events was not quite accurate and stressed that the other translators had not specified that they did not dare translate Richler:

Two translators were approached and they turned down the publisher because they had no time, and in one case it was some other reason. The person was leaving for a holiday or something. So, they [had] very non-ideological reasons for turning the work down.

As for whether he was chosen for the translation because he, as a Franco-Ontarian, was outside the controversy in Quebec, Poliquin states that this “never played a role.”\textsuperscript{178} Rather, he was approached by the publisher because he had been recommended by anglophone translator David Homel, and also because he was available to translate the work in the short time frame the publisher had set. It was strictly, Poliquin explains a matter of finding a translator “who [could] work fast and who [could] do the job and who would take the job too.”

Poliquin has described Richler’s work as “an eye opener,” though he has also said

\textsuperscript{177} For a full list of Poliquin’s publications, awards, translations and interviews, see: Descoeurs, Marie-Jo. (2002). Bibliography. Voix et Images, 27(3), 478-490.

\textsuperscript{178} The full text of this interview is available in Appendix 1.
Richler was not evenhanded, as Richler “gave the impression that most Quebecers felt as Father Groulx did, overlooking the fact that this anti-Semitism was a phenomenon among intellectuals” (2001: A13). While Poliquin does not define himself as a federalist, since he feels that only Quebecers have the right to call themselves federalists or sovereignists (Barrière 2000: A2), he does share some of Richler’s views. In his 2000 essay Le roman colonial, he repeatedly takes digs at a stereotypical francophone Quebec nationalist for whom a persecution complex “chez un nationaliste de la bonne école comme lui, est résolument superflu” (2001: 19), and he asserts that “comme mon ami Lesieur [the nationalist protagonist], je ne sais pas, moi non plus, à quel moment au juste j’ai quitté la foi nationale. Il fut un temps, en effet, où nous pensions pareil, lui et moi, mais dans des contextes fort différents” (2000: 44).

In fact, during my interview with him, Poliquin noted that after reading Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!, he realized:

[it] was innocent, [it was] nothing. And so that changed me in that sense. It really marked my own rupture with the whole nationalist movement, or the beginning of it. I said, “No, there’s something wrong there.” We are being told by Lise Bissonnette in Le Devoir, and other people not to read that book. There was even a member of parliament who said that the book should be banned. And then I said, “No, this is the Inquisition, this is the Auto da fé, the Act of faith.”179 I don’t want to live in that sort of world, and so it pushed me farther apart from my nationalist friends and their whole thought process.

However, Poliquin also acknowledges that Bill 101, by strengthening the position of French in Quebec—and therefore, he feels, in the rest of Canada as well—has done a lot for

179 According to the The Wordsworth Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, the Auto da fé was the ceremonial procedure of the Spanish inquisition when sentences against heretics were read. Persistent heretics were subsequently delivered to the secular arm for punishment.
francophone minorities outside of Quebec (Cyr 2005: 331), so his views do not always match those of Richler.

After translating *Oh Canada! Oh Québec!*, Poliquin wrote two articles that appeared in *Maclean’s Magazine* and the *Globe and Mail*. These articles commented on Richler’s work and the response to Richler’s narrative. This is valuable insight into the translator’s point of view, as few of the translators in the delimited catalogue have published their thoughts on the works they have translated. These articles, along with Poliquin’s responses to my interview questions, will be explored further in a moment.

### 4.1.4 The “Richler Affair”

*Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* has been chosen for this case study because of the controversy it generated in Canada, and particularly in Montreal, shortly after its publication. In fact, the controversy began when Richler first published an article entitled “Inside/Outside” in the September 23, 1991 issue of *The New Yorker.* Throughout September and October 1991, editorials and letters to the editor appeared in *La Presse* (e.g. Adam 1991: B2; Gagnon 1991: B3; Mordecai Richler: suite et fin... 1991: B3; Leblanc 1991: A1; Gruda 1991: B2), *Le Devoir* (e.g. Bissonnette 1991: A8), the *Globe and Mail* (e.g. Cooper 1991: D5; Dear 1991: A10; Gagnon 1991b: D3), *The Gazette* (e.g. King 1991: B2; Champion 1991: B2; Webster 1991: B3) and other newspapers across the country. Some of these writers criticized Richler for “contempt and arrogance” (King 1991: B2), for writing a “récit excessivement détaillé, dont la monotonie distille un ennui...” (Adam 1991: B2), for offering a text with “l’omniprésence d’un préjugé défavorable que rien ne vient jamais contrebalancer” (Gagnon 1991: B3), and for creating a “rambling, 31-page article” that offered “a lot of facts about Quebec’s pathetic linguistic saga”

---

180 *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* would eventually be published as an expanded version of this article.
but was overall “a nasty and unfair piece, with unfounded accusations of anti-Semitism flying all over” (Gagnon 1991b: D3). Others, however, supported Richler’s narrative. In a letter to the editor that appeared in the Gazette shortly after “Inside/Outside” was published, Richler was praised for “expos[ing] the ethnocentric mindset of individuals in Quebec whose education and social position should preclude such destructive childishness” (Champion 1991: B2). The essay was also described as “fair comment” and Richler himself as someone who had “held up a mirror to Quebec [and could] hardly be blamed if the Quebec nationalists [didn’t] like what they saw” (Cooper 1991: D5). Another journalist noted that while Richler’s article did have “a few snide shots,” it was not “full of the devastating put-downs Richler usually summons. It [was], rather, a critical but often plodding roundup of developments in Quebec, mainly on the language front, over the last couple of decades” (Webster 1991: B3). Richler’s narrative evidently generated different reactions from Canadian readers. While an initial assumption might be that reviews by French Canadians were generally unfavourable and reviews by English Canadians were generally favourable—or at least not unfavourable—a closer analysis of the editorials and reviews published several months later reveals that this assessment is not quite true.

When Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! appeared in March 1992—seven months after the New Yorker piece, more editorials and letters to the editor were published for several months afterward.181 Book reviews appeared in the daily newspapers of many provinces, including British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, and excerpts from the book were printed in the Halifax Daily News, Gazette, Ottawa Citizen, Toronto Star, Edmonton Journal and the Vancouver Sun. Once again, reviews were very mixed. Richler was frequently criticized for arguing that Quebecers were more anti-Semitic than the rest of Canada. In fact, this section of

---

181 Though most of the opinion pieces were published in March and April, the book was still being discussed months later. Le Devoir, for instance, printed a letter to the editor about Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! as late as August 11, 1992.
his book, which occupies most of chapters ten and eleven, part of chapter twelve as well as a large part of the postscript, though not the main thesis of Richler’s work,\(^{182}\) is mentioned at least in passing in virtually every\(^{183}\) book review in the daily newspapers as well as in *Maclean’s*, *L’Actualité*, *Books in Canada*, *Spirale* and numerous editorials.\(^{184}\) He was also criticized, in both English and French, for his poor writing style (Lisée 1992: 11; Graham 1992: C20; Moore 1992: F64), for getting dates and/or facts wrong (Lisée 1992: 11; Granatstein 1992: 56; Graham 1992: C20), for putting “his own spin on events” (Cook 1992: K1), offering “demi-vérités, [d]es approximations frauduleuses et [d]es silences” (Saletti 1992: D1) and for relying on dated, anglo-centric or second-hand sources (Cook 1992: K1; Graham 1992: C20). Yet other reviewers—both anglophone and francophone—praised his wit (Behiels 1992: H3; Powe 1992: G17), found that “il tape fort juste dans la plupart des cas” (Brunelle 1992: 8), asserted that Richler was “remarkably objective and almost painfully fair” (Scott 1992: 12), and found the book “well” (McGoogan 1992: B7) or “vividly” (Powe 1992: G17) written and Richler’s research “comprehensive” (Galt 1992: 38). Evidently, Richler’s work was framed in very contrasting ways, and the labels applied to *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* varied widely from one review to another.

One complaint raised in several reviews and editorials was that Richler would be read by a non-Canadian audience, who would likely perceive Quebec unfavourably. Three articles in *La Presse* published shortly after the *New Yorker* article deplore this fact:

\(^{182}\) *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* has a total of 25 chapters. The postscript and chapters 10-12 comprise approximately 55 of the 260 pages of text in the book.

\(^{183}\) Only *La Presse* does not mention the passages about anti-Semitism in Quebec or address the controversy surrounding Richler’s statements. However, this review is very superficial and quite short (about 200 words). [See Vennat 1992: B5]

\(^{184}\) Richler himself considered this a “diversion” from the points he raises about the language laws in Quebec “because nobody can justify these goofy laws that we have in Quebec or the stifling of the rights of the English-speaking people in Quebec and discriminatory practices and so it’s all focusing on the Jewish question” (Gzowski 1992: 8min10sec-8min34sec).
[...] le malheur, c’est que son histoire sera celle qu’on lira aux États-Unis”
(Leblanc 1991: A1);

Il me semble que la décence commande de ne pas aller faire à l’étranger le procès de son pays ou de ses concitoyens [...] À plus forte raison quand cela risque de faire un tort considérable à l’image de marque d’une société (Adam 1991: B2);

Le Québec—comme le Canada d’ailleurs—est si peu connu à l’étranger que nombre d’intellectuels et de décideurs américains, après avoir lu ce portrait signé par un écrivain renommé, dans une publication de haut niveau, resteront convaincus que le Québec est une société où l’antisémitisme et la répression des minorités sont la règle plutôt que l’exception (Gagnon 1991: B3).

In much the same vein, the Globe and Mail review of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! stressed that Richler had a “double responsibility because he [was] writing for an international audience who [couldn’t] be expected to have the background or context to put Richler’s wilder assertions into perspective” (Graham 1992: C20).185

But perhaps the most striking example of the extent to which some readers objected to Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! is the fact that Bloc Québécois MP Pierrette Venne tried to have the book banned under section 319 of the Criminal Code, which addresses public incitement and

185 The review in the Times Literary Supplement helps show that Canadian reviewers did not necessarily give international readers enough credit. In her review, Tippet states that Richler’s view of Quebec is “dated” and that this “outmoded and narrow view of Quebec—and indeed of Canada—is illustrated by the fact that he considers the country’s two major problems to be language and regional loyalties,” adding that when Richler says Canadians are “intimidated by the perishingly cold tundra on one side and American pizzazz on the other”, [he] ignores the extent to which they have come to terms with their climate and with their neighbour to the south” (Tippett 1992: 32).
wilful promotion of hatred. She explained that “when you describe the Quebec people as a nasty, racist tribe, that is hate propaganda” (quoted in Fraser 1992: A1). Despite Venne’s efforts, however, the book was never actually banned.

Responses to Richler’s text were not limited to reviews and editorials in Canadian periodicals. Nor were positive responses limited solely to anglophones: Nadia Khouri, in 1995, published *Qui a peur de Mordecai Richler?*, an analysis of the controversy surrounding “Inside/Outside” and *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*. In it, she argued that Richler had many valid points and had written “d’innombrables autres passages hilarants, satiriques et roulards qui font le talent des grands écrivains” (Khouri 1995: 40). She explained, in an interview with Posner (2004), why she supported Richler:

There was a tremendous amount of political correctness, which irritated me tremendously, and there was a lot of this business of “Don’t rock the boat.” You have to rock the boat when there’s a lot of xenophobia, when there are periods in history that you have not come to terms with, when you have ideologues like Lionel Groulx. Somebody had to say something. This was not a nice guy. [Groulx] was a xenophobe. Yes, he was anti-Semitic. He was a reactionary. He was awful. I felt Mordecai was being feminist when he said that the punishing level of fertility that Lionel Groulx and the Catholic Church imposed on women amounted to treating them as though they were sows, but of course it was completely misinterpreted as his saying francophone mothers were sows, which is ridiculous. And I thought, my god, not only is this thing crazy, but people don’t even read. And when they do, they don’t read properly (Posner 2004: 287).

Khouri analyzes numerous editorials and reviews of Richler, as well as letters to the
editor from *Le Devoir* and *La Presse* to show that many of the criticisms against Richler stemmed from superficial—or even no—readings of his work. For instance, she critiques Pierre Foglia, of *La Presse* who, after misquoting Richler,

rétorque en se demandant quelle serait la réaction de Richler si, transposant aux Israéliens une phrase sur les Québécois que Richler n’a jamais littéralement écrite (mais quelle importance que ce détail !), lui Foglia se permettait d’écrire quelque chose comme: « Les Juifs d’Israël ne forment qu’une tribu dont l’émancipation dans le monde moderne tient à la magnanimité des Américains »? On comprend à la lecture de cette sotte rétorsion que Foglia n’a jamais lu Richler, lequel en a écrit de bien pires sur sa « communauté » et sur Israël (Khoury 1995: 24).

Conversely, a group of twenty-five\(^\text{186}\) anglophones, mainly academics and/or writers, published an open letter denouncing Richler’s narrative. They argued that while Richler was entitled as an artist “to be critical of society,” his statements “misrepresent[ed] Quebec culture and risk[ed] creating misunderstandings that could have grave consequences at this critical time in Canada’s history.” The signatories argued that Richler had ridiculed Quebec’s language laws while making “no serious attempt to understand their intent” and was insulting when he referred to Quebec as a “tribal society.” In the last decade, according to the letter, Quebec’s sense of collective identity had “evolved and opened up to other ethnic groups within Quebec.” The letter writers considered that Richler’s statements could have a considerable effect on the entire country, as they insisted that “emotional and unreasoned attacks like those of Mordecai Richler can ignite such inter-cultural antagonisms, ones that in the present climate could destroy the possibility that still remains for conciliation between Quebec and English Canada” (letter reprinted in Smart 1992: 9). In their framing of Richler’s book as an “emotional and unreasoned

---

\(^{186}\) This number later expanded to 28 (Smart 1992: 9).
attack,” these anglophones voiced an opinion similar—albeit more tempered—to that of many francophone reviewers and demonstrated that opinions about *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* were divided across the country rather than particular to a given language or geographical group. To explore how these public narratives may have affected the way *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* was framed for French-speaking readers, let us now look at the way translation reframed Richler’s narrative.

### 4.1.5 Framing Richler’s Narrative

Section 1.2.4 has already introduced the concept of translation as a narrative frame. This section will closely examine the idea that “translators [...] can and do resort to various strategies to strengthen or undermine particular aspects of the narratives they mediate, explicitly or implicitly” and further, that “these strategies allow them to dissociate themselves from the narrative position of the author or speaker or, alternatively, to signal their empathy with it” (Baker 2006: 105). Based on an analysis of translated passages from *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and an interview with Daniel Poliquin, this section will explore how translators can use framing strategies to signal their empathy or antipathy for a narrative.

#### 4.1.5.1 Peritexts

The English version of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* contains a postscript, but no preface or foreword. In addition to a short biography about Richler on the first page, the book also contains end notes, a bibliography and an appendix that consists of excerpts from the Charter of the French Language pertaining to public signs in Quebec. In the English edition, the endnotes are used solely to list bibliographic details and not to provide information on Yiddish terms or
literary references. The French edition follows this convention, although the endnotes are listed at the closing of each chapter rather than at the end of the book. Poliquin has, however, added seven translator notes to gloss three Yiddish terms (\textit{putz, mame-loshn, mechaiah}), provide the full form for three acronyms (PSBGM—Protestant School Board of the Great Montreal \textit{[sic]}, c.r.—Conseiller de la reine, and WASP) and explain one literary reference to “madame Defarge,” a character in \textit{A Tale of Two Cities}. Asterisks and italics have also been used throughout the French translation to mark words or phrases that were in French in the English ST (e.g. \textit{visage linguistique, Québécois pure laine, la revanche des berceaux, indépendantiste}).

One paratext that has not been included in the French edition is the biography, which is found neither within the covers nor anywhere on them. With the exception of the translator notes, asterisks, and missing biography, the text within the covers of the French edition is nearly identical in form to that of the English edition: chapter divisions have been maintained, and the postscript appears at the end of the work.

The title, covers, and blurbs, however, do differ in the English and French works. Because the French title, \textit{Oh Canada! Oh Québec! Requiem pour un pays divisé} is a direct translation of the English, not much focus will be placed on this paratextual element, except to say that the fact that this title was translated literally indicates that the publishers, author and translator did not think it necessary to create a more or less provocative title for the new audience or to adapt it in any way, as was done with some of the other titles (cf. 3.2.5). Their decision probably indicates a desire to ensure French-language readers would immediately recognize \textit{Oh Canada! Oh Québec! Requiem pour un pays divisé} as a translation of the book they had heard so much about in the press five months earlier. The book covers, however, are of greater interest than the title. Let us start with the English edition.
Covers

As discussed in Section 3.2.6, the covers of a work act as visual frames that situate the textual narrative for (potential) readers. The cover of the English edition depicts a vandalized STOP sign. The sign is obviously from Quebec, as it contains the words STOP and ARRÊT.

Black spray paint covers the word arrêt and partially covers the letters of the word stop so that it instead looks like 101 (see Figure 8). This image evokes a frame of conflict that sets the tone for the textual narrative inside. Simultaneously, the vandalized stop sign a) provides a reference to Bill 101, b) indicates that the vandal felt strongly enough about Quebec’s language policies to deface a traffic sign and c) provides a visual reinforcement for Richler’s narrative, since he discusses “vandals who took to the streets spray-painting the inflammatory word STOP on road signs to make it look like ‘101,’” as in Bill 101, the French Language Charter” (1992: 6). This photograph, located above the title, tells potential readers that the text will be about language issues in Canada—and Quebec in particular, and that these issues have had enough of an impact that someone has resorted to vandalism to make a statement. For those who actually read the
work, the visual frame reinforces Richler’s points and provides evidence that Richler has not simply invented the STOP sign example, although he has not mentioned that both the words STOP and ARRÊT have been vandalized. However, the image is somewhat unclear, as one cannot be sure whether the vandal is against or for Bill 101: while the French words have been covered, the English words have also been partially erased. Is the vandal indicating that with Bill 101, the English words would not be on the sign at all, or simply expressing a distaste for the language charter? The image therefore conveys conflict and controversy, with Bill 101 at the source.

The French cover (Figure 9) has an image of half a blue fleur de lys and half a red maple leaf separated by the subtitle Requiem pour un pays divisé. While references to Bill 101 are absent from this cover, conflict and division are still part of the visual frame, since these are the symbols that represent Quebec and Canada and they are separated by the words “un pays divisé,” implying that Quebec is dividing the country or is, at the very least, separate from it. The fact that the fleur de lys and maple leaf are separate rather than touching also shows conflict or hostility between the people these symbols represent. Like many of the covers in the 1968-2000 delimited catalogue, these symbols have been used to contrast Quebec with Canada, as though, instead of sharing a part-whole relationship, they could be compared on equal footing. The visual frame is one of discord between Quebec and Canada, and though not as specific as the visual frame on the English cover, it still accurately indicates to potential readers one of the themes in Richler’s narrative.

Blurbs

The texts on the back covers of the French and English editions differ in many respects.
The French edition contains a short blurb, followed by five excerpts from book reviews of the English edition, while the English version contains only a blurb and a short passage listing Richler’s most recent publications. The French blurb shows that the translation is targeted at French-speaking Quebecers rather than francophones throughout the country: it makes use of the *nous* to address readers and indicate that the publisher (or at least the writer of the blurb) is part of the French-speaking majority in Quebec rather than part of the Others outside Quebec. Remarking that Richler “dénonce l’absurdité de *nos* lois linguistiques”, the blurb asserts that Richler’s narrative is “avant tout une satire mordante de *nos* travers, de *nos* aveuglements, qui ne peut laisser personne indifférent.” Here, readers are promised a narrative that touches on their realities and they are warned that it will likely provoke strong reactions in all readers (“ne peut laisser personne indifférent”).

While the French edition does not offer a new introduction, preface, postscript or other similar peritext to tell readers how the work should be read or why they would find it relevant, the blurb on the back cover fulfils this function instead. The opening sentence asserts: “[v]oici le livre le plus controversé de l’année, dont tout le monde a parlé mais que personne n’a vraiment lu.” Readers are being advised that they should read this book because it is topical, controversial and has been read by very few people so far. Anyone who chooses to read the book would be able to better express an opinion about the controversy it has generated.

The blurbs and quotations on the back cover also frame Richler’s narrative in another way. They tell readers *how* the book should be read: the blurb and four of the five quotes

---

187 When I asked Poliquin why no peritexts had been added to the TT, he responded that the question had never come up during the publication process, and that in fact, if the subject had come up, he would have been against it. “From my own experience writing a thesis on it, you shouldn’t do that. You should just present the book as it is, just launch the book as it is. The book is there, people do not need a preface, especially not someone telling them what to read, how to read it, and what posture, and whatnot. I was glad that they did not do that. And if it were to be reprinted, it might be needed, but just to explain the context at the time, and not, ‘this is how you should receive this book.’”
emphasize that *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* is satiric, ironic, and amusing rather than an analysis:

“[ce livre est] avant tout *une satire mordante*” (blurb, emphasis added)

“[ce livre] n’est pas une analyse méthodique et soporifique de la vie contemporaine au Québec. C’est *une exubérante satire sociale* menée à bâtons rompus [...] Ramsey Cook, *The Gazette*” (emphasis added).\(^{188}\)

“[Richler] écrit avec éclat; il est spirituel, avec *un don pour le trait d’ironie mordante* [...] B. W. Powe, *Toronto Star*” (emphasis added).\(^{189}\)

“[...] *pour ceux qui savent tenir le rire quand c’est d’eux qu’on rit*, pour ceux-là le petit livre de Richler est un « God send » comme on dit dans l’autre parlure. Dorval Brunelle, *Spirale*” (emphasis added).

“Lire *Oh Canada! Oh Québec!* pour son esprit, son effet immédiat, le ton effronté de sa prose tirée à bout portant, est *une expérience divertissante*. Maria Tippet, *Time [sic] Literary Supplement*” (emphasis added).\(^{190}\)

In each of the above quotations, readers have been told to consider *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* a humorous work. The word “satire” appears in both the blurb and the first quotation, while “irony” appears in the second quote, and an emphasis on humour (“pour ceux qui savent rire”) or amusement (“expérience divertissante”) figure in the last two citations. In at least one case—the quotation from the *Toronto Star*—the French version differs significantly from the original English review. While Powe wrote that “[Richler] writes vividly; he is witty, with a gift for the sarcastic putdown” (Powe 1992: G17, emphasis added), this line appears on the back cover as “un don pour le trait d’ironie mordante,” significantly reducing the negative connotation in the English version. For French-speaking readers, Richler’s work is being framed as *ironic*, rather than sarcastic and insulting. It would appear that a deliberate framing strategy has been adopted on the back cover: readers are being instructed to read the book because

---

\(^{188}\) This quote is a translation of the original English review: “[this book] is not a systematic, soporific analysis of contemporary Quebec life. It is a rollicking, rambling social satire...” (Cook 1992: K1).

\(^{189}\) This quote is a translation of the original English review: “He writes vividly; he is witty, with a gift for the sarcastic putdown” (Powe 1992: G17).

\(^{190}\) This quote is a translation of the original English review: “To read *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* for its wit, its immediacy, and its cheeky, shoot-from-the-hip prose, is an entertaining experience” (Tippett 1992: 32).
hardly anyone has, but not to take it seriously because it is a satire. While the blurb does frame Richler as controversial (“voici le livre le plus controversé de l’année”), it spins this in a positive light by suggesting that the controversy it has been generating is based largely on hearsay rather than the book itself. Potential readers are invited to discover for themselves what Richler had to say. Clearly, more emphasis was placed on Richler’s humour than on his offensiveness, to help make him more acceptable to TL readers. Given that the purpose of the blurbs and the selectively cited reviews is to help engage the reader and sell the book, this emphasis is understandable.

The English edition frames Richler differently. The blurb on the back cover emphasizes the criticisms Richler has levelled against Quebecers. Its opening sentence tells potential readers that “[...] Quebec is on the verge of an election and Mordecai Richler’s gloves are off” (emphasis added). He is cited as writing about “the western world’s goofiest and most unnecessary political crisis” (emphasis added), and the second paragraph asserts that “English-speaking Quebecers endure Draconian language laws” (emphasis added). The third paragraph labels Richler’s opinions “extremely controversial” and his essay is said to have “unleashed a torrent of commentary—both critical and complementary.” While the French edition limited the extent to which Richler was framed as a critic and focused instead on his humour and wit, the English edition has emphasized his controversial statements. In addition, the biography of Richler that follows the blurb frames him as a wide-ranging writer: his non-fiction, fiction and collections are listed, and Solomon Gursky Was Here is described as “critically acclaimed.” No biographical details are given aside from Richler’s most recent publications. Thus, for English-speaking readers, Richler is a talented author who writes controversial essays and makes disparaging remarks about Quebec, while French speakers are told that Richler has written a
satire that is best read with a sense of humour.

4.1.5.2 Translation frames: Richler in French and English

Translation played a significant role in reframing Richler’s narrative for French-speaking Quebecers. As Section 4.1.4 explained, *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* generated controversy in Canada when it was published, and part of this controversy was based on translations published in the French Canadian press. Without a doubt, these translations had an influence on French-speaking readers: when Quebec MP Pierrette Venne asked the government to seize *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* under Section 319 of the Criminal Code, she based her argument on the translations in *L’Actualité*. As the *Globe and Mail* reports, Venne said “What I have seen here in *L’actualité* and *The Gazette* is really, in its entirety, hate propaganda” (Fraser 1992: A1). How and why various agents reframed *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* through translation is therefore an important issue to consider, in light of the goals for this project.

To analyze Richler’s narrative and its French translations, several ST passages have been chosen so that they can be compared with translations in the press and the TT published by Les Éditions Balzac. The first passage has been chosen because it was cited in several epitexts—both English and French—as a passage some readers found offensive, while the second set of examples are passages that appeared in French in *L’actualité*. These translations, which were published prior to *Oh Canada! Oh Québec! Requiem pour un pays divisé*, were cited by MP Venne as one of her reasons for considering *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* hate propaganda. In both cases, the analysis will focus on what role translators played in reframing Richler, what these frames reveal about the expectations translators had of French-speaking readers, and how and why a narrative like Richler’s, which was critical of French-speaking Quebecers, was reframed
for this same audience—in the press and in the Éditions Balzac TT. This analysis will help determine what role translation and translators played in the “Richler Affair.”

First analysis: Les filles du roi

In the first passage, Richler makes a comment about the filles du roi who were sent to New France between 1663 and 1673 under the reign of King Louis XIV:

Look at it this way. Some of the Québécois pure laine or de vieille souche are in fact the progeny of les filles du roi, or hookers, imported to New France by Jean-Baptiste Talon to satisfy the appetites of his mostly functionally illiterate soldiers. And many of those United Empire Loyalists—from whom, Walter Stewart has written, one out of six English-speaking Canadians is descended—were either obdurate reactionaries or—pace Mrs. C. M. Day—refugees from justice, men without fixed principles, or designing and unscrupulous adventurers. Mind you, we didn’t even get the top-of-the-line conmen and thieves or whores. Those were shipped to Van Diemen’s Land in shackles, culturally enriching Australia, not us (Richler 1992: 102).

Before examining the translation of this passage, let us compare Richler’s narrative with other narratives about the filles du roi circulating in Canada in the late twentieth century, beginning with the public narratives—defined in Section 1.2.3.2 as stories elaborated by and circulating within social formations and institutions (cf. Baker 2006: 33). First, the Canadian Encyclopedia. As the Introduction to the First Edition of the Canadian Encyclopedia notes, “many Canadians from every part of Canada [...] have generously given us their time and their support for a project they believed to be of great importance to our nation. [...]” [Mel Hurtig, who
put together the financing for the project] believed that all Canadians would be drawn together in this national project, and his faith in Canada is reflected in these pages” (Marsh 1988: introduction, reprinted in the 2000 edition), while the back jacket to the 2000 edition describes every entry in the encyclopedia as being written “for a Canadian reader, from the Canadian point of view.” This makes the encyclopedia a set of public narratives about Canada for Canadians. How the encyclopedia describes the filles du roi can therefore be considered one public narrative circulating in Canada around the time of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!’s preparation and publication. The 1988 edition of the Canadian Encyclopedia asserts that “some [of the filles du roi] were Parisian beggars and orphans; others were recruited from the La Rochelle and Rouen areas” (Wien 1988: 765). No mention is made of prostitutes here.

Several conceptual narratives mirror that of the Canadian Encyclopedia but place greater emphasis on the “good” backgrounds of the girls: Université Laval history professor Jacques Mathieu (1977), for instance, states that the filles du roi were “orphelines ou enfants trouvées, résid[ant] pour la plupart à l’hôpital général de Paris, aux frais du roi. Généralement bien élevées, pourvues de quelque instruction, elles purent venir chercher mari en nouvelle France, sous la protection des autorités civiles et religieuses” (Mathieu 1977: 149), while archivist and historian Gustave Lanctôt (1964) is even more effusive in praising the filles du roi, who were, he argues, “émigrants de choix, qui, par leurs qualités, leur labeur et leur dévouement, méritent de porter dans l’histoire, comme un titre de distinction et d’honneur, le nom unique de filles du roi” (Lanctôt 1964: 152). Other conceptual narratives offer a more balanced picture of these women: in the Histoire populaire du Québec, historian and Prix du Québec winner Jacques Lacoursière states that “les filles du roi n’étaient pas toutes de petites saintes, ni non plus des filles de mauvaise vie. Selon Silvio Dumas, plus d’une vingtaine [out of nearly 800] ont eu des démêlés
graves avec la justice” (Lacoursière 1995: 117). And historian and demographer Yves Landry (1992) argues that most narratives of the filles du roi depict these women alternately as either loose, promiscuous women of questionable virtue, or virtuous and moral woman. The former narrative stems from sources from the 17th century when, for instance, an Ursuline nun named Marie de l’Incarnation, wrote in a 1669 letter that “parmi les honêtes gens il vient beaucoup de canaille de l’un et de l’autre sexe, qui causent beaucoup de scandale. Il aurait été bien plus avantageux à cette nouvelle Église d’avoir peu de bons Chrétiens, que d’en avoir un si grand nombre qui nous cause tant de trouble” (cited in Landry 1992: 66). The latter narrative was commonly circulating in Quebec from the mid-19th to the mid-20th century. Landry adds that “l’ardeur manifestée par les historiens à rétablir la réputation des Filles du roi s’explique aussi par la force de l’idéologie nationaliste conservatrice qui domina largement le Québec entre 1850 et 1950” (1992: 30). Landry himself concludes that the women “ven[aient] d’horizons divers, [et] la grande majorité des Filles du roi devaient certainement leur exil à leur extrême pauvreté” (Landry 1992: 67).

Evidently, then, several versions of the filles du roi narrative were circulating in Canada at the time when Richler wrote Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!, some of which considered a number of the women prostitutes—or at the very least, women whose morals did not match those considered appropriate at the time—and some of which considered the filles orphans from good homes, or simply poor women, with varying backgrounds and ethics.

Even Richler seems unsure which of these narratives to subscribe to, since sixty pages prior to the filles-du-roi-are-hookers narrative, he makes the following statement: “Another official, Jean-Baptiste Talon, first intendant of the colony, conceived the idea of importing shiploads of orphaned girls from France for the settlers, les filles du roi” (Richler 1992: 42). In
this version, no comment is made about whether these orphans are prostitutes (though presumably the two are not mutually exclusive), leaving open the possibility that the women come from differing backgrounds. However, in his second reference to the *filles du roi* (quoted at the start of this section), Richler has clarified his position and adopted the narrative that contradicts many of the conceptual and public narratives listed earlier, since Richler groups *all* the women under the same “hooker” label: few, if any, of the other narratives do. In the above passage, Richler has selectively appropriated events so that all 800 of the *filles du roi*—rather than just a few or even none of them—are depicted unflatteringly. He has thereby constructed a reality that may offend the descendants of both the *filles du roi* and the United Empire Loyalists.191

Since he has chosen words that many French and English Canadians are unlikely to consider complimentary—e.g. hookers, refugees from justice, unscrupulous adventurers, functionally illiterate soldiers—it seems likely that Richler is being deliberately provocative. He has taken pains to write a narrative that disagrees with the *relationality, selective appropriation* and *causal employment* features (cf. Section 1.2.3.2) of other public and conceptual narratives.192 Instead of interpreting the coming of the *filles du roi* as an effort by the king of France to provide an opportunity for poor French women to start a life in New France, while helping to create a society rather than a military outpost, Richler has considered these women prostitutes sent for the enjoyment of the soldiers of New France (the *relationality* feature). The details he

---

191 While English-speaking descendants of the UEL may have cause to be offended by Richler’s narrative, the focus of this thesis is to explore the effects of translating texts that narrate events in such a way as to offend large numbers of TL readers. For this reason, as well as space and time limitations, only the *filles du roi* narrative has been explored.

192 This example is not the only occasion in which Richler contradicts existing public narratives. In her conclusion, Khouri lists the things of which Richler is “guilty” in *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*: One is for having “raillé les théories conspiratoires de l’histoire, les légendes de cape et d’épée, les romans noirs sur « la nuit des longs couteaux » et les polars du « couteau sur la gorge » perpétrés par les malandrins fédéralistes. Il est coupable de favoriser une version opposée à l’histoire officielle de nos élites québécoises” (Khouri 1995: 157).
has selected provide little room for a positive interpretation of events (*selective appropriation*). The women do not get married, they do not create loving family homes, they do not help the colony’s population to double in seven years (c.f. Lacoursière 1995: 118); they are simply women sent to have sex with “mostly functionally illiterate soldiers.”

Nor, in Richler’s narrative, are only some of the women prostitutes: Richler has lumped them all together as hookers. And from Richler’s narrative, readers are expected to form the opinion that neither the *Québécois de vieille souche* nor the descendants of the United Empire Loyalists have laudable roots, contrary to other narratives circulating in Canada (*causal emplotment*).

In this passage, Richler’s narrative differs from the epertextual frames offered in the *Edmonton Journal*, the *Winnipeg Free Press* and *Globe and Mail* reviews, the only three (of twelve) English-language reviews to mention the *filles du roi* passage. Dumas writes in the *Edmonton Journal* that “other times Richler is the smart aleck in the alley, the smug one with the smirk who’s calling you names. Your ancestors were nothing but a bunch of illiterate peasants and ‘hookers’ (as he designates the ‘filles du roi,’ those penniless orphans who were rounded up and auctioned off like cattle to the men of New France)” (Dumas 1992: D6). Her version is similar to that offered by Mathieu (1977), where the *filles du roi* are orphans rather than hookers, although Dumas removes the element of choice from these orphans, as they were “rounded up” and “auctioned off” rather than given the opportunity to choose a husband, as Mathieu (1977) states in the above citation. Moore, in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, has the following to say about Richler’s version of the *filles du roi* narrative:

> In his non-fiction, Mr. Richler does not step away from his fiction, he steps inside it. [...] French Canadians are descended from prostitutes, their heroes are anti-

---

193 Richler also omits the fact that many of the women were also functionally illiterate (see the biographical data about the women and their husbands in Landry 1992: 269-379). Landry estimates that one in four of the *filles du roi* was able to sign her own name (1992: 91).
Semitic. Their mothers wear army boots. Not terribly illuminating perhaps. A part
of political debate the way brawls are part of hockey (Moore 1992: F64).

Here, he is essentially arguing that Richler’s narrative contradicts the generally accepted
public narrative: that the filles du roi sent to Quebec were not, in fact, prostitutes. Likewise,
Graham, in the Globe and Mail review, warns that since Richler has insisted he is not writing
satire, even though his book has been catalogued under humour:

[Richler] has a responsibility to be more responsible. Were my two ancestors who
came from New France as filles du roi really ‘hookers’ –most historians say no–
and did the “racist effusions” of Le Devoir really resemble Der Stuermer in the
1930s? Indeed, he has a double responsibility because he is writing for an
international audience who can’t be expected to have the background or context to
put Richler’s wilder assertions into perspective (1992: C20). 194

Like Moore, Graham argues that Richler’s narrative is inappropriate because it
contradicts conceptual narratives circulated by historians at this time. His objections are related
to the causal emplotment feature of narratives: international readers will form an incorrect
opinion about the filles du roi (and by extension their descendants) because of how Richler has
selected and interpreted events.

So now let us look at how Poliquin has dealt with Richler’s deliberate attempt to
contradict existing narratives and provoke his readers:

La preuve en est que certains Québécois pure laine* ou de vieille souche* sont en
fait les rejetons des filles du roi*, ces prostituées importées en Nouvelle France par
Jean Talon pour satisfaire les appétits de ses soldats qui étaient pour la plupart des
illettrés. Et nombre de ces Loyalistes de l’Empire uni—à propos desquels, a écrit

194 Der Stuermer was a Nazi weekly.
Walter Stewart, un Canadien anglais sur six est le descendant—étaient soit des réactionnaires incorrigibles ou—sauf le respect que je dois à Mme C. M. Day—des fugitifs de la justice, du gibier de potence, ou même des aventuriers sans scrupules. Encore là, le Canada n’a même pas été l’hôte de la crème des escrocs, voleurs ou putains. Ceux-ci ont été relégués à la Terre de Van Diemen, sous les fers, enrichissant la culture de l’Australie et non la nôtre (Richler 1992b: 123).\(^{195}\)

In his translation, Poliquin has not made a deliberate effort to choose French words that are likely to have more provocative or offensive effect than those used in the English text. While *hookers*, and Poliquin’s translation *prostituées*, are not words many descendants of the *filles du roi* would appreciate being used to refer to their ancestresses, *prostituée*, unlabelled in the Oxford-Hachette and *Nouveau Petit Robert*, is not as offensive as *pute*, which is marked *vulgar* in the Oxford-Hachette (2003) and *vulgar* and *pejorative* in the *Nouveau Petit Robert* (1996).

By contrast, one of the readers offended by Richler, in a letter to *Le Devoir* before the French translation was published, used the word *pute* for *hooker* when referring to this passage: “Mon ancêtre Nicole Legrand s’est amenée de Paris en 1666 pour marier François Noël. C’était une orpheline. Pas une pute” (Noël 1992). Noël, writing before the French edition had been published, has chosen a much more provocative term to highlight the offense he has taken at Richler’s narrative. A letter to the editor, of course, is not representative of the opinions of the writers for the newspaper. Reviews and editorials published in the French-Canadian press, when they referred to this passage, used the word *prostituées* rather than *putes*. However, even though they used a French word that more accurately translates the English word “hooker,” that does not mean that the French-language editorials and reviews did not make an effort to frame

\(^{195}\) Note: Poliquin has used asterisks throughout the French edition to mark words or phrases that appeared in French in the source text.
Richler’s comments about the “filles du roi” in a way that positions the narrative as provocative rather than humourous or ironic.

*Le Devoir,* for instance, headlined an opinion piece on its March 19, 1992 *Des idées, des événements* page with the title: “Descendants de prostituées et antisémites congénitaux” (Neamtan 1992: B8). This title has evidently been chosen to show French-language readers that Richler has made disparaging remarks about their ancestors, but the article under this headline addresses only Richler’s comments on anti-Semitism and not his “hookers” statement.196 Another opinion piece published in *Le Devoir* on March 25 sarcastically stated that “mes ancêtres sont arrivés de France en 1640: il s’agissait sans doute d’une prostituée et d’un voleur” (Vézina 1992: B8). Again on March 19, *La Presse* printed an editorial cartoon depicting Richler requesting that his quote about “rejetons de prostituées amenées en Nouvelle-France par J. B. Talon pour satisfaire aux besoins primaires des soldats illétrés” be printed in red so that it would attract more attention. This cartoon is probably referring to an article by Maurice Girard that appeared in *La Presse* two days earlier and contained the following translation of the *filles du roi* passage:

“Examinez la question sous cet angle. *Plusieurs* des Québécois pure laine ou de vieille souche sont, en fait, les rejetons des filles du roi, ces prostituées amenées en Nouvelle-France par l’intendant Jean-Baptiste Talon pour satisfaire *aux besoins primaires de ses soldats illétrés*, écrit [Richler].

*Les troupes loyalistes* n’ont guère une descendance plus noble, poursuit-il, *eux* qui sont sortis de la cuisse de « réactionnaires obsédés ou de repris de justice... de voleurs, de

196 Here, it is worth noting that newspaper and magazine editors probably played a very significant role in determining how Richler was framed. Headlines, for instance, are likely to be prepared by an editor rather than the author. Further study into the various agents involved in the newspaper framing strategies would likely prove very illuminating.
prostituées et d’arnaqueurs de deuxième ordre » (Girard 1992b: B1, emphasis added).

Poliquin’s translation differs only slightly from the version offered in La Presse, but in much the same way that has already been discussed. In this translation, La Presse has omitted a number of qualifiers: “mostly functionally illiterate,” “some of the Québécois pure laine” and “many of those United Empire Loyalists.” Instead, some of the Québécois pure laine has become plusiers, creating ambiguity in the French text, since plusiers could mean either several or many, in its Canadian sense. In the other instances, the qualifier has simply been omitted; the mostly functionally illiterate soldiers are all illiterate, and the comments about many UEL in the English version are supposed to apply to all of them in the French. These qualifiers slightly temper Richler’s words in the English text and, when omitted in the translation, reframe Richler as being more provocative than he was. Poliquin’s translation of this passage does not have the same pattern of omissions found in the La Presse version. Some of the Québécois pure laine has become certains Québécois pure laine, avoiding the ambiguity that arises in the translation from La Presse. The mostly functionally illiterate soldiers are pour la plupart des illettrés, and Poliquin’s translation refers to nombre de ces Loyalistes de l’Empire uni rather than all the United Empire Loyalists. But Poliquin has also not made an effort to soften what Richler has said: when Richler uses the word “whores” in the second-to-last sentence, Poliquin has followed suit, opting not to use the unlabelled prostituées but rather the more offensive putains, to match registers with Richler.

As these examples show, opinion pieces and letters to the editor in both La Presse and Le Devoir have translated Richler’s words in a way that makes them more provocative to French-language readers than the original English text would have been; Le Devoir has used the term prostituées in its headlines to attract attention to the filles du roi narrative even when its
articles do not discuss it, while *La Presse* has removed modifiers from its translation to make Richler’s words more offensive. The official translation, by contrast, has not taken pains to make his words more provocative, nor has Poliquin chosen to moderate Richer’s narrative by choosing less offensive French equivalents. But, is this contrast between Poliquin’s French version and the translations in the French-Canadian press repeated on other occasions? Can similar omissions be found in other epistextual frames, and do they also reframe Richler’s book as more offensive to francophone Quebecers? To answer these questions, let us turn to another set of translations that appeared in the French-language press after *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* was published in English but before it was published in French.

*Second analysis: Translated passages in L’Actualité*

A number of passages from *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country* are cited in *L’Actualité*, in the April 1992 review (or rather preview) of Richler’s book. These passages have presumably been translated by Jean-François Lisée, the author of the article, as no translator’s name is given, and the translations in *L’Actualité* differ from those in Poliquin’s version. Here are nine sample passages as they appear in *L’Actualité*, Daniel Poliquin’s translation, and in the original English text.¹⁹⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L’Actualité translation</th>
<th>Daniel Poliquin’s translation</th>
<th>English source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 René Lévesque « ne mèritait pas sa réputation d’honnêteté » écrit Mordecai Richler [...]. Ce jugement sans avertissement et sans preuve est suivi de ce commentaire: « J’ai le sentiment durable que [René Lévesque] ne mèritait pas néanmoins sa réputation d’intégrité. Le souvenir que j’ai de René Lévesque est celui d’un homme qui, ayant décidé de me pendre, au moment même où il me serrerait la corde autour du</td>
<td>[René Lévesque] nevertheless did not merit his reputation for honesty. My enduring feeling about René Lévesque is that if he had chosen to hang me, even as he tightened the rope round my neck, he would have complained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁹⁷ Lisée does quote several other passages, but they are short references (e.g. to Richler’s “gaffé embarrassante” with respect to PQ using a theme song based on a Nazi song, and Lévesque’s retort to Richler that when the author of the song “va vous rattraper, vous recevrez son poing dans la figure”) and do not illustrate anything not already demonstrated in the passages quoted here.
4.1 Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! Requiem for a Divided Country
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Richler consacre au contraire de longues pages à Lionel Groulx, qu’il affirme être « le saint patron des indépendantistes », prétend que « depuis le début, le nationalisme canadien-français a été fortement tarié de racisme » et que la province a « une longue histoire de xénophobie » (Lisée 1992: 11).</th>
<th>Dès le début, le nationalisme canadien-français a été tarié par le racisme. Le saint patron des indépendantistes*, le chanoine Lionel Groulx, n’était pas seulement un antisémite virulent mais aussi un fasciste en puissance, un admirateur inconditionnel de Mussolini, Dollfuss et Salazar dans les années 30 (Richler 1992b: 100). Les immigrants s’inquiètent également du long passé xénophobe de la province [...] (Richler 1992b: 206).</th>
<th>From the beginning, French Canadian nationalism has been badly tainted by racism. The patron saint of the indépendantistes, the Abbé Lionel Groulx, was not only a virulent anti-Semite but also a nascent fascist, an unabashed admirer in the thirties of Mussolini, Dollfuss, and Salazar. (Richler 1992: 81). [Prospective immigrants to Canada] also fret over the province’s long history of xenophobia [...] (Richler 1992: 178-179).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Il dit de l’indépendantiste Pierre Bourgault qu’il est « un auteur parfaitement épouvantable » qui semble avoir « dicté (son dernier livre) en se rasant » (Lisée 1992: 11).</td>
<td>[Bourgault] est aussi, si l’on en croit son dernier livre, un très piètre écrivain. [...] J’aimerais penser qu’il l’a dicté pendant qu’il se rasait, mais Bourgault prétend avoir écrit ce tract « à chaud » (Richler 1992: 182).</td>
<td>Bourgault [...] is also, on the evidence of his latest book, a perfectly appalling writer. [...] I prefer to think that he dictated it while shaving, but Bourgault claims he wrote his tract in “a white heat” (Richler 1992: 157).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Parant du défilé de la fête nationale de 1991, dont il ridicule le thème « heureux ensemble! » tourné vers les communautés ethniques, [Richler] écrit que « la procession faisait immanquablement songer à</td>
<td>Parce qu’il s’avéra que le thème de la journée, qui serait apolitique, avaient promis les organisateurs, n’était pas seulement Heureux ensemble*, mais aussi le Québec, un pays de géants*. C’était le message qui apparaissait sur la banderole</td>
<td>For it turned out that the theme of the day, which organizers had promised would be apolitical, was not only “Heureux ensemble!,” but also Quebec, a country for giants. This, certainly, was the message on the banner that preceded the first float in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Richler] parle avec nostalgie du Montréal des années 50, « un temps où l’anglais et le français florissaient, et où les deux cultures s’enrichissaient mutuellement; un temps où Montréal était hors de tout doute la ville la plus agréable et la plus cosmopolite d’un pays encore insignifiant » (Lisée 1992: 11).</td>
<td><strong>La nostalgie anglophone pour l’ancien Montréal n’est pas nécessairement fondée sur le regret de la domination économique mais plutôt de l’époque où anglophones et francophones prospéraient dans la même ville, et les deux cultures se fécondaient mutuellement au lieu de s’affronter. C’était bien cela, l’époque où Montréal, sans aucun doute, était la ville la plus agréable et la plus cosmopolite dans un pays encore colonial (Richler 1992b: 126).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Anglophone nostalgia for an earlier Montreal is not necessarily based on a longing for economic dominance but rather for a time when English, as well as French, thrived there and the two cultures enriched rather than excoriated one another. Those, those were the days when Montreal, beyond a doubt, was the most enjoyable and cosmopolitan city in a still picayune country (Richler 1992: 106, emphasis added).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> L’ensemble des Canadiens [...] sont, écrit-il, « des gens notoirement paresseux », qui « ont réussi à planter la laiderie presque partout où ils ont construit », sauf à Québec (Lisée 1992: 11).</td>
<td><strong>Les Canadiens, ayant reçu en partage de la nature un paysage d’une diversité et d’une beauté incroyables, ont réussi à installer la laideur à peu près partout où ils ont construit. [...] Québec est une exception [...] (Richler 1992b: 129).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canadians, blessed with a natural landscape of incredible beauty and variety, have managed to entrench ugliness just about everywhere they have built. [...] Quebec City is an exception [...] (Richler 1992: 108).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Il informe aussi ses lecteurs que « la majorité des habitants de Terre-Neuve et de l’Île-du-Prince-Édouard passent traditionnellement l’hiver en chômage » (Lisée 1992: 11).</td>
<td><strong>Ce qui voulait dire que le remède constitutionnel proposé par Mulroney pouvait être repoussé par la petite Île-du-Prince-Édouard ou Terre-Neuve, dont la majorité des citoyens hivernent traditionnellement aux frais de l’assistance sociale (Richler 1992b: 174)</strong></td>
<td><strong>This meant that Mulroney’s constitutional fix could be undone by tiny Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland, most of whose citizens traditionally wintered on welfare (Richler 1992: 149, emphasis added)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Il met en parallèle « le cri racial plaintif “Le Québec aux Québécois !”, entendu dans les rues de Montréal et la révolte des nerds de l’Ouest, c’est-à-dire la montée du Reform Party » (Lisée 1992: 11).</td>
<td>D’où le slogan raciste qu’on entend dans les rues de Montréal, « Le Québec aux Québécois!* », et dans l’Ouest, la révolte des wasps, avec la montée soudaine du Parti réformiste, également xénophobe [...] (Richler 1992b: 122)</td>
<td>Hence the plaintive racial cry in the streets of Montreal of “Le Québec aux Québécois!” and out west the revolt of the nerds, that is to say, the sudden rise of the equally xenophobic Reform Party [...] (Richler 1992: 101, emphasis added)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>« L’amère vérité est que la Sûreté du Québec n’assommaient pas les autochtones plus souvent que la police de l’État de Californie ne fait éclater la tête des Noirs ou des Hispaniques ou—et je déteste avoir à l’admettre—que les soldats israéliens ne brisent les os des enfants palestiniens » (Lisée 1992: 11).</td>
<td>La malheureuse vérité, c’est que les agents de la Sûreté ne sont pas plus violents envers les autochtones que la Police d’État de la Californie, qui se fait une spécialité de battre au sang les Noirs ou les hispanophones, ou—et je déteste l’admettre—que les soldats israéliens qui rompent les os des enfants palestiniens (Richler 1992b: 201-202).</td>
<td>The sour truth is that the Sûreté didn’t beat natives to pulp more often than the California State Police cracked open the heads of blacks or Hispanics or — much as I hate to admit it — Israeli soldiers broke the bones of Palestinian children (Richler 1992: 176, emphasis added).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these passages will be explored in turn. The translations in *L’Actualité* will of course differ from those in Poliquin’s translation simply because they are excerpts, while Poliquin has translated the entire book. However, even when this point is considered, one can still see in Lisée’s review a pattern of selective use of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* to reframe Richler for francophones. While Lisée has included several quotes of Richler insulting groups other than Quebecers (the inhabitants of PEI or Newfoundland, for instance), most of Lisée’s omissions occur in the translation of these passages, showing a clear attempt to frame Richler as more critical of Quebecers than of other Canadians.\(^{198}\)

What is interesting about these nine passages is that they illustrate the slight changes that have been made to Richler’s narrative in both French versions. Lisée’s translations, at first

---

\(^{198}\) Whether Richler was indeed more critical of Quebecers is a question that cannot be easily answered here. Certainly, Quebecers were the focus of his book, so most of the passages are about them; however, he does criticize other Canadians on several occasions (cf. 4.1.2) and he compliments Quebecers on others. However, by selectively quoting from the most provocative passages, and omitting qualifiers when Richler is criticizing other Canadian groups, Lisée has clearly positioned Richler as someone who has made very disparaging remarks about Quebec *without necessarily making similar remarks about the rest of the country*. 
glance, give the impression of being quickly written, but this is probably due to its nature as a journalist piece. In some cases, he has adopted English-language syntax or used English words when a French equivalent is available. In the first passage, for instance, he writes “il aurait resserré la corde autour de mon cou” instead of using a reflexive verb and and indefinite pronoun like Poliquin: “il me serrera la corde autour du cou,” and in the eighth, Lisée uses the word *nerd* instead of a French equivalent, although this may be a journalistic convention, since the word is used by other francophone journalists in newspapers published at this time.¹⁹⁹ In other cases, he has chosen a less appropriate French equivalent (e.g. *teinté* instead of *souillé* or *entâché* for *tainted* in passage 2). Poliquin’s translation does not have these same syntactic and lexical problems.²⁰⁰ To see what framing strategies they do share, let us focus on Lisée’s nine passages.

The translations in these passages clearly show that Lisée has reframed Richler as a writer who has repeatedly insulted Quebec institutions and politicians—and by extension its people—in his latest book. This strategy is apparent first in Lisée’s use of selective appropriation: of the nine passages, virtually all say something negative, and only two are not referring to Quebec or a Quebecker. Although some quotations from Lisée’s article have not been

¹⁹⁹ A search though the corpus of texts published by the French Canadian Press in 1993 reveals that seven articles from such periodicals as *L’Actualité* and *Le Soleil*, use the word *nerd* or *nerds*. Thus, while *nerd* was not extensively used in the French Canadian Press at this time (other words such as *crétin* have more hits (31 vs. 7 for *nerd*)), Lisée was certainly not the only journalist to use it, and his word choice, given the speed at which the translation seems to have been prepared, may very well have been influenced by the conventions of other French-language periodicals. Lisée also uses *Reform Party* instead of *Parti réformiste*, but here he seems to be following the convention of the French-language periodicals in the 1990s, as a search through the same corpus reveals that *Reform Party* was used in 871 articles, while *Parti réformiste* appeared in 103 articles. The French Canadian press corpus includes all articles from French-language periodicals such as *Le Soleil* and *L’Actualité*. Likewise, in *La Presse* that same year, only three articles used the term *Parti réformiste*, while 13 used *Reform Party*.

²⁰⁰ Poliquin and Lisée were, however, operating in different frame spaces: Lisée, being a journalist, was likely restricted to a certain amount of space for his article (and by extension, the translated passages), and he was to be published in a magazine that had specific stylistic, register and other language conventions. His framing strategies were therefore tied to his role as a journalist who was using the translation to construct an argument (namely that Richler was offensive to French-speaking Canadians).
included in this section for lack of space, they do not contradict this trend: he notes Richler’s “gaffe embarrassante” about the PQ singing a Nazi song at a 1976 victory rally and Richler’s omissions of surveys contradicting his data that Quebecers are more anti-Semitic than the rest of Canada. Both of these examples also depict Quebec negatively. The strategy can also be seen in Lisée’s reframing of passages 7 and 8, which discuss Canadians in general rather than Quebecers specifically. Translation 7 contains a shift in meaning, as Lisée has rendered “traditionally wintered on welfare” by “passent traditionnellement l’hiver en chômage” rather than something closer to the sense of the English text as Poliquin has done (“aux frais de l’assistance sociale”). This shift in meaning frames Richler’s narrative as less offensive, since the Newfoundlanders and Prince Edward Islanders are unemployed rather than dependant on welfare. When they are unemployed, they are not affecting other Canadians, but when they are on welfare, they are living on money provided by Canadian taxpayers. In passage 8, Lisée has omitted a key offensive term from his translation. While Richler has called the Reform Party “equally xenophobic”, Lisée has omitted this qualifier, with makes the comparison between the “cri racial plaintiff ‘Le Québec aux Québécois!’” and less unflattering to the Reform Party. Together, translations 7 and 8 paint a less critical picture of Canadians outside Quebec than Richler’s ST. Combined with the fact that very few of the quotations Lisée has selected criticize non-Quebecers, Lisée clearly has reframed Richler in a way that will make francophone readers think Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! is very critical of Quebecers and less so of Canadians outside Quebec.

The other passages, which narrate events in Quebec, do not contain any major omissions like those found in passages 7 and 8. Some passages do contain shifts in meaning, but they do not significantly reposition Richler.\footnote{Consider, for instance, the shifts in passage 1, where Lisée writes “...il se serait plaint de l’humiliation de devoir}
he intended to use these translations to frame Richler in a negative light and to position Richler as a provocative writer who has said very insulting things about Quebec figures, history, institutions and francophones and very few negative things about Canadians in general.  

So what about Poliquin’s translation, then? In the analysis of the filles du roi narrative, it seemed that Poliquin had made an effort to avoid the shifts in meaning and omissions that were prevalent in the press translations of this same passage. However, this trend has not carried through in all nine of these new passages. Poliquin’s translation, unlike Lisée’s, does not have anglicized syntax, English words or shifts in meaning due to faux amis, but some of the passages do have shifts in meaning that reframe Richler. These shifts are most apparent in passages 1, 8 and 9.

In the first translation, Poliquin has translated the label Francophone, used in the ST to refer to Lévesque, with the label Québécois. While this shift does not at first seem very significant, Richler has used the word Québécois in his English text, often as part of the term Québécois nationalist(s) (e.g. pp. 32, 35), but in almost all cases to refer to French-speaking Quebecers (e.g. pp. 43, 47, 48). Richler also uses the term Quebecer throughout his text to refer to those who live in Quebec rather than one specific linguistic group. The problem arises when

utiliser le giber” for “...he would have complained about how humiliating it was for him to spring the trapdoor” and “il m’aurait blâmé de l’avoir forcé à m’assassiner...” for “he would blame my ghost for having obliged him to murder.” While these changes are shifts in meaning, they do not really reposition Lévesque, nor do they reframe Richler’s narrative as more or less offensive than the ST.  

While a person’s political views do not always surface in the narratives they create and circulate, Lisée’s reframing of Richler is not unexpected, given that he has acted as an advisor to both Parizeau and Bouchard and has publicly expressed his support for independence. See, for instance, his brief submitted in 2000 to the Legislative committee of the House of Commons examining bill C-20 on Québec’s secession referendum, in which he states: “Now, obviously I am in favour of Quebec independence.” The full text of the brief is available at: http://archives.vigile.net/00-9/lisee-20.html.

Other passages do contain errors. For instance, in passage 1 he writes “il blâmerait mon fantôme pour l’avoir obligé à me tuer” for “he would blame my ghost for having obliged him to murder [and not murder me]” and in passage 4, he translates “twenty-foot high giant figures” by “vingt-deux statues de géant” and uses an asterisk to indicate “Québec, un pays de géants” was in French in the ST when it was not. Such shifts in meaning, however, are not the focus of this section.
these two terms are translated into French, as only the word *Québécois* exists for both senses\(^{204}\) and readers have to guess which of the two senses were intended by Richler. And while Poliquin has used asterisks to indicate words or phrases that appeared in French in the source text, he does not ever mark Richler’s use of the word *Québécois* to distinguish it from the sense of *Québécois* that means those who live in Quebec. So Poliquin’s use of Québecois to refer to René Lévesque raises ambiguity about what label Richler was using to refer to the ex-Premier, when Richler himself used the word francophone and no ambiguity existed in the English text. Had Poliquin used *francophone* in his translation, this ambiguity would not have arisen. Moreover, had he added asterisks to mark Richler’s use of *Québécois* in the ST, additional ambiguity would not have arisen in other passages, such as the one that describes Yvon Duchamps [*sic*] as a “Québécois comedian” but Brian Mulroney and Jean Chrétien as “Quebecers” (Richler 1992: 202-203). In the French translation, all three are simply *québécois* (Richler 1992b: 235-236).

The second passage is translation 8, where Poliquin has translated the word “racial” with the word “raciste.” This change is more problematic than the previous one. Here, a word that the OED defines as “of or concerning race” has been translated by a word the *Trésor de la langue française* defines as “qui manifeste du racisme.” Clearly, the French has reframed the narrative in a way that directly accuses Quebec nationalists of being racists instead of accusing them of

---

\(^{204}\) This difficulty has already been pointed out by Peter Feldstein, in his translator’s preface to the English edition of Jocelyn Maclure’s *Récits identitaires: le Québec à l’épreuve du pluralisme* (Trans. Quebec Identity: The Challenge of Pluralism, 2003). There, Feldstein notes that in his English text, he has translated *Québécois* as *Quebecer* when the term “refer[red] simply to the people of Quebec” and as *Québécois* when it more closely matched the second sense of *Québécois*, that of “the French-speaking or francophone Quebecers, formerly called the ‘French-Canadians’ [...] Within the second meaning are often (but not always) included Quebecers from other backgrounds who feel a strong identification with this place; they have adopted French as their habitual language, or have put down roots here, or align themselves with a political agenda for Quebec’s future, or simply feel ‘Québécois,’ whatever it represents for them” (Maclure 2003: xvi). Feldstein then notes that he has vetted with Maclure each instance of *Québécois*/*Quebecer* to ensure he has chosen the right English equivalent.
uttering a chant that refers to race. A nuance of difference, of course, but the fact remains that in the English text, Richler did not explicitly say that the chant *Le Québec aux Québécois!* was racist, while in the French version, he did. Given the controversy surrounding *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*, even a change like this can make French-language readers decide that Richler really was as offensive as many articles in the press asserted.

Finally, a significant change can be found in translation 9, where Poliquin has shifted verb tenses in his translation. In the English passage, the Sûreté du Québec *beat* natives to a pulp, the California police *cracked* open the heads of blacks or Hispanics, and Israeli soldiers *broke* the bones of Palestinian children. All of these verbs are in the past tense, representing violence that has been perpetrated in the past but has not necessarily continued into the present. In Poliquin’s translation, these actions take place in the present: les agents de la Sûreté *sont* violents envers les autochtones, la Police d’État de la Californie *se fait* une spécialité de battre au sang les Noirs ou les hispanophones and les soldats israéliens *rompent* les os des enfants palestiniens. With this change in verb tense, the Sûreté du Québec, along with the state police in California and the soldiers in Israel, is positioned as being violent on an ongoing basis. While this change alone would seem to suggest that Poliquin has again reframed Richler’s narrative in a way that makes him more critical of a Quebec institution than he was, Poliquin has mitigated this shift with his decision to translate *beat natives to a pulp* by *sont violents envers les autochtones*. Richler’s narrative certainly ascribes more violence to the Sûreté du Québec than Poliquin’s. While Richler has specified that the violence perpetrated by the Quebec police force was extensive, since natives were beaten “to a pulp,” Poliquin has chosen a less descriptive equivalent. The phrase “sont violents” does not specify how violent the police force is, and

---

205 This same change appeared in the translation by Lisée but, since the consequences of this change are the same no matter who translated the text, I decided not to analyze the same passage twice. Note, however, that the conclusions drawn with respect to Poliquin’s translation can apply to Lisée’s as well.
certainly does not immediately give the impression that natives have been victims of very extensive violence. Interestingly, Poliquin has retained Richler’s vivid descriptions of violence when they refer to forces outside Canada; the California state police *battent au sang* Blacks and Hispanics, and Israeli soldiers *rompent les os* of Palestinian children. It would seem that in this case, he has reframed Richler in a way that contrasts earlier framings. Instead of developing a narrative that depicts the objects of Richler’s criticisms in much the same way as Richler himself has depicted them—as Poliquin did with the *filles du roi* narrative—or reframing Richler in a way that makes his labels more offensive than they were in the source text—as Poliquin did with the *Le Québec aux Québécois!* narrative—he has reframed Richler so that the French-language narrative is less critical of Quebec than the English.

Because of the differences in the way Poliquin has framed Richler throughout the French translation, it is difficult to say what exactly his framing strategy was when he was translating *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*. However, my interview with Poliquin helps shed light on his intentions.

During the interview, Poliquin discussed his goals for the translation and whether he felt that they had been achieved. Stressing that his “only aim in translating Richler was to give the guy a chance,” Poliquin explained if people would listen to what Richler had to say, they would realize that “it’s no big deal.”

He also stressed that he felt French-speaking Canadians should read the full text rather than just the excerpts, because francophones he spoke with were still citing the misquoted passages from the French-Canadian press. However, Poliquin did note that his own ideologies occasionally played a role in the translation process:

And sometimes, yes, the translator will participate in the ideology. For instance, I

---

206 See Appendix 1 for the full text of this interview.
207 Such as the passage about Quebec women being sows instead of Quebec women being forced to reproduce like sows, which was what Richler actually said.
was teased by a friend about that. There’s a part about Lucien Bouchard, where Richler writes “Lucien Bouchard, the small-town lawyer”—the guy’s from Jonquière—and I translated it as “Lucien Bouchard, l’avocaillon de province.”

Avocat de province is small-town lawyer, avocaillon is small-time lawyer. And then I was quizzed by friends about that and I said, well, I’ll keep it. Because I hate the guy so much. [...] So, I went exactly in line with Richler, but I helped him a bit.

These remarks help explain the different strategies that seem to be at play in translations 1 through 9. Poliquin intended to make Richler available to French-speaking readers so they could judge for themselves whether the criticisms in the French-Canadian press were justified. However, he also supported Richler’s arguments and consciously “helped” him on at least one occasion, so he may have (un)intentionally “helped” Richler in other passages where Richler’s ideologies were closely in line with Poliquin’s own.

These shifts may also be due—at least in part—to two other factors. Poor scholarship on Richler’s part made research difficult: Poliquin stressed in our interview that when his researcher checked Richler’s references, they were often wrong. Moreover, Poliquin had only six weeks to translate Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!, and another three weeks for revisions. As Poliquin noted in our interview:

[The publishers] expected a perfect translation coming out in six weeks, and that’s impossible. Then you will have mistakes like the wampum. But then, look at the

---

208 Note: this passage occurs on page 163 of the English ST and on page 188 of the French TT. The exact passage in English reads as follows: “Mulroney, who had already lifted this small-town lawyer out of obscurity not once, but twice, extended his healing hand yet again” (1992: 163) and the French translation is as follows: “Mulroney, qui avait déjà sorti de l’ombre cet avocaillon de province, non pas une mais deux fois, lui tendit la main de nouveau” (1992b: 188).

209 Here, Poliquin is referring to an earlier comment during our interview, when he mentioned that he had not initially understood the use of the word wampum and had mistranslated it. The publisher corrected this mistake before publication. The word appears on page 204 of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!, where Richler writes: “Then
number of words and the number of mistakes you found, and the average is pretty
good.

So two factors were likely at play in the translations cited earlier. First is Poliquin’s main
strategy: that of making Richler available in French to show francophone readers that Oh
Canada! Oh Quebec! really isn’t as bad as they have been told by editorialists like Lise
Bissonnette. This strategy is evident in passages like number 7 or the filles du roi narrative,
where Poliquin’s translations more accurately reflect the content of Richler’s text than the
translations in L’Actualité or La Presse. Second are passages such as 1 and 8, where Poliquin
has introduced shifts that reframe Richler as more critical of Quebecers than he was in the
source text. These could be intentional shifts to show Poliquin’s support of Richler’s arguments,
or unintentional shifts due to the quick turn around time for the translation and the difficulty in
finding Richler’s original sources.

4.1.6 Conclusions

Framing is an active strategy used by agents like translators, reviewers and publishers to
present narratives in a particular light (Baker 2006: 167). The case of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!
serves as an example of how various agents may reframe a narrative to promote competing
narratives.

The translations of passages from Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! that appeared in the French-
language reviews and editorials show a clear tendency to reposition Richler as more provocative
than he was, and to reframe him for French-speaking readers as someone who has made very
critical observations about Quebec politicians, institutions and inhabitants without making

there was renewed squabbling over what would pass for the local wampum should Quebec separate.”
equally disparaging comments about the rest of Canada. These translations were very influential, as they were used by one Quebec MP to call for the book to be banned.

And here is an interesting point. Since the translations in the French-Canadian press were read months before Poliquin’s translation became available, they may have had more influence on French-speaking Canadians than the “official” translation published by Les Éditions Balzac. Sales of the French edition were low: of the 3000-copy print run, fewer than 1000 were sold (Slopen 1995: H13). Compare these figures to the English edition, which sold 58,000 copies and went into fourth printing one month after it was published by Penguin (Notes to You 1992: D8). Granted, the English edition was intended for both a Canadian and international audience, while the French-language edition was targeted primarily at French-speaking Quebeckers, but it would still seem that sales of the English version were buoyed by the controversy surrounding the book and that since this controversy had died down by the time the French edition was available, few copies were sold. This gave the translations that appeared first—such as those in L’Actualité or La Presse—more influence among francophones. Moreover, many of the French speakers who had objected to Richler’s book had read the English edition, so they may not have needed (or wanted) a translation at all.210

Unlike editorials and reviews with translated passages from Richler’s book, the TT epitexts—namely the blurbs and quotations on the back cover—do not show a conscious effort to promote an adverse reaction to Richler’s work, though they have pointed out that Richler’s text is controversial. The publishers have clearly chosen not to reframe Richler’s narrative in a way that minimizes the offensiveness he may cause French-language readers. The title, instead

---

210 Poliquin commented on this fact during our interview, noting that the publishers gambled on the French TT, hoping that it would sell well, while also wanting to make it available to French-speaking Canadians. He also noted that educated French-speaking readers would likely read the book in English, and that those who were hostile to the book would likely not read it in either English or French, simply from principle.
of being adapted in an attempt to generate more controversy or to frame the narrative as less controversial than when it was first published in English, has been translated literally. The only deliberate attempt to position Richler can be found in the blurbs and citations, which acknowledge that Richler is controversial, since he criticizes (“dénonce”) the absurdity of Quebec’s language laws and mocks (“raille”) politicians involved in the constitutional debate, but which position Richler’s writing as satire, meaning that readers should not be offended by what they read. This is quite different from the framing strategies adopted by press writers such as Jean-François Lisée and Maurice Girard.

The framing strategy most difficult to determine is the one adopted for the French translation published by Les Éditions Balzac. Daniel Poliquin’s use of contradictory repositioning strategies creates an ambiguous frame for Richler’s narrative. Poliquin has not omitted or softened Richler’s comments about the filles du roi, tribalism in Quebec, but he has repositioned Richler in other passages, sometimes making his narrative more critical of Quebec, and sometimes reframing the ST so that it is less critical.

What is interesting about Poliquin’s repositioning of Richler to make his narrative more critical of Quebec is that Poliquin’s motivations differ from those of the journalists who did this too. They both made an effort to slightly increase the way in which the English author criticized Quebec institutions, politicians and historical figures; however, Poliquin did so because he agreed with Richler, while Lisée seemed to do so because he wanted to show how insulting Richler had been and how justified French-speaking Quebecers would be to get insulted. Because Poliquin did stress that he wanted to make a more accurate version of Richler available to French-speaking readers and noted that he approached the translation task “with all the professional attitude that you need to do this,” he probably did not consciously and consistently
introduce shifts of meaning to what was already a fairly provocative text, but the occasional shift is apparent in the translation, even if the reasons for these shifts are not the same as for others who made similar shifts.

The next case study will explore how else narrative frames may be used by agents to reposition a work during a time of political strife, namely around the time of the October Crisis in Canada.

4.2 Nègres blancs d’Amérique : autobiographie précoce d’un “terroriste” québécois

4.2.1 Pierre Vallières

Born in Montreal on February 22, 1938, Pierre Vallières grew up in Longueuil-Annexe, a suburb of Montreal where his family moved in 1945 to get out of the city and own their own property. There, as Vallières writes in Nègres blancs d’Amérique, they lived in very poor conditions: their house—like the others around them—was made of “papier brique,” a sort of tar paper that looked like brick. Although his father made improvements to the house over the years, it initially consisted of just three rooms: one bedroom for his parents and baby brother, another for Vallières and his brother André, and a third room that served as a kitchen, bathroom and living and dining area.

When they first moved to Longueuil-Annexe, Vallières’ mother Madeline sent him to the local school, run by three nuns from Longueuil, and Vallières hated this place. As he explains in Nègres blancs: “Nous étions heureux dans les champs, car là, au moins, nous ne ressentions pas l’humiliation insoutenable d’être vus et enseignés en tant que pauvres et non en tant qu’êtres

---

[211] Longueuil-Annexe eventually became Ville Jacques-Cartier, which in turn eventually became part of Longueuil.
[212] Biographies of Vallières’ early life are invariably based on the version offered by Vallières in Nègres blancs (e.g. Morf 1970, Fournier 1998), and so this section relies heavily on Vallières’ personal narrative of the events in his childhood and early adulthood. Wherever possible, however, analyses from other sources have been added to provide additional perspectives on these events.
humains ‘normaux’” (1969: 137). As this quote illustrates, Vallières seems to have been marked by a feeling that being poor was humiliating and shameful and that other people were looking down on him because of his socioeconomic status. Consider the following examples from *Nègres blancs*, where he repeatedly notes his feelings of humiliation in various situations. The first recurrence is when he attended a school in Longueuil—rather than the local one—for the next three years:

À Longueuil, je me fis quelques amis, mais je me sentais un étranger parmi ces “bien vêtus”, ces “bien peignés”, ces “bien mouchés”. À force de me comparer aux autres, je devenais de plus en plus honteux de moi-même et de mon milieu. J’étais seul, incapable de communiquer ce que je ressentais. Et les bonnes sœurs qui me prenaient en pitié me rendaient l’existence encore plus pénible (1969: 143).

And again as a teenager, when he attended a Franciscan-run high school (Collège classique) by shamming a call to the priesthood so that his tuition could be funded by the Oeuvre des Vocations, Vallières remarks on his humiliation:

Un jour, le recteur me convoqua et me parla de ma “vocation”. Je compris tout de suite que mon intérêt était de jouer le jeu de celui qui hésite...

—Vous savez, me dit le recteur, il faut être franc avec nous. L’Oeuvre des Vocations est pauvre. Nous devons penser d’abord à nos prêtres. Si vous ne vous sentez pas “appelé”, il faut avoir la franchise de me le dire, mon petit. [...] Souvenez-vous toujours, Vallières, continua-t-il, que cet argent n’est pas à vous et que vous devrez le rendre, un jour ou l’autre. C’est l’argent des Vocations.

Il continua de parler pendant une grosse heure, mais je ne l’écoutais pas. J’étais
furieux et humilié. J’aurais voulu pouvoir lui flamber la cervelle et lui crier :


When describing his parents, Vallières notes that theirs was a marriage of his mother’s disenchantment and his father’s timid but tenacious spirit: “J’ignore si ce mariage fut heureux. Mais je ne me souviens pas d’avoir perçu chez mes parents cette joie de vivre que l’on peut constater chez ceux qui connaissent la sécurité, qui ont confiance en eux et qui croient sans difficulté en la vie” (1969: 104).

Vallières’ mother wanted him to study English and math instead of continuing with his classical studies at the collège so that he could get a job and help support the family, but Vallières refused. These arguments took place in early 1953, when Vallières was fifteen years old. His father, however, did not talk to Vallières about his studies, but did occasionally discuss unionization “durant ces rares moments où nous avions l’occasion d’échanger quelques idées” (1969: 181). Vallières describes his father at this time as “de plus en plus désabusé, refus[ant] de prendre parti, laissa[nt] les événements suivre leur cours. Il ne croyait plus à rien ni à personne. Il travaillait. Il n’avait plus d’énergies que pour son travail” (ibid.).

As Morf (1970) notes, this period was marked by Vallières’ rejection of both his parents: his father, “qui employait tous ses loisirs à améliorer la maison, sans que Pierre lui donne un coup de main,” and his mother, whom Vallières resented “pour vouloir qu’il se prépare à un travail utile qui lui permette d’alléger le fardeau des parents” (Morf 1970: 96). This is, in fact, just one example of what Morf describes as “l’évolution et l’aliénation progressive d’un fils
d’ouvrier qui a refusé de s’intégrer à la société existante. Passant de révolte à révolte (ou, pour imiter son style : d’écœurement à écœurement), il a fini par devenir un révolutionnaire professionnel” (1970: 92). The events in the next few years of Vallières’ life attest to this statement, as Vallières left school, left job after job, left Quebec for France, then France for Quebec, and expressed dissatisfaction throughout.

For instance, in the summer of 1954, Vallières got a job at a bank, giving half his salary to his parents. He expected to work there just until school resumed in September, but stayed on until February of 1955, when he grew depressed and sick of his job. He returned to the collège and was able to resume his studies at the point where he would have been had he returned in September like the rest of his classmates. But by December, he stopped pretending to be called to God. According to Vallières, he told the priests at the school the following:

Tous les prêtres seront pour moi des profiteurs et des lâches tant que je ne les verrai pas aider les ouvriers, les cultivateurs et les étudiants du Québec à brûler leurs églises, leurs séminaires, leurs presbytères, leurs Cadillac et le reste ! C'est bien beau, mon petit père, d’être honnête et vertueux dans son cœur, mais ça ne donne pas grand-chose à ceux que le régime opprime chaque jour. Comme tous les hommes, vous avez aussi des bras, servez-vous-en ! (1969: 192-193).

When the priest expressed his astonishment that Vallières, “le mo-dè-le de [sa] classe,” would say such things and then asked what had happened, Vallières apparently replied: “Rien du tout. Ou plutôt si. Il m’est arrivé... d’en avoir assez de jouer la comédie avec vous autres, bande d’idiots !” (1969: 193). Despite his dissatisfaction with the school and its instructors, Vallières did, however, finish his year and take his exams in June.

After leaving the collège, Vallières worked as a clerk at the brokerage house L. G.
Beaubien and Co., but was unhappy with the conditions of employment and soon left. At this time (1956), he met Gaston Miron, and together, they discussed contemporary poetry and decolonization. Miron introduced Vallières to a number of people, including Claude Ryan, whom Vallières describes as “antipathique” (1969: 203), the future founders of the literary review Liberté, and writers like Anne Hébert and Roland Giguère. Vallières also wrote articles for Le Devoir at this time, and credits Miron with being the inspiration behind this writing. Of these articles, however, Vallières has little good to say:


Articles for Le Devoir were not all Vallières wrote at this time. In the late 1950s, he also wrote three novels. The first, Noces obscures, he destroyed in 1958 after it was rejected by Cercle du livre de France because of its immoral ending, the second, Les Démons, he destroyed upon completion, and the third, Les Porteurs d’eau, he burned when it was nearly complete. He wrote articles for Cité libre while working as a sales clerk at a book store, but Pelletier and Trudeau refused to publish his pro-separatist article in their special issue about separatism, which led Vallières to conclude that: “La ‘Cité libre’ pouvait admettre bien des libertés, mais pas la liberté d’être séparatiste” (1969: 245). In 1962, when Vallières was offered a job at La Presse by Pelletier, he refused, and instead became a day labourer at a construction site. But
Vallières soon became disillusioned with this job and by September, he left Canada for France, intending never to return.

In France, Vallières was, for the most part, unhappy, unemployed and broke. He contemplated suicide before deciding to return to Canada. And so, in March 1963, he returned to Quebec several days before the Wolfe Monument in Quebec City was toppled by the FLQ. Vallières explains that this act gave him hope that Quebec was changing. He accepted (“avec joie”) an offer from Gérard Pelletier to work at *La Presse* and felt that journalism helped him to become more political:

Le milieu journalistique m’apprit à mieux connaître la société québécoise.

L’engagement politique, qui fit corps avec mon métier, m’empêcha de me laisser prendre au piège des idéologies confortables, des bonnes places, de l’arrivisme ou de la bonne conscience en pantoufles [*sic*] (1969: 266).

This same year, Vallières also agreed to take over editorship of *Cité Libre*—with some misgivings—though at the time, he says he was not fully aware of the ties between Pelletier and Trudeau and the Liberal Party. After the editorial changes he made—including transforming the journal “en une arme de combat pour les travailleurs québécois” (1969: 292), Vallières was given the choice of making a number of compromises or resigning, which he did in March 1964. When he left, he launched a new periodical, *Révolution québécoise*. In *FLQ: Histoire d’un mouvement clandestin*, Fournier describes this journal as follows:

[...] c’est une revue marxiste plus radicale que *Parti Pris*. Contre la stratégie dite des « deux étapes » (l’indépendance d’abord, le socialisme ensuite), elle affirme que les deux objectifs sont indissociables et que « la sécession en elle-même est une mesure à combattre si elle n’est pas nécessitée par l’établissement au Québec

In June 1965, the police raided Révolution québécoise. Vallières, along with several of his friends, was arrested and interrogated. When he was released, Vallières lost his job at La Presse. At this time, Vallières and his friend Charles Gagnon secretly became members of the FLQ, and the Révolution québécoise team merged with the Parti Pris to form the Mouvement de libération populaire (MLP). As Fournier notes,

Le Manifeste du MLP rompt avec la stratégie défendue jusque-là par le groupe Parti Pris, celle de l’indépendance d’abord et du socialisme ensuite, en deux étapes, ce qui impliquait un appui tactique à la bourgeoisie francophone sur la question de l’indépendance. La libération nationale, affirme-t-on, doit plutôt être réalisée «sous l’impulsion» du mouvement ouvrier. Bref, au slogan Le Québec aux Québécois, on substituait le mot d’ordre Le Québec aux travailleurs. (Fournier 1999: 113).

In his role as a permanent employee of the MLP, Vallières organized actions in support of workers, such as picketing to show solidarity with striking factory workers. During one such protest, Vallières was arrested for disturbing the peace and fined (Fournier 1998: 114). Throughout 1965, Vallières and Gagnon combined their clandestine activities at the FLQ with their public activities at the MLP, but by the end of the year, according to Vallières, “il fallut trancher en faveur de l’action clandestine” (1969: 304-305), a decision facilitated by the fact that the MLP merged with the Parti socialiste du Québec.

One year later, on September 28, 1966, Vallières and Gagnon were arrested in New York
while protesting outside the United Nations “pour attirer l’attention de l’opinion mondiale sur la lutte de libération qui se développe au Québec et sur le sort réservé aux prisonniers politiques québécois, membres du F.L.Q.” (1969: 374). During his time in prison in the United States, Vallières wrote *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*, which he finished a few days before he and Gagnon were deported (“illégalement,” notes Vallières) to Montreal on January 13, 1967. Once there, Vallières awaited trial for more than a year; on April 5th, 1968, Vallières was sentenced to life imprisonment for involuntary manslaughter in the death of Thérèse Morin (cf. Section 1.1.1.1). Vallières notes that during his trial, “il fut très peu question de l’accusation de meurtre levée contre moi. On ne fit pas le procès d’un présumé assassin, mais celui du Front de libération du Québec et de la révolution québécoise en général” (1968: 375). Vallières represented himself at the trial, although he had two legal advisors: Robert Lemieux and Bernard S. Mergler, who supported him but were not allowed to speak in court. He was found guilty of manslaughter in a second trial and sentenced to twenty months in prison. Released on June 24, 1971, after the October Crisis had come to an end, he was still to appear in court on lesser charges.

Before the Crisis, Vallières was a proponent of revolutionary violence. In an interview with journalist Nicholas Regush in the early 1970s, for instance, he said:213

[...] violence is not something parachuted from the sky, but it is something which is continuously present... In this context, the violence of the masses is a response of resistance to oppressive violence. In order to realize a society without violence we need, paradoxically, violence. And violence was not invented by revolutionaries; all systems exploiting the masses do so through violence in all aspects of life. And the violence from the masses is an exasperation, and it

---

213 The text of the interview was published in English, and Regush did not appear to indicate whether the interview had been translated from French or conducted in English.
becomes political when the masses become conscious that they must use this force
— their force of resistance—to change the existing system and to build a new
world (Regush 1973: 19).

But after he was released from prison, his views changed. In a letter to Le Devoir on
December 13, 1971, Vallières publicly broke away from the FLQ and instead endorsed the Parti
Québécois. He later explained why the Left should support the PQ, and expressed his arguments
in L’urgence de choisir, which was published by Parti Pris in 1972 (cf. Fournier 1998: 428).
And he further distanced himself from the FLQ when he published L’exécution de Pierre
Laporte : Les dessous de l’opération essai in 1977. In it, he argued not only that the government
took advantage of Laporte’s death to implement the War Measures Act and completely eliminate
the “separatist threat” (1977: 154), but also that it orchestrated the death to turn public opinion
against the movement and return Quebecers to the status quo (1977: 155).  

Not long after the PQ won the 1976 election in Quebec, however, Vallières denounced
the party. In an article published in the Toronto Star in November 1977, Vallières asserted that
“English Canada is very wrong to fear Lévesque’s troops. They have no strategy and the only
question asked is how to conserve power.” He concluded his article by arguing that: “The
independence of Canada is only a myth. The independence of Quebec is a dream which the PQ
is in the process of destroying” (Vallières 1977: A6).

In the 1980s, Vallières helped edit the Catholic Left publication Vie Ouvrière (Reid
1995: 19). He had turned to religion, after rejecting the church early in his life. In 1983, he

---

214 Jacques Rose later denounced Vallières, accusing the man he “once greatly respected” of making up theories to
sell his book. According to Rose, “... it was us, the FLQ. We did it [assassinate Pierre Laporte]. We said it in
court and we were proud to say it. It wasn’t anybody else. It was us period.” (Globe and Mail 1980: 9). Francis
Simard, in Pour en finir avec octobre, also objects to Vallières’ work, stating that “[...] il y a les idioties,
carrément malhonnêtes, du genre L’exécution de Pierre Laporte de Pierre Vallières” (1982: 191). Like Rose,
Simard shares responsibility for Laporte’s death: “La décision que nous avons prise, c’est que nous l’avons tué.
Ce n’est pas du tout un accident. Ça n’a rien à voir avec ce qu’on a raconté... Ça s’est fait très vite. Ça se fait
founded a community called *La Pierre vivante*, which was comprised of singles, families and priests or nuns “dont le projet s’articule autour de la nonviolence vécue dans une atmosphère chrétienne et franciscaine” (Marsolais 2002: B4). Before his death at the age of 60, Vallières was active in support of various causes, including gay rights and mental-health issues. In the early 1990s, he founded the Quebec-Bosnia solidarity committee when the war broke out, spending three months in Sarajevo in 1995 helping the relief effort (Gatehouse 1998: A6). Vallières suffered a heart attack in 1997, and another in December 1998, which led to his death one week later.

After his death, the public narratives about Vallières circulating in the press positioned him in various ways. *La Presse* labelled him an “ex-journaliste, militant et écrivain bien connu” (Vennat 1998: A8), *Le Soleil* “l’éternel défenseur d’un certain idéal de la liberté” (Presse canadienne 1998: A2), *Le Devoir* an “indépendantiste de la première heure” and “l’écrivain, le journaliste et le militant indépendantiste” (Myles 1998: A6), the *Globe and Mail* “a writer and former leader of the terrorist Front de Libération du Québec” and “political activist” (Downey 1998: A8) and *National Post* “an FLQ leader whose jailhouse manifesto became a rallying cry for the fledgling Quebec separatist movement in the late 1960s” (Gatehouse 1998: A6). The narratives about Vallières after his death differ in the importance they place on his membership in the FLQ: while this was an important element of his life in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it was evidently deemed less important by the time of his death, as *Le Devoir* does not mention his membership in the association until the third paragraph of the obituary (and even here notes only that Vallières was “pionnier du Front de libération du Québec” with Charles Gagnon and later that he was “membre du FLQ” (Myles 1998: A6) rather than the leader).\textsuperscript{215} Likewise, *La

\textsuperscript{215} A second obituary in *Le Devoir* does not mention the FLQ until the sixth paragraph, and like the obituary by Myles, notes that Vallières was a member of the organization rather than the “leader” he is said to be in the *Globe and Mail* (Dion 1998: A1).
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*Presse* notes in the fifth paragraph that “avec Charles Gagnon, [Vallières] forme une cellule du Front de libération du Québec” (Vennat 1998: A8). Only *Le Soleil*, of the French-language obituaries, describes Vallières as the “ancien leader du FLQ,” in a caption under his photo (Presse canadienne 1998: A2). So evidently, then narratives about Vallières, and the labels used to describe him are not consistent across Canada, within linguistic groups, or even during the same time periods. One similarity, however, is that the publication of *Nègres blancs* is a significant event in the life of Vallières: except for *Le Soleil*, all five newspapers mention the book in their obituaries, as did the *Toronto Star*.

4.2.2 Vallières’ Narrative

*Nègres blancs d’Amérique* was written between October 1966 and February 1967 at the Manhattan House of Detention for Men in New York, where Vallières was in prison awaiting extradition to Canada. The book was first published in 1968 by *Parti Pris*. A revised version was published in 1969, again by *Parti Pris*, but the 1979 and 1994 editions were published by Québec-Amérique and Typo respectively.\(^{216}\)

The book has a two-fold purpose: it is both a political treatise with a history of Quebec, and an autobiography narrating the first thirty years of Vallières’ life and justifying his reasons for wanting to overthrow the bourgeois class.

Section 4.2.1 has already cited a number of passages from *Nègres blancs* about Vallières’ childhood and early adulthood, so these passages will not be discussed again here. Instead,

\(^{216}\) Note: the 1979 edition may not have been published by Québec/Amérique. The edition I was able to obtain from the University of Ottawa library has a label with the Parti Pris logo stuck over the “Québec/Amérique” name on the front cover. However, the Library and Archives Catalogue, which lists Parti Pris as the publisher, has the following note: “L’adresse bibliographique recouverte d’une étiquette: Montréal : Québec/Amérique.” So, while Québec/Amérique may not have been the sole publisher of the 1979 edition of *Nègres blancs*, they were clearly associated with it in some respect, and for the purposes of this thesis, Québec/Amérique will be considered the 1979 publisher.
greater focus will be placed on Vallières’ feelings about workers, unions and socialism. The 1969 revised edition of *Nègres blancs* has been used as the basis for this chapter. This is because the 1971 English translation is based on this edition rather than the original 1968 version.217

The book opens with a seventy-five page first chapter bearing the same title as the book. This introductory section comprises almost a quarter of the 400 pages in the 1969 edition. It establishes the historical background in which the remaining autobiographical chapters should be understood. Vallières begins by explaining what he means by the word *nègre*:


But, Vallières notes, French-speaking Quebecers are a different sort of “nègres blancs” than the poor, white Americans he describes in the above paragraph:

La lutte de libération entreprise par les Noirs américains n’en suscite pas moins un intérêt croissant parmi la population canadienne-française, car les travailleurs du

---

217 During our interview, when I asked Joan Pinkham which version of *Nègres blancs* her translation was based on, she confirmed that the 1968 edition was not the source for her translation. She noted that Monthly Review Press had considered cutting certain sections, which its Reader’s Report had described as ‘tedious,’ ‘wandering,’ ‘repetitious,’ and ‘unreadable.’ Pinkham elaborated: “I agreed. But it emerges from the correspondence that the cuts—about 165 pages’ worth—were made a couple of months later, by the author himself, not at MR’s request but at the request of the publisher of a French edition in Paris (Maspero). Apparently Vallières suggested (or agreed) that we should use these same cuts for the English. Early in January of 1969 Parti Pris sent us another copy of the 1968 edition modified in the author’s own hand. That amended version became my “source text,” and I think it is identical to the one that appeared later in 1969 as Parti Pris’s ‘nouvelle édition revue et corrigée.’”

After this introduction to the idea of French-Canadians—and indeed all poor, working-class whites—as the nègres blancs d’Amérique,218 Vallières then narrates the history of Quebec, beginning with the colonization of New France. Life is hard for these colonists:

Les “engagés”, démunis, décus, prisonniers de leur pauvreté, se résignèrent à défricher un sol ingrat sur les seigneuries concédées par le roi de France ; ils durent se faire chasseurs, pêcheurs, trappeurs et bûcherons pour être en mesure de nourrir leurs nombreux enfants (1969: 29-30).

Throughout this narrative, Vallières highlights ways in which French-Canadian workers have been disadvantaged by the bourgeois class:


---

218 Vallières acknowledges later that “si les Québécois peuvent être appelés, sans exagération, des nègres blancs, ils ne sont pourtant pas les seuls Blancs d’Amérique à ‘mériter’ ce titre d’esclaves” (1969: 63). He also includes immigrants who came to the United States in the 18th and 19th centuries and who continue to be day labourers for the “‘premiers Blancs’, ces entrepreneurs de la race anglaise supérieure qui, depuis les Washington, les Jefferson et les Franklin, se sont toujours considérés comme les seuls propriétaires de l’Amérique du nord” (1969: 64).
C’est alors que l’instinct de conservation inspira au clergé et à la petite bourgeoisie l’idéologie du “retour à la terre” et de la “colonisation” des vastes régions inexploitées du Québec. Cette trouvaille inattendue fut accueillie favorablement par les Anglo-canadiens et la bourgeoisie canadienne-française des villes qui y virent le moyen le plus pratique et le plus économique de régler le problème du chômage urbain provoqué par l’exode rural. Les milieux d’affaires et le gouvernement s’empressèrent de financer les projets de colonisation et toute une littérature commença à circuler, invitant les Canadiens français à se souvenir de leur passé “glorieux”, falsifiant délibérément l’histoire afin d’idéaliser la vie des Habitants sous le régime français [...] (1969: 36-37)

La Confédération canadienne n’a été rien de plus qu’une vaste transaction financière opérée par la bourgeoisie sur le dos des travailleurs du pays, et plus particulièrement des travailleurs du Québec (1969: 38).

These examples of exploitation of the working class, the unemployed and the poor then serve as support for Vallières’s arguments that Quebec workers need to unite and that the bourgeois classes should worry about revolution:

Après trois siècles de muette et inutile soumission de tout un peuple à vos intérêts d’exploiteurs, la vérité, enfin, jette une lumière crue sur toutes choses, et il ne faudra pas vous attendre à ce que la révolte populaire en gestation se préoccupe, messieurs les bourgeois et messieurs les évêques, de ce qu’il adviendra de vos privilèges et de vos respectables personnes, lorsqu’elle éclatera, impitoyable et

He explores how the disadvantaged workers can overcome the powerful bourgeois class, given that they lack the resources that the more advantaged classes possess. He argues in favour of creating conditions in which people are equal in fact rather than just in law.

This emphasis on worker unionization and equality of the people surfaces later in the autobiographical chapters. For instance, when narrating the events of his childhood, Vallières notes that while his father might have tried to organize a union or engage in politics, his mother always prevented him from doing so:

Ma mère souffrait de son insécurité et ne voulait pas qu’une insécurité encore plus grande vienne aggraver sa souffrance... Mon père (qui lui aussi en souffrait chaque jour) aurait préféré s’engager à combattre cette insécurité, au lieu de la subir. Il savait que c’était un problème social, collectif, qui réclamait un engagement social et politique. Mais ma mère n’y voyait qu’un problème individuel ou, tout au plus, familial. [...] Mon père lisait les journaux et tout ce qu’ils racontaient l’intéressait. Mais jamais ma mère ne lui aurait “permis” de faire de la politique ou de s’occuper d’affaires sociales (1969: 106).

Throughout his narrative, Vallières expresses the most sympathy for his father. With his mother he seems only to argue:

L’auteur de ce petit livre est un idéaliste qui a appris de son père, dès son enfance, à souhaiter un monde meilleur où les hommes qui travaillent anonymement au jour le jour, les cultivateurs, les ouvriers, les journaliers comme mon père, pourraient jouir de la vie, après avoir si durement peiné pour subsister, pour
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durer... et pour perpétuer l’espèce (1969: 80).

Je regrette seulement d’avoir compris un tas de choses si tardivement, d’avoir été un adolescent cruel et de n’avoir, entre autres, découvert la bonté mêlée de détresse de mon père que le jour où il ne fut plus bon qu’à mourir, à 53 ans, d’un cancer généralisé (quelle atrocité !) après vingt ans de “loyaux services” aux usines Angus du C.P.R. ! (1969: 114).


Sentiments such as these help explain one of the main themes of Vallières’ narrative: revolution and a quest for human rights. Interspersed throughout the autobiographic events are Vallières’ reflections on Marxism, socialism and the need to revolt. He expresses his frustration with his friends and acquaintances who don’t understand the need for a revolution:

C’est ce qu’aujourd’hui je reproche à [mon ami] Maurice (et à plusieurs de ses amis) : de n’avoir pas voulu comprendre et de ne pas vouloir comprendre encore maintenant que les droits les plus élémentaires des hommes exigent une révolution globale, non pas dans les esprits, dans la “mentalité” des gens, mais
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dans les rapports sociaux, dans les rapports de production, sur lesquels se fonde,
se construit et se développe toute “mentalité” (1969: 213).

Near the end of the autobiographic narrative, Vallières discusses the FLQ, explaining the
group’s ideologies and goals. He uses “nous” when referring to the members, clearly
demonstrating that he considers himself a member of this group and shares in its aims:

Ce qui précède manifeste déjà clairement que notre idéal de société n’a rien à voir
avec les “programmes” électoraux des partis traditionnels. Notre programme n’est
ni plus ni moins qu’une transformation complète de la société et des hommes qui

After this chapter, the 1968 and 1969 French editions of Nègres blancs differ. The first
edition contains an additional chapter entitled “L’action révolutionnaire,” along with an
epilogue and a number of appendices, while the 1969 edition does not have the “Action
révolutionnaire” chapter but does include a new one entitled “Après le procès,” where Vallières
talks about his 1968 trial. Also included is an expanded epilogue. In it, Vallières encourages
readers to begin the revolution and is optimistic about its outcome:

La lutte sera longue et pénible, mais elle sera. J’en suis persuadé. Nous n’avons
pas fini de souffrir, d’être matraqués, d’aller en prison... mais nous vaincrons, car
nous sommes les plus forts. Nous paierons cher notre lutte, mais elle nous
obtiendra une société meilleure, qui sera enfin la nôtre. [...] C’est parce que je ne
puis supporter d’être un nègre que j’ai adhéré au F.L.Q ; que j’y demeurerai
jusqu’à la victoire des nègres blancs du Québec sur le capitalisme et
l’impérialisme ; que j’y demeurerai debout à l’intérieur ou à l’extérieur des
prisons de l’Ordre établi ; que j’y témoignerai, par tous les moyens possibles, de
notre volonté à tous de nous libérer de notre condition de nègres.
J’ai suffisamment confiance en vous, en nous pour ne pas avoir peur de l’avenir.
La révolution québécoise ne s’arrêtera pas... [...] nous avons déjà perdu trop de

And in this way, the “autobiographie précoce d’un ‘terroriste’ québécois” is sandwiched
between a polemical, political and historical activist text that narrates Vallières’ version of
Quebec history, expounds Vallières’s views on politics and calls readers to action. The
autobiography justifies the need for revolution: Vallières’s childhood can easily represent that of
all “nègres blancs” in Quebec, and the conditions in which he grew up can stand for those of all
French-speaking working-class Quebecers, who need to act against such conditions so that
workers in Quebec can have a better future.

4.2.3 Joan Pinkham\(^{219}\)

Unlike the majority of the delimited catalogue target texts, Nègres blancs d’Amérique
was not translated by a Canadian, nor was the English edition initially published by a Canadian
publisher. Joan Pinkham, who translated Vallières’ book in 1971, is an American who now lives
in Massachusetts but grew up in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., where her father was a
government official. Her mother, Anne Terry White, authored more than two dozen books for
children, including non-fiction works and adaptations of folk or other tales.\(^{220}\) After obtaining an

\(^{219}\) Because no biographic information about Joan Pinkham was available online or in any of the other translations
she has published, all biographic details in this section come from my interview with Joan Pinkham in the
summer of 2008. The full text of this interview, including excerpts from Pinkham’s résumé, is included
Appendix 2 at the end of this thesis.

\(^{220}\) Among her non-fiction works are North to Liberty: The story of the Underground Railroad. (Champaign, Ill.:
1970) and several books in the All About series for Random House (e.g. All About The Stars, All About
Mountains and Mountaineering). She also adapted fables and tales for children, publishing for instance,
MA in French from Middlebury College and spending a year in France at Université de Paris—Sorbonne on a Fulbright scholarship, Pinkham worked as a bilingual secretary at the United Nations for ten years.

Following her career at the United Nations, Pinkham began translating magazine articles for the independent socialist magazine *Monthly Review* and was then asked to translate three works for Monthly Review Press, the publishing house associated with the magazine: French philosopher and former Communist Party member Paul Nizan’s *Aden, Arabie* (1968), Pierre Vallières’ *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* (*White Niggers of America*, 1971) and Aimé Césaire’s *Discours sur le colonialisme* (*Discourse on Colonialism*, 1972). These were followed by a number of other translation projects in the late 1970s and early 1990s, which Pinkham solicited herself after Monthly Review Press had no more work to offer her. Among her translations are five works by Russian-French novelist and biographer Henri Troyat, including biographies of *Peter the Great*, *Catherine the Great* and *Flaubert*, one work by Pierre Goldman, *Dim Memories of a Polish Jew born in France*, and Lucien Israël’s *Conquering Cancer*. Goldman’s work is the autobiography of a revolutionary and activist. Goldman wrote the book from prison, where he was serving a life sentence for a murder he said he did not commit (he was later acquitted).

While Pinkham states that she never actively chose her projects, “except in the sense that [she] could have rejected them when offered,” she notes that she was “happy and proud” to undertake the translations offered to her by Monthly Review Press and feels “this work constituted [her] small contribution to the propagation of ideas that [she] believed in.” When asked what reasons in particular drew her to Vallières and to *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*, she responded that she accepted largely due to her esteem for the editors at the magazine. She

*Odysseus Comes Home from the Sea and Of Beasts, Birds and Men: Fables from Three Lands.*
explains:

[...] my admiration and affection for the editors [at Monthly Review and Monthly Review Press], and for the circle of friends who were more or less associated with them, was the basic reason for my eager acceptance of the translation. Then, when I read the book, I was delighted with the author. I particularly liked the early autobiographical chapters. I do remember thinking that a large portion of the book—a section on politics and philosophy—was tedious, heavy-handed, and ill-fitting; fortunately, Vallières himself suggested that it be omitted in the English version.

So, while Pinkham did not specifically choose Nègres blancs as a translation project and was rather offered the work through the editors at Monthly Review Press, she did agree to translate the book because she believed in Vallières’ ideas. And, being an American who was not directly affected by the October Crisis and the Canadian government’s official banning of membership in or association with the FLQ, Pinkham acknowledges that the political atmosphere in Canada at the time:

[...] scarcely affected my decision, because I knew nothing much about it. (Of course, I was well aware of the repressive atmosphere in my own country.) I learned of [Pierre Vallières]’s hunger strike, arrest, and trial [...] only from the book itself. His courage and commitment were evident from the rest, and in any event, I would have wanted to be his English voice.

Thus, very different events framed the translations of Nègres blancs and Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!. In this case, the translator learned of the political events shaping Vallières’ narrative only through the narrative itself, while in Poliquin’s case, he was already aware of the
controversy circulating in the press and of course was well aware of Quebec sign laws, nationalism and the sovereignty movement.

Some similarities between the translators’ expectations of the source texts do exist though. Poliquin initially disliked Richler’s article in the New Yorker, but decided to read the book after the translation project was proposed to him, found that it was really not the terrible book it had been made out to be in the press, and then concluded “after my own misgivings, my own knee-jerk reaction flew by, [...] that yes, [Richler] deserves to be heard and to be read.” This is not unlike Pinkham, who initially knew little about Pierre Vallières or Nègres blancs, but who, after reading the work, was “delighted.” Moreover, since she undertook jobs for this publishing house because she felt that these translations were her “small contribution to the propagation of ideas that [she] believed in,” Pinkham, like Poliquin, wanted to help make Vallières accessible to English-speaking readers and to make his narrative known to a wider audience because she felt an affinity with his ideas. In both cases, then, the translators played an active role in disseminating a narrative with which they were in agreement and which they felt deserved to be read by the TL audience. What differentiates the two, however, are the target audiences: while Poliquin translated Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! for the French-speaking Canadians (i.e. Quebecers) criticized by Richler, Pinkham translated Nègres blancs not for the English-speaking Canadians criticized by Vallières, but for English-speaking Americans. This difference is important when considering how the two TTs were reframed. It will be discussed further in a moment.

4.2.4 Malcolm Reid

Because Joan Pinkham is an American, she was initially hesitant about translating a
work by a Canadian author, and so she requested that the American publishers provide a Canadian consultant for her to work with. They agreed, and throughout her translation, she corresponded with Malcolm Reid, a bilingual Canadian living in Quebec.

Born in 1941, Malcolm Reid has worked as a journalist, writing for the Globe and Mail in the early 1970s and the Montreal office of the Canadian Press. In the early to mid-1990s he wrote a column entitled Quebec Sketchbooks for Canadian Dimension, covering such topics as the sentiments of Quebecers toward Americans, pluralism in Quebec society and the 1995 referendum. He has also published a young adult novel entitled Salut Gadou! (Toronto: Lorimer, 1982), which is set in Quebec City and tells the story of a group of children who fight for the clubhouse they are about to lose. In addition, Reid has done some work as a translator: the Library and Archives Canada catalogue credits him with a comic book translation from French to English, circa 1984. But Reid’s publication most relevant to this thesis is The Shouting Signpainters: A Literary and Political Account of Quebec Revolutionary Nationalism, which, like White Niggers, was published in New York by Monthly Review Press, and in Toronto by McClelland & Stewart. The two books are, in fact, just one year apart: The Shouting Signpainters was published in 1972, one year after the Nègres blancs translation appeared in English. Reid’s book presents Quebec’s intellectual left to English-speaking readers.

According to Sherry Simon, who studies The Shouting Signpainters in her book Translating Montreal:

---

221 This book is one of the 265 English-language works in the delimited catalogue, but because it had not been translated into French by November 2008, when this thesis was submitted, it has not been discussed elsewhere in this thesis. Simon does note, however, that “renewed interest in Reid’s special angle on Montreal’s angry years has led to plans for a new publication of the book in French translation” (Simon 2006: 30). During my correspondence with Malcolm Reid, he confirmed that The Shouting Signpainters would indeed be translated into French and published by the Presses de l’Université Laval (See Appendix 3). Indeed, in early 2009, Notre parti est pris : un jeune reporter chez les écrivains révolutionnaires du québec, 1963-1970 became available. This would have been an interesting case to study, as it is one of the few works to appear in translation decades after the source text.
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[...] it is Reid’s version of [Montreal] that has left a lasting imprint. Though the journal Parti pris was relatively short-lived, the cultural moment it encapsulated persists in the imagination of the city. This was the moment of encounter between language and the nationalist spirit. The conjunction captured the enthusiasm of many groups, and Reid’s admiration for writers and thinkers of this movement echoes that of a significant minority of progressive anglophones. They were eager to cross over into a territory where literature and liberation were conjugated in unison. As a translator and cultural reporter, Reid opened the new Quebec to English Canada. He made French Quebec suddenly and thrillingly modern (2006: 31).

The Shouting Signpainters explores joual in Montreal, the FLQ, Parti pris and the left in 1960s Quebec. Reid devotes an entire chapter to the review Parti pris, translating excerpts from various issues and commenting on the writers. In this book, Reid notes that he was a member of the Parti socialiste du Québec (1972: 27) and that he attended meetings of the Mouvement de Libération Populaire (1972: 288). He discusses Pierre Vallières, his trial, and writings, particularly Nègres blancs d’Amérique:

The book is unliterary, unembellished, unsubtle, uncouth—but not illiterate, and it is full of a kind of savage readability, true with the pathetic truthfulness of the man who across the tavern table sobs out the story of his life and rants his what-is-to-be-done. It will, I am sure, be read for many years, and it will, I am sure, be a part of the political education of many a cassé, many a barbare, many a cabochon (1972: 281).

In 1995, three years before Pierre Vallières’ death, Reid published an article about
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Vallières in Canadian Dimension (Reid 1995: 14-20). In it, he notes that he attended the trial of Vallières and Gagnon when they represented themselves on the charge of murder in connection with the death of Thérèse Morin.


When asked how he came to be the Canadian advisor for the Nègres blancs translation, Reid replied that because he was preparing to publish The Shouting Signpainters with Monthly Review Press, the publishers “were able to say to Joan: ‘We have your consultant for you.’” He states that it was simply because the publisher asked him that he helped Pinkham with her translation. However, he is reluctant to accept too much credit for the translation, noting that: “The translation was Joan’s, the judgement at work was hers. My contribution was modest. But perhaps it was reassuring for her to have me there to ask things of.”

His role as a consultant consisted for the most part in answering her questions, which were largely about Canadian history and “the feelings of French-English relations in Canada. What I thought gnawed at each group’s soul” (personal correspondence, August 5th, 2008, original emphasis). Finally, Reid notes that he felt that the importance of translating Nègres blancs into English lay in making the text available to the English-Canadian left, “which [he]

---

222 On August 16th, 2008, Joan Pinkham wrote to me about Malcolm Reid's responses, as he had forwarded her a copy of his letter. She noted that Malcolm Reid deserves more credit for his collaboration than he gives himself here. According to Pinkham:

I must repeat, though, that his contribution to the trans. was crucial. He is modest and has anyway forgotten. I have just been reviewing some of our correspondence: the xeroxed ms. pages I sent him, typewritten queries from me relating to almost every page, handwritten responses in red from him explaining an allusion, approving or altering an interpretation, selecting one E version over a proposed alternative.

Yes, as Malcolm says, the trans. was mine and the ‘judgement at work’ was mine. But it is thanks to him that I felt absolutely confident of my work when I submitted it to MR. And it is surely thanks to him (see Harry Braverman's letter to New Canada) that Laurier LaPierre approved the trans. by a U.S. translator.
hoped would draw inspiration from Quebec culture. Would get in on the fun. Also, it was to put Quebec on the world map of lefts. Every culture has its own style of rebellion, [...] its own style of yearning for social justice” (personal correspondence, August 5th 2008). In this way, Reid’s motivations for the translation were not that different from Pinkham’s, although she was not specifically targeting the English-Canadian left—or an English-Canadian audience in general—as Section 4.2.6 will show. Nor are Reid’s goals dissimilar from those of Monthly Review Press. They do, however, seem to differ from those of McClelland & Stewart, as Sections 4.2.5.2 and 4.2.6 will demonstrate. This idea will be further discussed in the conclusions to Part 4.

4.2.5 Political views of the publishing houses

4.2.5.1 Parti pris

Parti pris was the publishing house associated with the review Parti pris (cf. Section 1.1.1). The magazine itself was founded by André Major, Paul Chamberland, Pierre Maheu, Jean-Marc Piotte and André Brochu, who were activists and revolutionaries in support of a socialist, independent Quebec. Pierre Vallières was closely associated with Parti Pris, given that the team from his review, R évolution québécoise merged with the Parti Pris to form the Mouvement de libération populaire in 1965. While the magazine itself appeared from October 1963 to summer 1968, the publishing house continued for longer: the National Library and Archives Catalogue lists several works published by Parti pris in 1984, but nothing after that.223 Although Éditions parti pris published a number of essays, including Pierre Maheu’s Un Parti pris révolutionnaire (1983), Marcel Rioux’s La question du Québec (1980), Henri Gagnon’s La

Confédération : y’a rien là (1977) and Pierre Vadeboncoeur’s Indépendances (1972), they also published novels, poetry and short stories such as Jacques Brault’s La Poésie ce matin (1972) and Jacques Ferron’s La Nuit (1965, 1971). In addition, they published some translated works, among which are Poésies complètes de Mao Tse-tsong (1971) and Che Guevara’s Journal de Bolivie (7 nov. 1966-7 oct. 1967) (1968).

In The Shouting Signpainters, Malcolm Reid notes the following about Parti pris and the publishing house:

No longer the dreams of slipping out from under the oppression through Good French, acceptance in Paris, English liberal-mindedness: the partipristes would found their own publishing house, in Montreal, to publish books that might be in bad French if it was that kind of French that existed in Montreal, but that would consciously take their place in the revolution, that would take on the whole descriptive and transforming task of nailing down the old order and clearly stating the new. No longer the aestheticist’s limiting of oneself to words on paper, to oblique hints of revolt against oppression. If heavier weapons were needed to accomplish the revolution, the partipristes would try to forge them: they would found a political movement, with office, mimeograph, paintbrushes, dues to pay bail if need be; they would take their message to trade unionists and street gangs, they would take their verses into the streets, paint them on walls, shout them to crowds, melt them down in the furnace of action until they were arms for the oppressed in their war with the oppressors. Writers had not been heard announcing such a program of intent in Quebec before (1972: 35).

Clearly, Éditions parti pris shared similar goals with Pierre Vallières. The publisher did
not hesitate to show its support for Vallières or his narrative when they published the first edition in 1968: this version included a number of appendices, including a telegram of solidarity received by Vallières and Gagnon from Stokeley Carmichael, former president of the Student’s Non Violent Coordinating Committee [sic] (S.N.C.C.), “qui est l’un des organismes principaux du ‘Black Power’ américain” (535), and a message from the “Comité d’aide au groupe ‘Vallières-Gagnon’” asking for donations for their campaign. Many of these appendices, particularly the request for funds for the Comité d’aide au groupe ‘Vallières-Gagnon’ show Parti Pris’ support for the author (since the group was fundraising on his behalf).

4.2.5.2 Québec/Amérique

The Québec/Amérique website does not specify that this publisher has a particular political stance to support, nor is its catalogue limited to essays. The company’s publications include children’s and adult literature, essays, biographies and reference works such as specialized and general dictionaries and encyclopedia (e.g. Le Dictionnaire visuel, Le Petit Druide des synonymes et des antonymes) and cook books. Because they do not seem to have a clearly defined mandate, it will have to be assumed, for the purposes of this thesis, that Nègres blancs was not published by Québec/Amérique because it fit in with a particular series (given that no series is indicated on the cover) nor because it closely matched an ideology the publisher wanted to support. However, the Québec/Amérique edition of Nègres blancs was released in 1979, and the publication date does seem to point to a temporal framing strategy on the part of the publishers: this edition was released one year before the 1980 referendum on sovereignty-association. The timing was likely chosen to improve sales of the book, as the upcoming referendum would likely reignite interest in Vallières.
The blurb on the back cover shows that such a positioning strategy was likely in the minds of the publishers when they targeted the book at readers. On the back cover are excerpts from the 1979 preface, but above these excerpts is the following sentence, in bold: “Voici la réédition tant attendue—augmentée d’une préface inédite de l’auteur—d’un ouvrage qui demeurera un événement capital dans l’histoire politique et culturelle du Québec.” This shows that the publishers intended to reframe Nègres blancs as a key Quebec political text from a important period in Quebec’s history, making Vallières a figure who is an important part of Quebec’s history and whose work needs to be read as a “classic.”

4.2.5.3 Typo

Typo was founded in 1984 by François Hébert, Alain Horic and Gaston Miron, with the goal of ensuring that “œuvres marquantes du fonds littéraire” were distributed and continued to last. According to the Typo website, the goal of the publishing house when reprinting new editions of older works is to allow the author to rework his or her text so that readers can be offered a “definitive” edition. The final statement about the company’s history is important to this thesis:

[...] la maison compte plus de 160 titres à son catalogue, dont une bonne proportion des œuvres les plus importantes publiées au Québec depuis 50 ans, des classiques aux œuvres plus contemporaines. Théâtre, poésie, essai et ouvrages de référence se retrouvent dans son riche catalogue qui s’adresse surtout au milieu

[sic] scolaire (Typo 2008, emphasis added).

224 Gaston Miron, as noted earlier, is the poet whom Vallières befriended in the mid-1950s and whom Vallières describes as “le père spirituel (malgré son jeune âge) du F.L.Q., de Parti Pris, de Révolution québécoise, de Liberté et de bien d’autres mouvements politiques ou littéraires” (1969: 205).

225 These details can be found on the Typo FAQ webpage, available at: http://www.edtypo.com/faq.aspx
When *Nègres blancs* was republished by Typo in 1994, it was repositioned in a way that was consistent with the company’s strategy of publishing important works targeted at an academic market. The back cover contains several quotations from Quebec writers and academics that position *Nègres blancs* as revolutionary, extraordinary, and a key work on the revolutionary turmoil in Quebec in the 1960s. For instance, a 1969 quote from journalist and novelist Victor-Lévy Beaulieu notes that “C’est le livre le plus important publié au Québec depuis la Révolution tranquille,” while a 1985 citation from academic Robert Major asserts that “[...] la lecture de cette autobiographie est la meilleure introduction possible à l’ensemble de la production littéraire des années soixante [...] Un livre capital, le testament politique et spirituel d’une génération.” Typo clearly chose quotations that would frame *Nègres blancs* as an important, key revolutionary work of the late 1960s, consistent with its goals to publish the “most important” works that have appeared in Quebec in the past 50 years.

4.2.5.4 Monthly Review Press

The first English translation of *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* was published by New York-based Monthly Review Press, an independent socialist publishing house. While this would seem to make *White Niggers of America* ineligible for inclusion in the delimited catalogue, the translation was republished in Canada—virtually unaltered—by McClelland and Stewart in 1971, the same year it was released by Monthly Review Press.

*Monthly Review* is a monthly socialist magazine that was first published in May 1949 by Marxist economist Paul Sweezy and writer and teacher Leo Huberman, with whom Joan Pinkham was friends. The Monthly Review website notes that:

From the first[.] *Monthly Review* spoke for socialism and against U.S. imperialism,
and is still doing so today. From the first[,] *Monthly Review* was independent of any political organization, and is still so today. [...] A generation of activists received no small part of their education as subscribers to the magazine and readers of *Monthly Review* Press books. In the intervening years of counter-revolution, *Monthly Review* has kept a steady viewpoint. That point of view is the heartfelt attempt to frame the issues of the day with one set of interests foremost in mind: those of the great majority of humankind, the propertyless (*Monthly Review* 2008a).

As this website excerpt indicates, the magazine *Monthly Review*—like the relationship between *Parti pris* and *Éditions parti pris*—is associated with the publishing house *Monthly Review* Press, which acquired the English rights to *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* and approached Joan Pinkham for the translation. As one would expect, the publisher has a mandate similar to that of the magazine:

*Monthly Review* Press is an independent socialist publisher. Through our publishing program we seek to contribute to the critique of capitalism, and document and analyze struggles for a social order based on human need and possibility rather than corporate profit. We try to promote rational argument and open debate within a broad socialist culture rather than advancing the perspectives of any organization or tendency within the socialist camp (*Monthly Review* Press 2008).

In our interview, Pinkham spoke highly of both the magazine and the publishing house, noting:

[*Monthly Review* (and its press)] was an exceptional source of insightful, non-
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doctrinaire analysis of public events from a socialist point of view. I might add
that it was written and edited for educated but not specialist readers, so that it
could be understood even by people like me, who had little knowledge about
economics and less about Marxism. [...] 

At different times the magazine came out in several foreign-language editions. A
marginal publication [in the United States] in terms of readership, it nevertheless
had an international reputation. During travels many years after the period when I
was working for MR, I have met people from England, China, India, Nepal, and
Peru who knew the magazine and slipped easily into conversations about the
editors and authors.

Evidently, then, this publisher supported a political stance similar to that espoused by
Vallières in Nègres blancs, where he argues in favour of overthrowing the bourgeois class. They
may not, however, have supported the bombings and other violent terrorist activities Vallières
promoted at this time. In fact, during our interview, Pinkham noted that Vallières and those
working at Parti Pris read Monthly Review, or were at least aware of the magazine: “Apparently,
MR Press’s early bid to translate the book was quickly accepted because of their sympathetic
outlook. (I often wondered why it had not been picked up at once by some Canadian house, as it
was later.)”226 Vallières himself states that he received a message of support from Monthly

226 Pinkham’s question about why a Canadian publisher did not pick up the rights first is one best answered by
turning to a Globe and Mail article published shortly before White Niggers of America was published by
McClelland & Stewart. As the article notes, “Jack McClelland, head of the publishing house, said he tried to
find out from Justice Minister John Turner whether publication of the book Nègres blancs d’Amérique (White
Negroes of America) [sic] would contravene either the Public Order (Temporary Measures Act) or other
legislation” (“Vallières’ book ‘White Negroes’ to be brought out by McClelland” 1970: 8). As the article
suggests, legislation was in place from October 1970 until December 1970 (War Measures Act), and then from
December 1, 1970 until April 30, 1971 (Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act), which declared unlawful the
FLQ, any successor organization, or any group advocating crime to effect a change of government within
Canada. Among other things, the Act stipulated that anyone declaring that he or she belonged to or was acting
as an officer or representative of, communicating on behalf of, or contributing to such unlawful associations
was guilty of “an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.” The full
text of the Act is available at: http://faculty.marianopolis.edu/c.belanger/quebechistory/docs/october/.
Review when he was in the United States (1969: 393). Moreover, in the first appendix to the 1968 edition of Nègres blancs d’Amérique, a footnote advises readers to consult the September 1966 edition of Monthly Review, so Vallières certainly did seem to be reading the magazine and to have had some sort of contact with people associated with it.227

Malcolm Reid also had insight into the relationship between Vallières and Monthly Review Press. Here, it is worth quoting at length from his letter of August 4th:

Monthly Review Press has such a plain and colorless name. But in the sixties, it was Something!

It was the scholarly voice of socialist revolution in American culture. “The university press of the left.” Especially the revolution against U.S. domination of Latin America. The book-translated-from-the-Spanish was the characteristic MR book. Monthly Review began as a magazine in the fifties, and established then that you could be Marxist without being aligned as pro-Soviet. It pulled Marx away somewhat from Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Trotsky, even Mao. Marx was a Western European, his ideas had been strong in the West, even in the U.S.A., already in 1900. That was MR’s message. That was its way of finesse-ing the Cold War, of surviving McCarthyism. Einstein wrote a famous essay for it, saying socialism was the great question of the age. MR’s books also said, more and more, that culture, and tradition, and ethnicity, were as important in changing the world as economics and military doings. They developed the idea of the Third World.

227 Joan Pinkham also drew my attention to the February 1965 issue of Monthly Review (Vol. 16, No. 10), which contains an article by Vallières and translated by Perry Sturges entitled “Quebec: Nationalism and the Working Class,” which further demonstrates that Vallières had a relationship with the editors at the Monthly Review before Nègres blancs was published in French.
Only on the issues of feminism and sexuality was MR a little slow. Otherwise, it was busy helping with the founding of what was coming to be called the New Left. (Both magazine and the publishing house are still going strong.) Because of all this, it was admired by Pierre Vallières and other open-minded young leftists in the West. That MR should see Pierre as worthy of inclusion in its concert of voices from cultures around the world that needed socializing... this, I’m persuaded, was flattering for Pierre, exalting for him (personal correspondence, August 4th 2008).

Like Pinkham, Reid is sure that Vallières would have had a say about who published his work in English, and that he accepted Monthly Review’s bid because the house had earned his approval. So the political stance of this publisher is very clearly an important aspect of the story behind Nègres blancs in English. Evidently, Monthly Review Press was—and still is—a publisher that would support Vallières’s socialist narrative, and, as the paratextual analysis in 4.2.6 will demonstrate, they did not hesitate to show their support for Vallières in the TT. This is a marked contrast from the Canadian publisher, McClelland and Stewart.

4.2.5.2 McClelland and Stewart

Unlike Monthly Review Press, McClelland and Stewart does not explicitly support a political view, nor does it specifically publish books that take a certain political stance. The M & S website notes that the company “is proud of its leading role in dealing with environmental and Native issues, problems in the justice system, Canadian history and other matters of national concern, with books and authors representing every part of Canada”
(McClelland & Stewart 2008, emphasis added), so its focus is very clearly on publishing books by Canadian authors and works with Canadian content, such as the various editions of the Canadian Encyclopedia. If McClelland & Stewart does have a particular mandate, it might be to represent many regions of Canada through its publishing program.

This publishing house was established in 1906 in Toronto by John McClelland and Frederick Goodchild as McClelland & Goodchild. George Stewart joined in 1914, and when Goodchild left in 1918, the company name was changed to McClelland & Stewart. According to the Canadian Encyclopedia, Jack McClelland, the founder’s son and president of the company when White Niggers of America was published, “continued to develop a vigorous Canadian book publishing program that made a most notable contribution to the publishing and marketing of Canadian literature” (“McClelland & Stewart Inc” 2000: 1381). Although this article was written for an encyclopedia published by M & S, the company’s focus on publishing and marketing Canadian literature is evident in their list of authors—which includes Margaret Atwood, Yves Beauchemin, Robertson Davies, Mavis Gallant, Rohinton Mistry, Alice Munro and Jane Urquhart—as well as the fact that McClelland & Stewart continues to reprint Canadian “classics” in the New Canadian Library Series and Carleton Library Series. So while McClelland & Stewart does not specifically publish works supporting a particular political stance, it does have a mandate to publish established Canadian writers.

And the company also publishes works with which its publishers are not necessarily in agreement, as evidenced by a Globe and Mail article written several months before the English edition of Nègres blancs was published in Canada:

[Jack] McClelland said that he has no sympathy for the FLQ, but believes the Canadian public has a right to know what Vallières says. “Canadians are
intelligent enough to draw their own conclusions,” he said (“Toronto Firm” 1970: 8).

Here, then is an intention that differs markedly from that of Monthly Review Press. While the latter was sympathetic with Vallières’ views and published a translation of his work because it matched the socialist political stance of the publishing house, McClelland & Stewart published the English edition because it felt English Canadians had a “right” to this information, even if the views expressed in the book were not supported by the publisher.

The fact that M & S became the English-Canadian publisher of White Niggers did not pass unremarked by Canadian groups on the Left. In January 1971, the Left-wing newspaper, New Canada, accused Monthly Review of “selling the English Canadian rights to the big pro-imperialist Toronto publishing house McLelland [sic] and Stewart—who promptly arranged for a censored Canadian edition” (“Canadians to get censored version” 1971: 5). This led the American publishers to respond in the March 1971 issue of Monthly Review. They noted that the version to be published by McClelland & Stewart would not be censored—that M&S had in fact “contractually and orally” agreed to publish the translation “as is, without cuts or changes” (Braverman 1971: 357), a point that will be further explored in Section 4.2.6.1. The letter also mentioned that Vallières himself had deleted the material that would not appear in the TT (ibid.). Finally, the editors at Monthly Review Press explained why they had chosen McClelland & Stewart, instead of another Canadian house, to publish the Canadian edition of White Niggers:

We resent especially the charge that we made arrangements with McClelland and Stewart to be the Canadian publishers “to make a fast buck.” So far as we know, all the houses that applied to us for the rights are commercial Canadian houses, and each would have been willing to pay the same nominal advance we are
receiving from McClelland and Stewart, so that money (much of which goes to Parti Pris and Vallières himself) played no role. In view of the importance of the book, and the Canadian situation, we felt that the best interests of the book, and the author, and the cause would be served by giving it to the house which could give it the widest possible circulation (ibid.).

Clearly, then, the US publishers had chosen McClelland & Stewart as the Canadian publisher not because the two houses shared similar political views or had similar missions, but rather because M & S would be able to distribute White Niggers more widely than other, smaller houses, and this would result in wider dissemination of Vallières’ narrative.

4.2.6 Framing Vallières’ narrative in English: Target text frames

The American and Canadian edition are identical: the translation itself is the same length and all translator notes are the same. The only difference between the two texts are the front and back covers, and the seven-page Publisher’s Afterword to the Monthly Review Press translation that is not included in the McClelland & Stewart edition. What is most intriguing, for the purposes of this thesis, is how the same translation was reframed for American and Canadian readers. This section therefore concentrates on the reasons why the translation was reframed for these two audiences, and it also explores the role played by the translator, her adviser, and the publishers in the framing process.

4.2.6.1 Written frames

Publisher’s afterword

The Monthly Review Press edition of White Niggers includes a publisher’s afterword
entitled “Pierre Vallières and the FLQ.” It appears immediately after Pinkham’s translation of the *Nègres blancs* epilogue and is not included in the McClelland & Stewart edition.\(^{228}\) While the afterword does provide some details about the FLQ not already stated in *White Niggers*, it still seems a little out of place at the end of the narrative instead of the beginning, given that it also repeats many of the points raised by Vallières earlier in the book, which readers would have just finished.

Labels, temporal/spatial framing and positioning are three framing strategies particularly apparent in the afterword. The labels used to refer to Vallières, the government, workers and companies show that the afterword has been written from a socialist point of view. The publisher has used the word “comrades,” for instance, to refer to Vallières’ friends:

[...]

During this same period, [Vallières] was also secretary-general of the Syndicat des journalistes de Montréal (SJM), and joined his comrades at *La Presse* in a seven-month strike provoked by the daily’s owners and the government of Quebec (1971: 282).

This word choice is in line with the publisher’s socialist political stance, and it also corresponds to the translation itself, as Pinkham has frequently—though not always—translated the word *camarade* by *comrade* rather than *friend* or *classmate:*

Durant l’été 1956, je trouvais, grâce à l’un de mes camarades de l’externat, un emploi... rue Saint-Jacques. [...] La grande majorité de mes camarades de travail étaient de pauvres hommes, de pauvres femmes, dont les salaires s’échelonnaient de vingt-cinq à soixante dollars par semaine (1969: 194, emphasis added).

---

\(^{228}\) During our later correspondence, Pinkham noted that her MRP edition of *White Niggers of America* did not contain the publisher’s afterword and the only quote on the back jacket was from the book itself. I was able to obtain only the paperback edition of this book, so it may be that like the M & S edition, the framing devices differed from the original hardcover to the subsequent paperback editions.
During the summer of 1956, thanks to one of my *comrades at the day school*, I found a job... on the Rue Saint-Jacques. [...] The great majority of my *co-workers* were poor men and women whose wages ranged from $25 to $60 a week (1971: 142-43, emphasis added).

*Avec mes anciens camarades de collège*, je retrouvais plus d’aisance et de joie de vivre, mais quelque chose, aussi, me séparait d’eux : ils se contentaient de parler, de discuter ; ils n’avaient jamais rien à offrir, à échanger (1969: 202, emphasis added).

I was more at ease and had more *joie de vivre* with my old *comrades from the collège*, but there was also something that separated me from them: they were content to talk, to discuss; they never had anything to offer, to exchange (1971: 148, emphasis added).

*Mon père est encore vivant aux usines Angus parmi ses camarades* (1969: 114, emphasis added).


*Comrade* is not the only instance where the publisher uses the same labels found in the translation. *Cheap labour* and *scabs* are also examples of the pro-worker stance in the afterword:

In May 1966, the bombing of the LaGrenade shoe factory, in which all the
workers had been fired and replaced by scabs after an eighteen-month strike, left one dead and several injured. Similar attacks were carried out against the factories of Dominion Textile, a notorious exploiter of cheap labour in Quebec (1971: 283, emphasis added).

The original French source text uses the term cheap labour, in English, on at least a half dozen occasions (e.g. 1969: 78, 110, 132, 176, 195, 196), and these have been kept the same in the English text (e.g. 1971: 59, 85, 100, 130, 143, 144). So both the publisher and the translator have used similar labels to refer to Vallières and the people around him, which is not surprising, given that the translator and the publisher shared similar views. As Section 4.2.6.2 will illustrate, the labels used by Pinkham and Monthly Review Press are very different from those used by the Canadian publisher to refer to Vallières and the FLQ.

Finally, temporal and spatial framing are used in the afterword to create a framework that positions Vallières as a victim of harassment and police brutality, and Canada as a country of systematic repression.

In the meantime, the FLQ continued its clandestine activities, at a time when sharpening social conflict was radicalizing a growing number of workers, students, welfare recipients, “marginal” youths, etc. Demonstrations grew increasingly violent. Repression became harsher and more systematic. A growing unity of action began to manifest itself among groups opposed to the established order.

In May 1965, Pierre Vallières’ living quarters, which also served as offices for R évolution québécoise, were searched and wrecked by some dozen policemen.

---

229 While most of the occurrences of cheap labour are not offset by quotation marks as they were in the French source text (e.g. 1971: 59, 85, 100, 130), the translator note on page 149 indicates that cheap labour is one of several English words “sprinkled” throughout the French text.
Vallières and two comrades who were on the premises when the search began were subjected to a continuous seven-hour interrogation and threatened with violence. The police seized the magazine’s subscription lists, as well as address books, letters, and “subversive” publications. Vallières and his companions were finally released when the police failed to bring charges against them (1971: 282, emphasis added).

In this example, the police are positioned as violent and threatening forces who have unjustly imprisoned Vallières and his companions. They “wreck” the office during their search, they interrogate the suspects for seven hours and threaten them but are unable to find any reason to press charges. This positions Vallières as a victim of the injustices and repression he is trying to fight against. Similar examples of this use of temporal and spatial framing to reposition participants can be found throughout the afterword:

After a trial that took place behind closed doors in the library of the Tombs—at which not a single witness was heard, and Vallières and Gagnon were not allowed to defend themselves—the two were found guilty of illegal entry into the United States and ordered deported. (For reasons as yet unexplained, the Canadian government had not issued a request for extradition.) Vallières and Gagnon immediately appealed the decision. On January 13, 1967, without any prior notice to the defendants or their New York lawyers, the appeal was denied and the deportation order upheld. The decision reached the authorities at about 4 p.m., but since Vallières and Gagnon were not notified, they were unable to plan further legal action. Two hours later, they were told to pack at once. They guessed immediately that they were to be kidnapped and forcibly deported to Montreal, but
their demands for an explanation failed to elicit any response. They were forced out into the street, surrounded by agents of the Department of Immigration, and ordered into a prison van. When Vallières refused to comply, *agents smashed his eyeglasses and bashed his head against the sidewalk* (1971: 284-5, emphasis added).

As in the previous example, Vallières and Gagnon are positioned as victims of unjust and threatening governments: their trial is secretive and closed, they are not allowed to speak in their own defense, they are not notified in advance of decisions they could have appealed, they are “kidnapped” by the government and sent against their will to Canada, and one of them is assaulted by American agents when he refuses to go into a prison van. This afterword continues with other examples of how Vallières has been harassed and mistreated:

At the end of September 1968, Vallières and Gagnon were “readmitted” to the Montreal prison, where they were placed under constant surveillance and subjected to a great deal of harassment (1971: 286).

In the midst of his trial Vallières was charged in the Ottawa Parliament with being the author of a “master plan for revolution in Quebec.” The charge of sedition which had been brought against him a few days before his second trial for murder was evidently designed to prejudice the jury (1971: 288).

At other points, the afterword highlights the fact that the government has been unable to successfully convict Vallières or stop his political activities:
The Vallières-Gagnon affair became the symbol of both the political repression and the people’s revolution. Demonstrations, petitions, and articles on their behalf multiplied rapidly. The two prisoners never ceased writing, propagating their ideas, sustaining the morale of those “outside” who were being clubbed, manhandled, searched and interrogated incessantly (1971: 286).

Vallières’ appeal was not heard until the end of April 1968 (more than a year after he had received a life sentence). The Quebec Court of Appeals set aside the decision of September 13, 1969, and severely criticized the numerous irregularities committed jointly by the prosecution and the magistrate during Vallières’ trial. The Court of Appeals held unanimously that Vallières had been tried and convicted for his political ideas rather than for the murder of Thérèse Morin (1971: 286, original emphasis).

In spite of all their efforts, the authorities did not succeed in breaking Vallières and Gagnon. Through their writings, letters, and trials, the two imprisoned revolutionaries participated very actively in the liberation struggle (1971: 287).

By autumn 1969, three years after their arrest, the charges brought against them had still not been proven. Vallières’ conviction was overturned by the Court of Appeals. Between June 1968 and August 1969, Charles Gagnon had four trials in which no other evidence was produced than the fact, freely admitted by the defendant, that he was a revolutionary and an FLQ activist (1971: 287).
As these examples illustrate, Monthly Review Press has framed *White Niggers of America* by positioning the author as a socialist activist who has been harassed, unjustly imprisoned, subject to unfair trials and yet continues to be a revolutionary despite these injustices. Although this afterword includes more details about Vallières’ arrest than some of the other peritexts discussed in Section 3.2.3.2—such as acknowledging that he was charged with murder, for instance—they have positioned Vallières in such a way that it is clear these charges are not the real reason he was arrested (“tried and convicted for his political ideas rather than for the murder of Thérèse Morin”). By placing Vallières in a particular context—a time when revolutionary violence has become more widespread, and where those standing up for the “people” are “clubbed, manhandled, searched and interrogated incessantly,” the publisher positions Vallières not as a violent man who has written *Nègres blancs* from prison because he has been fairly tried and convicted for crimes he committed, but rather as the victim of a government that wanted to stop him from fighting for better rights for workers.

Translator notes

Joan Pinkham has added a number of translator notes to the English edition of *Nègres blancs* to explain references to political figures, literary works, political parties, holidays and historical events. These notes are identical in both the Monthly Review Press and the McClelland & Stewart editions. For instance, she defines the word *joual*, explaining its origins and noting that:

The radical *joualistes* [...] write in *Joual*, claiming for it the status of a separate language. Vallières opposes this position. His own work, while it is sprinkled with
English words ("les businessmen," "l'Establishment," "un racket," "cheap labour," "le Big Boss," "le fun," etc.) and contains a number of peculiarly Québécois expressions, is written in standard French (1971: 149).

In other notes, she provides details about Quebec figures, including René Lévesque, Gérard Filion, Montreal Mayor Camillien Houde, singer Léo Ferré, and union official and suburban mayor Lucien Tremblay and political parties or organizations such as Social Credit, the CCF, NDP, RIN, Parti social-démocrate, fédération des travailleurs du Québec, Parti socialiste du Québec, and the CSN. She explains nicknames such as Ti-Jean-la-Taxe Lesage, who “earned his nickname by imposing heavy taxes to finance his reforms, notably new schools. This policy helped defeat him” (1971: 43). Finally, she explains allusions—to both literary works/characters and real people, organizations, companies, etc. For instance, she provides details about Les insolences du frère Untel, Trudeau’s Pour une politique fonctionnelle: un manifeste, Maria Chapdelaine, and Sartre’s No Exit. She also explains that the founders of Cité Libre are Trudeau and Pelletier, that “Ayers” refers to three companies (Dominion Ayers Wood, Ayers Blankets, Beautyrest Mattresses), that Donalda is a character in Un homme et son péché, and that certain citations are from Les fourberies de Scapin, Milovan Dijilas’ The New Class or Simone de Beauvoir’s Pour une morale de l’ambiguïté.

Up to this point, the notes in White Niggers of America are no different than the translator notes added to many other English translations (cf. Section 3.2.4). However, a number of the notes are very obviously targeted at an American audience. For example:

The name of the conservative party in Canada is the Progressive Conservative Party (1971: 247).
The Fédération des travailleurs du Québec (FTQ), or Quebec Federation of Labor,
is the Quebec branch of the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC). *The CLC has
branches throughout Canada and has close ties to the AFL-CIO in the United
States* (1971: 159, emphasis added).

The NDP (New Democratic Party) is social democratic and a member of the

Such notes are certainly more suited to an English-speaking American audience that
might be unfamiliar with Canadian political parties and organizations. What is intriguing,
however, is the fact that McClelland & Stewart did not remove such notes from the Canadian
edition, where they would be needed by very few—if any—Canadian readers.

When Joan Pinkham was asked about her target audience for the translation and whether
she knew that her translation would be published in Canada as well as the United States, she
noted that when she was working on the translation, she did not know it was going to be
published in Canada and that the arrangement between McClelland & Stewart and Monthly
Review Press may not have even been made until the US edition was published.230 She also had
the following comments:

[...] Even if I had known in advance about potential publication in Canada, it
wouldn’t have made any difference to me technically. That is, I have never
directed my translation of any book to any particular audience, in the States,

---
230 The Notes from the Editors included in the March 1971 edition of *Monthly Review* help clarify this matter. Editor Harry Braverman explains that “McClelland and Stewart will only be a few weeks behind us, since they intend to produce and publish as fast as possible after they have our negatives” (Braverman 1971: 357). It appears that both editions were indeed released at roughly the same time, as a book review of the McClelland & Stewart edition was published in the *Globe and Mail* in late March 1971, one month before reviews of the Monthly Review Press edition appeared in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. 
Canada, or UK. I write the kind of English I write (which is, I guess, American) and have never considered whether it was appropriate for one place or another. For example, I use the American spelling that comes naturally to me.

My chief concerns, then as always, were to be as faithful as I could to the content and tone of the original and to write decent [English] that didn’t sound as if it had been done out of the French. At the same time, since this was a first-person narrative, to use neutral expressions (especially for slang) that would not jump off the page as being American, thus making the reader suddenly aware that it was not a Québécois speaking. [...] I guess, come to think of it, that I did have an American audience in mind, since I believe I added some explanatory footnotes -- about joust, say, or some historical event -- that would have been unnecessary in Canada. But that notion didn’t affect the trans. itself. That is, I don’t know what I would have done differently if I had been deliberately trying to reach “a general North American audience.”

And so, as the footnotes seemed to indicate—and as the translator herself confirms—the original translation was never intended specifically for a Canadian audience and if an intended readership was imagined during the translation process, it was American. For the most part, the only indications that this translation was not prepared by a Canadian or for a Canadian audience are the translator notes and American spelling. In a case such as this one, the Canadian publishers could certainly have made minor changes to the translation (had they negotiated something of the sort with Monthly Review Press and Joan Pinkham), such as changing the spelling—e.g. neighbors (1971: 113) or fervor (1971: 150)—to match Canadian conventions and removing footnotes that would not be needed by English-Canadian readers, who could be
expected to be familiar with the NDP and the Progressive Conservative Party. However, the editors’ comments in the March 1971 issue of *Monthly Review* indicate that such an agreement was not made and that M & S was in fact contractually obliged to reprint the translation exactly as it appeared in the US edition:

The translation is not being revised by anyone. The translation was given to [McGill history professor and former NDP member] Laurier LaPierre by McClelland and Stewart because, as they said, they were worried about whether a U.S. Translator would get the Canadian French right, and he pronounced the translation excellent in all respects. The translation will be published as is, without cuts or changes, or it will not be published at all. We have been assured by McClelland and Stewart, both contractually and orally, that they will use exactly what we give them, and in fact may even photo our pages (Braverman 1971: 357).

So, by agreeing to reprint Pinkham’s translation as is, McClelland & Stewart—intentionally or not—has positioned Vallières as an Other. Because the English text does not conform to Canadian spelling conventions and the translation includes footnotes for concepts, groups and people English-speaking Canadians are familiar with, this translation comes from outside the country rather than within. What is interesting, however, is the fact that the US origins of the translation are not mentioned anywhere in the Canadian peritextual material. While the back cover of the Canadian edition stipulates that McClelland & Stewart are “The Canadian Publishers” no mention is made of any *other* publisher, aside from *Parti pris*; the copyright belongs to M & S. So readers are left with an ambiguous message about the origins of the translation.

---

231 As Poliquin pointed out during our interview, other Canadian works have been translated and published outside Canada and then distributed to Canadians through a Canadian publisher. Some of Richler’s fiction, for instance, was translated in France and then distributed in Quebec.
Acknowledgements

Although no acknowledgements are included in either the US or Canadian English translation of Nègres blancs, Joan Pinkham indicated in our interview that this was not her choice and that she had, in fact, prepared the following peritext for inclusion in the English-language edition:

I wish to cast blessings on Malcolm Reid of Quebec City, who read this book in manuscript, suggesting many judicious changes and providing a great part of the explanatory information that appears in the Translator’s footnotes. His intimate knowledge of political life in Quebec, his mastery of both French and English and his comradely spirit in replying to questions have been my salvation on countless occasions.

However, when she asked Malcolm Reid his permission to publish this acknowledgement, he declined. While Pinkham does not remember whether he gave her any reason, she notes that she had asked him “just at the time of the kidnapping and murder of [Pierre Laporte], when nobody wanted to be officially associated with the FLQ. I was disappointed but by no means naïve, and I understood without elaboration that at that moment he might not wish to have his name associated with the book.” Malcolm Reid, in our correspondence, noted that turning down Pinkham’s offer to acknowledge his contribution to the translation “is not something that stuck in my memory. But yes, it was the October Crisis that was my reason. Fear was in the air. (All gone now...)” (personal correspondence, August 5th, 2008).

This is a very intriguing instance where a translation frame was a non-event. By
choosing to remain anonymous, Malcolm Reid removed all Canadian connections from the translation. Instead of being prepared with advice and explanations from a bilingual Canadian, this edition of Nègres blancs—the first (and only) English edition to appear, in fact—was published by an American publishing house, translated by an American translator for an American audience, and merely distributed by a Canadian publisher.

_preface_

The acknowledgements are not the only paratextual frame that did not appear in one of the target texts. A preface was actually prepared for the McClelland & Stewart edition but was not included because Vallières did not approve it (Richmond 1971: 15, Desbarats 1971: 42). While the Montreal Star reported that Vallières “objected to the inclusion on the grounds that the book must speak for itself” (Richmond 1971: 15), this may not be the real reason, as Vallières does not seem to have objected to the afterword included in the Monthly Review Press edition.

This preface was written by Laurier LaPierre, the McGill history professor who was asked to assess and approve the translation for publication in Canada. Quotes from this preface were included in both the Gazette and Montreal Star, and these excerpts show that the passage quoted on the back cover of White Niggers of America were taken from this unpublished preface (cf. Section 4.2.6.2).

_titiles_

One of the most striking aspects of the English title is the use of the word “niggers.” To better understand what Vallières meant by the word “nègres,” let us return to the opening paragraph of Nègres blancs:

In this passage, Vallières is using the term “nègre” in its most derogatory sense. The insults he includes as examples are used by racists, who would not be interested in choosing a politically correct term. So the only real choice in English is the word “nigger,” which Pinkham has used for the title and throughout the text, including this first paragraph.\(^{232}\)

To be a “nigger” in America is to be not a man but someone’s slave. For the rich white man of Yankee America, the nigger is a sub-man. Even the poor whites consider the nigger their inferior. They say: “to work as hard as a nigger,” “to smell like a nigger,” “as dangerous as a nigger,” “as ignorant as a nigger.” Very often they do not even suspect that they too are niggers, slaves, “white niggers.”

White racism hides the reality from them by giving them the opportunity to despise an inferior, to crush him mentally or to pity him (1971: 21).

Before Pinkham’s translation was published, both “negroes” and “niggers” were used in

---

\(^{232}\) This, according to Vallières, is also the English term he first used to name the concept. In the preface to the 1979 Québec/Amérique edition of *Nègres blancs*, Vallières notes: “C’est en voulant percer ce mur d’indifférence et de mépris que j’inventai, pour désigner les Québécois, le concept des nègres blancs d’Amérique. C’est d’ailleurs en anglais que ce concept se formula spontanément dans ma tête. *White Niggers of America*” (1979: 16).
translated titles for Nègres blancs by the Toronto Star and the Globe and Mail. In many of these articles, however, the reporter may not have read Nègres blancs, as the book was mentioned only in passing and was not reviewed. For this reason, these reporters may not have been aware of the pejorative sense of “nègres” Vallières wanted to convey. What is more likely, however, is that these journalists were reluctant to use a word like “niggers” in print in a major Canadian newspaper.

So much for the title, which is identical in both the US and Canadian editions. What about the subtitle, then? This is where the American and Canadian version differ, because the subtitle, The Precocious Autobiography of a Quebec ‘Terrorist’, is not included anywhere in the Canadian peritextual material, although it appears on the cover and title page of the Monthly Review Press edition. Ann Charney points out in the Globe and Mail review of White Niggers of America that since the book is both a political treatise and an autobiography, when the subtitle is dropped, the title no longer indicates which aspect of his book Vallières wanted to emphasize (Charney 1971: 65). Yet, there is a second possibility: this subtitle is not indicated on the covers of any of the post-1968 French editions either—although it does appear on the title page of the 1969 edition—so McClelland & Stewart may simply have been following the trend set by Parti pris. The publisher may have also expected Canadian readers to know more than Americans about the book and Vallières, given the number of articles published about the author and his work in the Globe and Mail in the late 1960s and early 1970s (cf. Section 3.2.3.2), and would

---

However, White Negroes is also used in the Toronto Star: See, for instance: Montreal Bureau. (1970, October 16). 154 arrested before dawn in hunt for FLQ kidnappers. The Toronto Star, p. 1
The Globe and Mail also used the title White Niggers of America, in two articles published August 17, 1970 and December 5, 1970; however, both of these articles were by Malcolm Reid, who would have been familiar with Pinkham’s translation. Other articles in the Globe and Mail use the title White Negroes:
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therefore not need the subtitle to identify the book. More on this in the next section, which considers the blurbs on the McClelland & Stewart hardcover and paperback editions of *White Niggers*.

4.2.6.2 Visual frames

*Front and back covers (Canada)*

Both the hardcover and soft cover Canadian editions contain no illustrations. They consist of a black cover with white text (Figure 10). In this design, no images or other text distract the eye from what is a rather provocative title, given the use of the word “Niggers.” What is a more important framing device, however, are the blurbs that appear on the back cover (for the paperback edition) or the inside jacket (hardcover edition). Slightly different blurbs appear on the two M & S editions. The hardcover contains a short biography of Vallières on the right inside jacket, and a quote from “the distinguished historian Laurier LaPierre”234 explaining the book’s significance on the left inside jacket. The paperback edition235 contains a revised version of this quote but does not include the biography.

Here are both blurbs as they appear on the original 1971 hardcover edition:

[on the right inside jacket] Pierre Vallières was born into a working-class family

---

234 This is the same person who read the English translation prior to McClelland & Stewart’s agreeing to publish it. While he was a member of the NDP in the late 1960s, LaPierre later became a Liberal and was appointed a senator in 2001 under Jean Chrétien. LaPierre retired from the senate in 2004.

235 Actually the fourth printing from 1972, as my copy indicates.
living in Montréal’s “East End” on February 22, 1938.

He was arrested in New York in September of 1966, writing most of this edition of *White Niggers of America* while in jail there. He was deported to Montréal in January, 1967.

Pending appeal of a sentence to life imprisonment for manslaughter, Pierre Vallières was released from prison in early 1970, but he was re-arrested in the fall of 1970 after proclamation of the War Measures Act.

[on the left inside jacket] This book is essential reading for anyone wishing to have a clear understanding of the background leading to the current crisis in Québec. Of this edition, the distinguished historian Laurier LaPierre says: “The book is of value primarily because of all it tells its readers about the FLQ... it seems inevitable that the FLQ or its successor organizations will remain an integral part of the Québec reality for some time to come for reasons inherent in its philosophy. We need to know what the FLQ is all about and how it came to occupy such an important place in our lives. Pierre Vallières tells us just that, with all the insight, prejudice and emotional involvement of an active participant, [*sic*] he explains how the FLQ was organized, its program of action, and, most important, its motivations and aims. If the FLQ is really the enemy, then we should know all we can about it and Vallières’ book is indispensable to such knowledge.”

The blurb on the paperback edition is very similar to the one on the left inside jacket of
the hardcover edition. However, the last sentence has been removed. Instead of the final two sentences quoted above, the paperback ends with the following revised quotation from Laurier LaPierre: “[...] Pierre Vallières tells us just that, with all the insight, prejudice and emotional involvement of an active participant—how it was organized, its program of action, and, most important of all, its motivations and aims.” After this quote is the following note: “This is a complete and unexpurgated edition.”

These two blurbs (particularly the revised version on the paperback edition) are very important framing devices that clearly show the use of multiple framing strategies—particularly positioning, labelling, and selective appropriation.

The biography of Vallières on the right-hand inside jacket is a good example of selective appropriation that can be compared to the biographies in other translations of Vallières’s works (cf. Section 3.2.3.2). Here, labels for Vallières are absent. While other biographies described him as a “theoretician” of the FLQ or a “civil and compassionate” radical, this one does not use any such labels. Instead, selected events are used to frame Vallières as a criminal who has been tried and convicted of manslaughter. This is a contrast with the other biographies, which decry the trial used to convict Vallières and in some cases do not even mention the manslaughter charges when noting that Vallières was jailed in the late 1960s. Here, then, Vallières has not been put on trial for his beliefs, but for involuntarily killing someone; no effort has been made to include details that would position Vallières as anything but a criminal associated with the October Crisis who was re-arrested when the War Measures Act was proclaimed.

The left-hand blurb positions Nègres blancs d’Amérique as a work that can help English-speaking readers understand the FLQ and the “background leading to the current crisis in Quebec.” Unlike in other peritexts that adopted a similar positioning strategy (cf. Section
3.2.3.4), in this case, TL readers are not encouraged to read the TT as a goodwill gesture or to help forge better relations between anglophones and francophones, but rather so they can understand “the enemy,” since it is likely to “remain an integral part of the Québec reality for some time.” This positioning strategy is in line with what McClelland expressed in the *Globe and Mail* prior to the publication of *White Niggers*: although the publisher does not support Vallières’ point of view, it considers that English-speaking Canadians have a “right” to know about it.

Labels are another framing strategy used in the left-hand blurb. The quote is attributed to Laurier LaPierre, who is labelled a “distinguished historian,” and is therefore positioned as a trustworthy, credible source for insight into the October Crisis and the *White Niggers* narrative. And according to this distinguished source, *White Niggers* is full of “insight, prejudice and emotional involvement,” making it a particularly subjective narrative that cannot necessarily be accepted as an accurate depiction of reality. Moreover, since Vallières is an active participant in the FLQ, he must also be part of the “enemy” LaPierre speaks about (enemy of whom, one wonders: Canada? English Canadians? the federal government?). So Vallières’ narrative is to be read as a way to gain insight into the inner workings of an enemy organization.

What is particularly intriguing is the fact that the label “enemy” has been removed from the blurb on the back of the paperback edition. This slightly changes the way the work is positioned. English-speaking readers are still being told that *White Niggers* is a work that will help them understand the FLQ, but they no longer need to do so because the FLQ is an enemy about which they need to know as much as possible. Instead, they need to understand the organization because it will be a part of Quebec for a long time to come.

The way *White Niggers* has been framed by McClelland & Stewart, while in line with
the publisher’s ideology, differs considerably from the left-leaning publishers who have released other translations of activist narratives, targeting English-Canadian activists (cf. Section 3.2.3.4). While other publishers have shown their support for the narrative and positioned it in a way that makes it relevant to the causes for which TL readers are likely to be fighting, M & S has simply positioned the work as background material essential to understanding a cause TL readers are not expected to support. The sentence noting that this edition is “complete and unexpurgated” also points to this positioning strategy: the translation is a sort of authoritative edition, given that it is said to contain everything that Vallières said in French and has not been censored in any way.236 Moreover, the fact that the subtitle “autobiography of a Quebec ‘terrorist’” has been dropped, combined with the fact that the book has been positioned as a text that “tells its readers about the FLQ” shows that the narrative was being positioned as a text more about a revolutionary movement than one revolutionary.

*Front and back covers (United States)*

Unlike the McClelland & Stewart cover of *White Niggers*, the Monthly Review Press edition contains a photograph, in addition to the title, subtitle and author’s name (Figure 11). The photo depicts Pierre Vallières kicking one police officer in the chest while another, cigarette between his lips, is grasping Vallières by the wrist. On the back cover, a caption indicates that “the front panel photo shows Vallières and police during a Quebec strike.”

---

236 This, of course, is debatable, given the changes between the first and second French editions. As discussed, both Pinkham and the editors of *Monthly Review* have noted that Vallières himself suggested cutting out material that appears in the 1968 edition but not in any subsequent versions. The M & S edition, then, is a complete translation of the 1969 text, but certainly not a complete version of what was originally published by *Parti pris* in 1968.
Here, then, is an important contrast between the photograph and the text used to refer to its participants. Just above the photo is the subtitle *The Precocious Autobiography of a Quebec “Terrorist.”* This text, combined with the photo underneath and the caption on the back cover, indicates to readers that the book is the autobiography of the man struggling with the police. While he has been labelled a “terrorist,” this is not how he sees himself (given that the label appears in quotation marks), and readers are going to get his point of view rather than the “official” story that has mislabelled Vallières. They may even be offered reasons to explain the struggle between the author and the police.

The back cover consists of four citations from reviews of *White Niggers* as they appeared in *The New York Times Daily Book Review*, the *Sunday New York Times Book Review*, *The Nation*, and *Library Journal*. This is not unlike the McClelland & Stewart edition, which did not comment on the book directly, but instead used quotations from other sources to position Pierre Vallières and *White Niggers*. Unlike the McClelland & Stewart edition, however, the quoted passages do not frame Vallières as belonging to an “enemy” organization.

Here are the four citations as they appear on the back cover of the Monthly Review Press edition of *White Niggers*:

**New York Times Daily Book Review:**

[This book] will take its place alongside the writings of Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver, Frantz Fanon, Che Guevara and Régis Debray; for it is an eloquent revolutionary document that clutches one’s throat like a drowning hand....

---

237 A New York-based weekly magazine. According to its website, *The Nation* is an independent journal of opinion founded by antislavery abolitionists in 1865. It publishes articles on politics, culture, books and the arts. See: [www.thenation.com](http://www.thenation.com)

238 A biweekly magazine targeted at librarians and published in New York. See [www.libraryjournal.com](http://www.libraryjournal.com).
Sunday New York Times Book Review:

Profound in its assessment of men and events, faithful in its recollections... ranks more than favourably with Eldridge Cleaver’s and Malcolm X’s recollections of the spiritual tempest raging in and around their lives.239

Vladimir Dedijer, The Nation:

Few books in my lifetime have had such an effect upon me as this one... for me the most impressive aspect of [Vallières’] book is its political lucidity and sincerity in an age when the established ideologies of East and West alike can no longer lay claim to such qualities.... It was spiritually refreshing to return to a book that records a life lived in keeping with deeply held principles, the life of a man whose words and deeds show no discrepancy.

Library Journal:

Not only is it the most important document to emerge from the Quebec separatist movement, it is a key to understanding the young revolutionaries of all countries. ... Brilliantly written... everyone should read White Niggers; Canada’s crisis as portrayed here is really the crisis of the modern world (1971: back cover, emphasis added).

These quotations are good examples of the positioning framing strategy, as they position Vallières not as a prejudiced, emotionally involved participant in an enemy organization, as the McClelland & Stewart cover did, but rather as a revolutionary who can be compared to such...
well-known figures as American civil rights activists Malcolm X and Eldridge Cleaver, Martinique political activist Frantz Fanon (who has written about racism and colonialism), Marxist Revolutionary Che Guevara and French intellectual Régis Debray, who in 1968 was sentenced to jail in Bolivia after he was captured with the guerilla band led by Guevara.

The idea of understanding also surfaces in the Library Journal review, but here, instead of positioning White Niggers as a source for understanding the “enemy” as it were, the book is rather a source for understanding “young revolutionaries of all countries.” Like the previous reviews, this one positions Vallières as addressing issues that apply to anyone, and supporting causes similar to those espoused by other activists around the world. He is not representing an organization relevant only to Canada or fighting for a cause that can be understood only within his own country; rather, he is an activist engaged in a local crisis that is representative of “the crisis of the modern world.” This strategy helps make White Niggers relevant to American readers, and positions Vallières in a very positive light, showing that reviewers from multiple sources have labelled his work “profound” and “lucid”, and have positioned Vallières as a man who has “deeply held principles” and whose “words and deeds show no discrepancy” instead of someone who can tell only a prejudiced story because he is an active participant (as on the covers of the McClelland & Stewart edition).

The front and back covers of the Canadian and American editions, then, clearly show that the two publishers have very different positions with respect to Vallières and his narrative and did not hesitate to reframe the narrative to match their own political views.
4.2.7 Conclusions

The example of Pierre Vallières’ Nègres blancs d’Amérique and its English translation has helped to show how the same TT can be reframed to different ends by various agents and has offered insight into why certain framing strategies were adopted. Monthly Review Press has framed White Niggers as a master narrative that operates on a scale large enough that readers across the world will understand and relate to it. The frames do so by highlighting the ways in which the problems raised in Nègres blancs can apply to groups other than French-speaking Quebecers and by positioning Vallières as a peer of revolutionaries in other countries.

By contrast, the Canadian edition of White Niggers of America frames the narrative as one that recounts events relevant to Canada and addresses problems Canadians will have to face in years to come. Instead of positioning the work as a source of understanding to help foster better relations among Canadians, the covers of this edition position White Niggers as a source for understanding a problem, an enemy: the FLQ and successor organizations. Moreover, the publisher has noted that the narrative is one English-speaking Canadians have a “right” to know about, implying that the translation has been published out of a sense of duty rather than to help disseminate ideas the publisher supports. Although only three years separate the original ST publication and the McClelland & Stewart English edition, the work has been repositioned as the authoritative edition of a resource for understanding the “current crisis” in Quebec. This is the only way in which the M & S framing strategy is somewhat consistent with how the TT was framed in the United States, where the work was positioned as an eloquent revolutionary document.

The McClelland and Stewart edition also differs from the US translation in another important respect. The publisher has not made an effort to show its support for the author or the
narrative. They have labelled themselves the “Canadian publishers” of something that has evidently been translated elsewhere. By not removing translator notes that are not likely to be needed by Canadian readers, McClelland & Stewart has further demonstrated its lack of involvement in the production of the translation, and distanced itself from a text that was still potentially illegal in Canada. Of course, the lack of involvement was not entirely McClelland & Stewart’s choice: Vallières prevented them from including their own preface targeted at English-Canadian readers. By contrast, Monthly Review Press has added a publisher’s afterword to express their support for Vallières, and the original French edition by Parti Pris includes various appendices that show the publisher’s support of Vallières—most notably the request for donations to a fund to help free Vallières and Gagnon from prison, demonstrating a much different framing strategy on their part than on the part of McClelland & Stewart.

The framing strategies discussed in this section clearly show how various publishers have made their views known through the peritextual material included with the French and English editions of Nègres blancs d’Amérique. More importantly, however, this section has shown how other agents, namely Pinkham and Reid, have reframed the narrative. Further, this section has demonstrated that not all frames for a narrative have to be published or visible to reframe the narrative. In the case of White Niggers, Pinkham did not publish her acknowledgements to Malcolm Reid, and yet he still influenced how the translation was framed; Pinkham asserts that he provided many of the details that appear in the translator notes. Moreover, the fact that Reid did not want to be identified has influenced how White Niggers was framed. Because no mention is made of the Canadian consultant who helped in the translation process, both the Canadian and American editions of White Niggers are bereft of any Canadian ties. And, because McClelland & Stewart distanced themselves from the translation in their
peritexts, no support from English Canada seemed to be given to the TT: the publisher was not a sympathetic, left-leaning house like Monthly Review Press (or like the publishers of other English translations of activist texts), no English-speaking Canadians appeared to have a role in preparing the translation, and no supportive quotes from anglophones in Canada were included in the TT peritexts to frame the translation in a positive light.

This case study has also shown that the goals of the agents involved in preparing a TT for publication are not always the same. The goals Joan Pinkham and Malcolm Reid had in mind for the translation did not always match those of the publishers. Both Pinkham and Reid have said they wanted to make the translation available because they were sympathetic to Vallières’ views: Pinkham noted that “I wouldn’t undertake a trans. unless I admired the author and was in general sympathy with his or her views as they were revealed in the text. Otherwise, why spend all that time and energy propagating a text you didn’t believe in? (Surely not for the insulting pay.).” She also noted that her admiration for the editors at the socialist Monthly Review Press led her to agree to translate Vallières: she trusted their judgement and was delighted with the author when she finally read Nègres blancs. Reid hoped the translation would make Vallières known to the English-Canadian left and even serve as a source of inspiration for them. This is clearly not what McClelland & Stewart had in mind when it published the English version, however. The paratextual material clearly shows a different framing strategy than Pinkham or Reid intended. This section has demonstrated, then, how a work can be prepared with one intention but positioned in another way when it is finally published.

Finally, this section has also demonstrated how the same translation can be positioned for one audience by one publisher (English-speakers on the Left at Monthly Review Press) and then repositioned for a new audience by another (English-speaking Canadians—not necessarily
Left-leaning—in the case of McClelland & Stewart). This is demonstrated by the fact that both publishers quote from McGill history professor Laurier LaPierre on the back cover of the TT. But, while the McClelland & Stewart edition focuses on how the narrative is marked by “prejudice and emotional involvement,” Monthly Review Press focuses on LaPierre’s book review in The New York Times and selects excerpts that frame White Niggers as a “profound” and “faithful” philosophical document that ranks favourably with those of other activists. Clearly, then, even the same source can be used to reframe a narrative in competing and contrasting ways, according to an agent’s goals.

4.3 Conclusions

These two case studies have attempted to better answer the research questions on which this thesis is based: how were works critical of TL groups reframed for these same readers, what role did translators play in the reframing and what do these frames reveal about the expectations assigned to TL readers? More importantly, they have provided insight into why works critical of TL groups were reframed in various ways, something Part 3 was unable to explore in any detail. This section has demonstrated the ways in which framing strategies can be used to influence the way in which readers are expected to interpret a narrative and have highlighted ways translators have worked within their frame space to reframe a ST narrative.

Richler’s Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! has been reframed in contrasting ways: selective appropriation has been used in French-language newspapers to position Richler as being more provocative and critical of French-speaking Quebecers than he was in the English ST, and the French TT reframes Richler alternately as more or less critical of Francophones than the ST. These contrasting frames have not been divided along language lines, but rather according to the
individual views of the agents who framed *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*. Likewise, several agents, including the American translator, Canadian consultant and various French- and English-language publishers have repositioned Pierre Vallières as either a dangerous leader of a seditious organization or a revolutionary fighting for a cause that could be espoused by many groups. The then-recent October Crisis likely led to the negative positioning strategies adopted in the Canadian edition of *White Niggers*, while the pro-socialist stance of the American publisher clearly led to the positive positioning strategies in the American edition.

One of the more interesting findings in the case studies has been the contrasting strategies of Daniel Poliquin and Joan Pinkham, who both felt an affinity for their authors and wanted to translate the ST because they felt the authors had not only a right to be heard in the TL, but also a message that should be shared with others. Their approach to the translation differed, however: Poliquin wanted to show his support for the author—given that Richler had been lambasted in the French-Canadian press—by inserting occasional shifts in meaning that were still in line with the author’s point of view. Pinkham has stressed that to show her affinity for the ST author, she tried to ensure that the English version was as accurate as possible so English-speaking readers would receive a message as close to the original as possible. What this study has shown, then, is that even with similar motivations, translators may adopt different framing strategies. Conversely, translators with contrasting motivations—such as those of Poliquin, who supported Richler, and Jean-François Lisée, who did not—can reframe a work in much the same way, even though their ultimate goals differ. In the case of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*, Poliquin wanted to “help” Richler to express his own antipathy for Quebec politician Lucien Bouchard, while Lisée clearly “helped” Richler to fuel the argument that *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* was overly critical of French-speaking Quebecers. These two case studies have
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demonstrated the importance of speaking with translators to determine their motivations for reframing a ST in a particular way, as the TT itself will evidently not provide all the answers—and indeed, may not clearly illustrate the translator’s goals at all.

What has also been illustrated by the case studies is how the events framing the translations affected the way the translations were prepared and positioned by the various agents. Poliquin’s translation was prepared very quickly—in only nine weeks, including all revisions, while Pinkham worked on hers for almost two years—from November 1968 until August 1970, with the final seven months consisting of revisions and correspondence with Malcolm Reid. The longer deadline for the translation means that Pinkham would have had more time to prepare a very accurate translation, while Poliquin would have had considerable difficulty producing a translation without inadvertent shifts in meaning or errors in such a short period of time. This shows that how a ST is actually reframed in translation is not necessarily the same way the translator would have reframed it if working conditions had been different. And indeed, the contrasting framing strategies for White Niggers have demonstrated the effect political events have on TT frames, particularly with respect to a work critical of the TL audience.
PART 5: CONCLUSIONS

5.1 FINAL CONCLUSIONS

To conclude this thesis, let us first review the research objectives set out in the introduction. There, it was stated that the objectives of this thesis are two-fold: to determine what works were published between 1968 and 2000 on Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda, and to determine how these works were reframed for TL readers. Further, the introduction noted that this thesis, while placing particular focus on the STs most critical of TL readers, would attempt to answer three key questions: 1) why the delimited catalogue works were reframed as they were, 2) what the frames reveal about expectations assigned to TL readers, and 3) what role translators played in developing and disseminating these frames.

This thesis has demonstrated how concepts from narrative theory can be applied to the study of translation, and to non-fiction texts in particular, but it has focused exclusively on Mona Baker’s interpretation of narrative, given that she had already adapted the concept for use by translation researchers. Since so many studies of texts related to Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda have focused on novels, poetry and dramatic works, this thesis found new material and has illustrated how the non-fiction texts published on these three topics can be studied as stories about Canada. As Part 2 has demonstrated, the works published on the topics of Quebec nationalism, independence movements and the sovereignty referenda are very diverse. The writers range from researchers to politicians, from journalists to university students, from historians to activists. What is most evident, however, is that both English- and French-speaking Canadians published works with similar themes and theses. It would be a mistake to conclude that only francophones argued in
favour of Quebec independence, or that only anglophones supported the status quo. The delimited catalogue analysis has shown that some anglophones have argued not only for changes to the Canadian federation, but also for complete independence for Quebec. Likewise, some francophones have concluded that independence would not be to Quebec’s advantage. Other works in both French and English have narrated events in Canadian history and focused on the October Crisis, the development of Quebec nationalism, or the changes in how Canada has been viewed by federal politicians. What has clearly been demonstrated in Section 2 is that the works chosen for translation often had themes and theses that were already present in the TL—and although the paratexts to the French T Ts often emphasized that the English STs were not typical examples of English-Canadian opinion, these English STs did represent opinions held by many French speakers. These are intriguing conclusions that should be borne in mind during future studies of the translations themselves (rather than just the peritextual frames).

Part 3 has explored how these diverse narratives were framed when translated. This section revealed that the attitudes and expectations about English- and French-speaking Canadians are evidenced in the frames surrounding narratives. By analyzing the peritextual material prepared specifically for the T Ts, this section showed that even though the works in the delimited catalogue were diverse in nature, they were reframed in a limited number of ways when translated. Similar arguments were given to French- and English-speaking readers for why they should be interested in reading a work not originally addressed to them. Further, the frames revealed expectations about TL readers: English-speaking Canadians were not expected to know or understand much about Quebec and were also expected to be offended or angered by some of the T Ts. By contrast, the French-speaking readers were considered knowledgeable about events, people and places related to Quebec nationalism, independence movements and
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the referenda. They were also not expected to be offended by the TTs, although they were expected to find that the TTs offered a unique point of view, even if these translations often had theses similar to works originally written in French and published around the same time.

Finally, the case studies have yielded more detailed answers to the last three research questions. By analyzing the events shaping the translations of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and *Nègres blancs*, Part 4 explored the motivations behind the framing strategies discussed in Part 3. The interviews with Daniel Poliquin and Joan Pinkham have provided insights into why the frames surrounding *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* were constructed as they were, and why some frames were missing entirely. The responses from the translators provide insight into why paratextual material was not included with the French translation of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and why the English translation of *Nègres blancs* was framed differently for Canadian and American readers. The case studies illustrate the importance of consulting the agents involved in a translation, as the answers provided by Poliquin and Pinkham clarified—and in some cases contradicted—the narratives circulating in Canada about Richler, Vallières, and their books.

5.2 Contribution to translation studies

The contribution of this thesis to translation studies lies mainly in the way it has applied the concept of framing to a large body of works. In Part 3, various peritextual frames were considered, including prefaces, introductions, and postscripts written specifically for the target texts. This raises the question of whether frames can present not just narratives (as the definition in section 3.1 stipulates) but also other frames. Since translations are framing the source text and the peritexts are framing the translation, the concept of framing can be expanded in future
studies to include not only *frames* such as translations, which present a narrative, but also *re-frames* such as introductions to translations, which present a narrative frame. The various levels on which framing operates can certainly be explored in greater depth, and the analysis in Part 3 could serve as a basis for such a study.

Finally, as Part 4 has illustrated, the motivations behind framing strategies are varied. What is very intriguing, however, is the possibility that agents may not always be consciously adopting a framing strategy when translating a text. While Baker has argued that framing implies agency and is a way for human beings to *consciously* help construct reality, the interview with Daniel Poliquin, combined with the analysis of excerpts from his translation, has shown that the translational frame does not always reflect the translator’s conscious strategies. Poliquin, for instance, supported Richler and felt justified in “helping” the author whenever Poliquin particularly agreed with his criticisms. However, in other passages, the translation does not reflect this same strategy: some TT passages minimize Richler’s criticisms while others accurately render the criticism in French. As this case study indicates, we need to consider the fact that multiple frames exist within a single translation, and that multiple strategies have been adopted, each of which is apparent in certain passages. Speaking with the translators can help illuminate what strategies they *thought* they adopted or *intended* to adopt, while analyzing the translation can help determine whether the conscious framing strategy is actually apparent in the translation, or whether framing perhaps also operates on an unconscious level, one in which many of the choices translators make may not actually frame the text as they intended. This would help expand how the concept of framing can be applied to translation and open the door for more research in this area.
### 5.3 Future studies

The two case studies presented in this thesis lay the foundation for further research into how translations are reframed and what reasons lie behind the framing strategies. Because Daniel Poliquin and Joan Pinkham had similar motivations for translating two writers as controversial as Mordecai Richler and Pierre Vallières but employed different strategies to achieve similar goals, further studies into the motivations, intentions and framing strategies employed by other translators would be very illuminating. For instance, three other works by Pierre Vallières were translated into English in Canada during the 1970s and 1980s, all by different translators. Penelope Williams translated *L’urgence de choisir* into English in 1971 (*Choose!*, Toronto: New Press), Ralph Wells translated *L’exécution de Pierre Laporte* into English in 1977 (*The Assassination of Pierre Laporte*, Toronto: J. Lorimer), and Jeffrey Moore translated *Un Québec impossible* into English in 1980 (*The Impossible Quebec*, Montreal: Black Rose books). How do their motivations compare with Poliquin’s and Pinkham’s? How were these three works framed in translation and paratexts? How do the framing strategies used in these translations compare to those employed by the American and Canadian publishers of *Nègres blancs/White Niggers*, the first book of Pierre Vallières to be translated into English? Interviewing these translators and researching the events that shaped the translations could shed further light on whether the translators shared similar motivations, political views and goals for their translations. It would also show the role that translators and publishers play in framing polemical, political and historical activist translations for target audiences, particularly since the role of publishers has been largely unexamined in this thesis, due to space and time considerations. Of course, one limitation of this type of study is that the translators and other agents involved in the (re)framing process must be living during the period when the researcher
undertakes such a study. Motivations would have to be speculative, based on a study of the source and target texts, if the translator is unable or unwilling to discuss how the translation came about and what role he or she played in the various framing strategies.

Finally, a large part of the delimited catalogue can still be explored in greater detail. This thesis has demonstrated some of the framing strategies employed in the new TT peritexts; for the most part, however, it has not compared these framing strategies with the translations themselves. More research could be conducted to examine whether the translation and the new peritexts frame the ST in similar ways and explore reasons for any discrepancies. For instance, a number of works were positioned in a way that was supposed to reassure TL readers about the work, the author, or SL groups. Did the translator also choose TL equivalents that would address potential TL apprehensions? Do translations with peritexts acknowledging the TT’s potential to provoke TL readers show a tendency to use provocative equivalents in the translation when less provocative equivalents were available and suitable? Do the labels used in the peritexts to refer to SL authors, groups, organizations, and politicians differ from those used in the TT? Such questions could be answered by analyzing the STs and TTs and comparing them to the TT frames, and—if possible—by interviewing the translator(s) to see what strategies they consciously adopted during the translation and why. Their answers could then be compared with answers from publishers, editors, consultants, etc. to determine how other agents influenced the translation process and the framing strategies.
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Appendix 1: Interview with Daniel Poliquin, translator of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!

This interview was conducted on June 25, 2008, in person at Daniel Poliquin’s office in Ottawa. The following is an edited transcript of the questions and responses exchanged during this interview.240 Note: while I had intended to conduct the interview in French, Daniel Poliquin thoughtfully insisted on speaking in English since that was the language in which this thesis was being written.

Julie McDonough: In a 2005 article entitled “Daniel Poliquin : Le mur du combattant,” Danielle E. Cyr asserts that you were chosen to translate Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! because none of the other translators who had been approached could, would or dared do the translation. Had the publishers specifically said that the fact that you were a Franco-Ontarian, and therefore outside of the controversy happening in Quebec, played a role in their decision to ask you to translate Richler’s book?

Daniel Poliquin: I don’t know where Danielle got that interpretation of hers. What I can tell you is the facts and what I remember. I got a call one day from—I think it was Roger Magini—and he was with Balzac. Now just a word about Balzac. They were sort of a French group that had run away from Lancot. They had created Balzac on a shoestring. Part of it was a father and son business. I was talking often to the gentleman who was there—he was their computer specialist—and we talked about software and stuff like that. It struck me that it was a very meagre kind of operation; however, they did produce very fine books and to make a name for themselves they had taken on the Richler challenge.

Because some places, like Lancot for instance, would not touch it with a ten-foot pole, and they decided to go ahead, so they were looking for a translator. Some people were approached and turned it down because they were too busy. [...] Two translators were approached and they turned down the publisher because they had no time, and in one case it was some other reason. The person was leaving for a holiday or something. So, they [had] very non-ideological reasons for turning the work down.

And then [Les Éditions Balzac was] looking for someone, and there was also a time element, and they said who’s the fastest and the best and can combine those two qualities. David Homel recommended me to Magini, and Magini said I don’t know that guy but I’ll approach him. But the fact that I was Franco-Ontarian, and all that never played a role. It was strictly, you know, who’s the up-and-coming, young translator who’s the talk of the town and who can work fast

240 The original transcript was fourteen pages long, so I have removed some of the asides that were less relevant to this thesis as well as some passages that were inaudible, and I have corrected some of the oral speech to make it flow more coherently as a written text. This includes removing such discourse markers as “you know”, “I mean” and “like” as well as such interjections as “Ok”, “Oh”, and “I see.” Deletions of these discourse markers and short interjections are not indicated in this appendix. However, other changes to the transcript, such as deletions of entire paragraphs, are marked by ellipses in square brackets, while additions or corrections are offset by square brackets.

241 Published in Agnès Whitfield (Ed.) Le métier du double : Portraits de traductrices et traducteurs littéraires (2005: 334)
and who can do the job and who would take the job too. Because they had concerns about that, would you take the job? And as I told you, my first reaction to Richler’s article in the *New Yorker* was épidermique, like a knee-jerk reaction, how could he dare do that? My girlfriend said, well you know, if you’re that nuts you shouldn’t read it, and so I did not read it, but then when they approached me, I decided to go back to the scholarly posture and say, “Let’s see what he did.” The very basic Canadian principle to shed the light on was: he has the right to say whatever he wants.

And that’s something. When we deal with nationalism, you deal with the affect and the intellect is very powerless next to the affect. And I realized after having read the book that [it] was innocent, [it was] nothing. And so that changed me in that sense. It really marked my own rupture with the whole nationalist movement, or the beginning of it. I said, “No, there’s something wrong there.” We are being told by Lise Bissonnette in *Le Devoir*, and other people not to read that book. There was even a member of parliament who said that the book should be banned. And then I said, “No, this is the Inquisition, this is the Act of fate.” I don’t want to live in that sort of world, and so it pushed me farther apart from my nationalist friends and their whole thought process. So it readied me to translate Richler. But then I did [the translation] with all the professional attitude that you need to do this and it went okay. I did translate it with relish.

And sometimes, yes, the translator will participate in the ideology. For instance, I was teased by a friend about that. There’s a part about Lucien Bouchard, where Richler writes, “Lucien Bouchard, the small-town lawyer”—the guy’s from Jonquières—and I translated it as “Lucien Bouchard, l’avocaillon de province.”242 *Avocat de province* is small-town lawyer, *avocaillon* is small-time lawyer. And then I was quizzed by friends about that and I said, well, I’ll keep it. Because I hate the guy so much. [...]. So, I went exactly in line with Richler, but I helped him a bit. So in that sense yes, translation can also be ideology sometimes.

**JM:** Ok. I think that was it for the first question then. We’ve sort of touched on the second question. Was there a reason why you agreed to translate the book? You’ve sort of answered it already, but would you say it was because you wanted to make it available to francophones after what had been said about it in the press?

**DP:** Yes, after my own misgivings, my own knee-jerk reaction flew by, I decided that yes, this man deserves to be heard and to be read. Now living in a bilingual environment where all francophones speak and read English well, we *never* need translations. None of these guys ever reads me in translation, for obvious reasons, and if you are an educated reader in Quebec, you will read in the original. That’s a problem we had right from the bat: who will we reach? And you realize that, no, Lise Bissonnette is not going to read you.

---

242 Note: this passage occurs on page 163 of the English ST and on page 188 of the French TT. The exact passage in English reads as follows “Mulroney, who had already lifted this small-town lawyer out of obscurity not once, but twice, extended his healing hand yet again” (1992: 163) and the French translation is as follows: “Mulroney, qui avait déjà sorti de l’ombre cet avocaillon de province, non pas une mais deux fois, lui tendit la main de nouveau” (1992b: 188).
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Now, there’s a phenomenon here reading as an act, as an ideological act. Now, so who’s going to read me? I mean, even the educated Québécois intellectuals would not read the book in English if they can, so a fortiori they will not read it in French either. So, who’s it going to be? Well, it might be my Aunt Martelle. She’s from Longueuil, she knows some English—like she can order a coffee in a restaurant and a full meal, and have a medium conversation with people—but she can’t read English. She won’t. So I decided that she would be my reader. And that could include a lot of people, if the translation’s okay. But I knew that the press reaction would be right there. There were two [reactions] I heard regarding me as a translator. One was, how come a gifted guy like that [has agreed] to translate Mordecai Richler?

**JM:** Where was that? I was actually curious, because I had been able to find so few reviews of the actual French version.

**DP:** That was on the radio.

**JM:** Oh, on the radio. Ok.

**DP:** That was Daniel Pinard. And Daniel Pinard said [something] like, “What are these two doing together?”

The other reaction was quite prévisible: “I’m not going to read that.” This is the non-reading act as an act of ideology and that attitude of course is very convenient. I mean, you don’t have the book to read to begin with, you won’t buy the book. And it’s also the idea of giving money to the author, of encouraging that kind of thing. And that’s the old Catholic attitude regarding books: “This, you should not read.” And remember, you’re in Quebec, all right? Heavily Catholic culture, as Gaston Bachelard used to say, “Tu crois rêver, pourtant, tu te souviens.” You don’t imagine things. I mean, they have been imagined for you and you just recycle them, that’s all you do. So, in this heavily [inaudible] Catholic environment, the idea of censorship or inquisition—index, des livres à l’index—is very simple to revive, and that’s what happened with Mordecai Richler. So he did have some readers, he did find some readership, but the publishers were hoping for a livre de scandale, that would sell by the millions and all that, and that did not happen.

**JM:** Actually, that leads into my next question. This one is tied to what you were saying. I was curious about the publishers because they had printed a 3000-copy run and then they had sold, as far as I could tell, about a thousand copies, according to the *Toronto Star.* So I was curious about what the publisher had intended. You said that they had intended to make this sort of a scandalous book, that would have a lot of sales...

**DP:** Well, they did not say that in so many words, but that was basically the idea: This is a livre de scandale, who knows what can happen. It’s a gamble. Publishers know that. But they probably also knew that they could end up with a lot of books gathering dust in warehouses. But they took the chance, and one of them, Roger Magini, was European. He was French, and he was more of the school of thought that it’s out there, it exists, so let’s be able to read it in French.

---

**JM:** So let’s make it available.

**DP:** Let’s make it available, exactly. So that was the attitude too. It was not just, “I think there’s a big buck to make here.” No, it was not that sort of attitude. But they were bold and sensitive. They agreed to take on the challenge.

**JM:** The other thing I wanted to ask about the publisher—you’ve also sort of answered this one—was about the few copies that were sold and the fact that there were very few reviews. As far as I could tell, only *Le Devoir* actually reviewed the French version of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!* and the other French reviews, such as the one in *Spirale*, had actually reviewed the English version. I suspect that it was simply due to the fact that a lot of the controversy had died down by the time the French version was published, and as you were saying earlier, that many francophones would have already read him in English. I was wondering if you suspected these things might have been due to anything else.

**DP:** Ok, what probably happened here [is that] translations seldom get reviewed, number one. Because, you should see the competition for reviews in, even in a small-town, small-time paper, newspaper like *Le Droit*. *Le Droit* has half a page devoted to literature. All Franco-Ontarian writers want to be in *Le Droit* every week. They constantly complain, why are you reviewing this Belgian author, this Quebec author, what about us? What about us? And no use telling them, hey, you want to be reviewed, just write a good book, just for a change. No, they feel it should be *Le Droit’s* responsibility to promote Franco-Ontarian literature. And of course *Le Droit* is very wise not to listen. They won’t do reviews [of books] that aren’t good. Tough luck, pal.

It’s the same thing with *Le Devoir* and *La Presse*. *Le Devoir* is more open in a way because they have their own *section des livres*, and it’s a big one. So they review a lot of books. And a lot of people, in cafés in Montreal on Saturday, read the reviews, and they don’t read the books. This is a cultural industry in Quebec. And it leads to sentences like “la critique dit que...” and of course they haven’t read it. But they’ve read their reviews. It’s that kind of intellectual laziness that you have to fight against and still exists.

Now *La Presse* [has] sizeable space too, but people who work for publishing houses, the media people, are on the backs of the reviewers all the time. So what the people like Réginald Martel [do], for instance? They don’t return calls—they very seldom do. They listen politely, they accept all the invitations for lunch, free lunch, free dinner whatnot, and they say, “Thank you very much, I’ll do what I want.” So, you have these independent-minded individuals who will do what they want and then they also subcontract a lot of reviews.

But again, with 250 books, and 500 books published in France, about 150 in Quebec every year, imagine the competition. And you only have 52 Sundays in *La Presse* where you can do your work, so competition’s extremely tense, so the fact that that book would not be reviewed [is partly] explained.

The other thing, had the controversy died down? Because of the controversy, they would have talked about it, but I guess they just felt that a good way to kill a writer is not to review him. I
think that played more, because you’ll have reviews in local newspapers, like the newspaper for Chicoutimi, or what do they call it, L’Équipe, La voix de je sais pas quoi là. I have the name anyway—Le Progrès—Le Progrès de dimanche has a page or two on books. It’s like the Whig Standard in Kingston: they have an excellent literary review section. But over there, of course, they would not talk about Mordecai Richler, and because the space is so scarce. So, [if] we don’t talk about him, he’s dead, that’s good, and if we talk about him, we’ll make sure we murder him or something, and we’ll also attack the translation. That’s also important. Very important too in terms of ideology. If you don’t like a book, talk about the translation, and try to find some mistakes. And you will.

The beef I had with Mordecai Richler—that’s an aside—he was published in France. Now again, the way it works, anglophones sell a lot of copies. Big market. For instance, Elizabeth Hay and Alissa York, we had dinner together and they both asked me, “Who’s your French publisher?” I don’t have a French publisher. “How come?” You know, I have a Quebec publisher. “Yeah, but who publishes you in France?” Well, nobody. I’m distributed there, but I don’t have a publisher. Because they tried, and they [didn’t] want me. They protect their own authors. And [Elizabeth Hay and Alissa York] said, “Well we both are published in France.” So, well, who’s your publisher in Italy? What next? If you’re not published in France, you won’t be published later in Italy, Spain, and Germany, and Japan, Korea, India, all these places. We’re seldom published in Paris because we don’t sell many books. La petite fille qui jouait trop avec les allumettes by Gaétan Soucy sold about forty thousand copies in Quebec, so, of course they took him in France. They put him on the shortlist and the long list for the concours. Of course it was a joke, he didn’t win, didn’t get any further, but at least from there, he was able to be translated into German, Dutch, and all that. So, you have to go through Paris to do something. Or sell a lot of books in English.

So what happened with Mordecai Richler and his Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!: One French publishing house was interested. It was Calmann Lévy. They had a look at it and they decided that the content was too local, who cares? They said “No”, and so the deal just went away, period. [...]

And of course, we were surprised that we were not on the short list for the translation prize, for the Canada Council. And someone told us we should not be surprised, because it was as if you don’t touch it. So there was a part of that. Then [in] my contact with journalists elsewhere, when they were attacking me for having translated Mordecai Richler, the only question I asked was, “Did you actually read it? How founded is your opinion?” And nobody could answer. So they obeyed the modern day index, led by people like Lise Bissonnette and others: don’t read that book.

**JM:** If it makes you feel better, I had about a hundred translations and I think only one was shortlisted for the Governor General, and I don’t think anyone actually won. They didn’t win any prizes for any of the translations into English or into French for the hundred non-fiction translations that were published between 1968 and 2000 on nationalism and independence movements and the referendums.

---

244 Note: Poliquin is referring to La petite fille qui aimait trop les allumettes
DP: You might want to read one day the book called In the name of the father.245

JM: I did, actually, that was one of the works in my corpus.

DP: That’s when I was called the “Mordecai Richler français.” Again, it’s a place where controversy is not welcomed. It’s not always like that, though. You can’t say, “This is a closed world.” No, it’s not true. It is hard to penetrate, that’s true, and [if] it’s controversial you’re going to get hell. But then, with Mordecai Richler, I started enjoying it. Well, not always. Sometimes you get free insults, or you get insulted for nothing. You get attacked very unfairly on your translation, and [it’s] “death by a thousand cuts.” It’s a pain in the arse. I could walk away from it.

JM: Actually, I was curious about how the controversy might have affected your translation. I know that you were aware of what was going on in the press. Did you consciously try to avoid reading what they were saying so that you wouldn’t be influenced when you were doing your translation?

DP: No.

JM: No?

DP: No, no, no, I did not care. I knew what they said. Then of course, it was a time when I often went to Montreal for either translations or for my own writing as well. [The French version of Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!] came out in 1992, so that’s two years before L’Écureuil noir. I had published Visions of Jude in 1990, and so it was right in between. And my theory is that traduire, c’est écrire avec la main de l’autre. It’s important for me to be the other person. And as well, [due to] lack of inspiration, or just lack of material, translat[ing] other books was feeding me as a writer. So I enjoy doing that, and so that’s when Mordecai Richler came along. And then I translated Douglas Glover and other people, and that was extremely fruitful too. But no, I was not at all influenced by various articles on it.

The thing is though, at the same time, just as an aside, L’Écureuil noir or Black Squirrel is a homage to English-Canadian literature. All the names of places you find in there, and all these typonomies are places borrowed from the English-Canadian novel. Like Manawaka from Margaret Lawrence, Mariposa from Stephen Leacock, Salem, Matt Cohen, all these guys. I was immersed in English-Canadian literature at that time [...] because I had been asked to translate W.O. Mitchell, after I had done Kerouac. And I said, “Who’s that guy?” and they said, “What? On what planet do you live?” I was about 35, 37 in those days, and I had gone through high school without ever reading one single English-Canadian writer. There were none. It was still in the process, it was still a very colonized country, Canada. And [so] you read Mark Twain and Shakespeare. Atwood did not even publish in those days. So that’s why I had gone by it and not

245 Poliquin may be alluding to the fact that In the Name of the Father (the English version of Poliquin’s Le roman colonial) won the Shaughnessy Cohen Award for Political Writing; however, this award was not for translation per se (as is the Governor General’s Award for French-to-English or English-to-French Translation), but rather for the book itself. It was, in fact, jointly awarded to Poliquin and his English translator Dan Winkler, and was the only case in the delimited catalogue where both a translator and author co-won a literary award.
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seen it.

So I had taken the response of reading a hundred and fifty English-Canadian books and one of
the authors, of course, on the list was Mordecai Richler. And so I read it through and through
exactly in that period. So it was just a coincidence. I said, well, might as well read the rest right
now. And then I came to my great discovery, that as a writer, I had no feeling for him at all. I
found his jokes repetitive, stale and facile and dumb, and sometimes, yes, okay, but I liked what
Margaret Atwood said of him: Mordecai’s humour is like someone farting at a funeral. I mean
that’s what it is. Which is all right, if you want some cheap laughs, but I didn’t find him a very
good writer. He was a good theatrical writer, like in terms of the personnages that he could
profile, and he was good at that. But it was caricature, it was cartoon. As for the material of the
books, I found them extremely weak, and very disappointing. But then I read his other, his other
essayistic projects, including Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!, and then I found him quite good. So, in
a very bizarre sense, if you compare Mordecai Richler’s style to styles of other essayists—just
think for a moment [of] Norman Mailer. Norman Mailer writes in a very erratic way. He’s very
diffuse; he’s all over the map, whereas Richler’s very disciplined, as a good English writer, or
British writer, and that translates extremely well into French. Whereas translating Norman
Mailer or some guy like that would be very difficult. Because it’s not a language. It’s not
English. When he says things like “I feel powerful, I feel like a negro”, I mean how do you
translate that into French? But I know what he means, because he’s talking as a white New
Yorker, but Richler wouldn’t do that. You wouldn’t find those excesses of language in Richler
and in that sense, he was very easy to translate. [...] But as a fiction writer, I find him small.
Sorry.

JM: My last two questions are sort of similar. As I said, I am focusing on paratexts for my
thesis and about seventy percent of the translations that I had looked at had some sort of new
introduction or preface, or postscript or publisher’s note that had been added to the translation to
explain to the target-language readers why they should be interested in reading the work or how
they should read it. I was curious about why Oh Canada! Oh Quebec! didn’t have any new
prefaces. It was so controversial and I thought for sure that they would want to explain to the
French-language readers why they should be interested in reading the work. And I was
wondering whether you knew why there wasn’t one added.

DP: No, it was never discussed—preface or not. And to tell you the truth, I would have been
against it. From my own experience writing a thesis on it, you shouldn’t do that. You should just
present the book as it is, just launch the book as it is. The book is there, people do not need a
preface, especially not someone telling them what to read, how to read it, and what posture, and
whatnot. I was glad that they did not do that. And if it were to be reprinted, it might be needed,
but just to explain the context at the time, and not, “this is how you should receive this book.”

JM: Ok.

DP: But then, talking about the paratexts, too, I was asked a couple of times, and that’s quite
rare, as a translator, to represent him. He would give us an interview, of course, but he can’t do
it in French. Could you give us ...
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JM: Oh, that’s right, you had published two articles in the Globe, I believe? The Globe and Mail?

DP: Me?

JM: I thought it was you who had written about Richler.

DP: OK, when he died, although he had been very rude to me [...] one of my fans, one I’m very surprised to have as a fan is Aislin, the cartoonist in the Montreal Gazette, and he recommends me all the time. Every time I get a call from the Globe and Mail, [they say] Aislin recommended you. [...] So anyway, I’d been recommended by Aislin for the thing at the Globe and Mail, and so I wrote something when he died, and then I wrote something for Macleans [...]. But I’d agreed to do that, again on the French side, to defend him. But then, on the French side, a very bizarre thing is: “Mordecai, c’est un grand écrivain.” They will acknowledge that. “C’est aussi un gars de Montréal.” “Il y a [inaudible],” Bon. “un grand Québécois.” But, for his essayistic work, he is the devil incarnate. [Still], nowadays. Will he ever recover from that? I don’t think so.

But the bizarre thing is that Quebecers themselves, in the critiques the social fabric and all that, they’re fiercer than Mordecai Richler. Ten times. I mean they are worse. But they seem to remember here, this famous sentence I saw all over the place, Jean Larose, Lise Bissonnette: “Mordecai Richler nous a amenés à l’étranger.” In the Roman colonial, I wrote, “What do you mean? Who cares about you guys? Who cares?” The only valid comment I heard was this, and I think it’s someone from Montreal who said [it], “When you mention nationalism in Quebec, anti-Semitism, and all that, the conclusion you come to is that this is an immature society that cannot govern itself. So it pretends that Quebec is no good.” I thought that was kind of a valid comment, but I mean, I don’t think that people really care that much about it. [...] For some people, some Jews, yes, it meant something. But to say that Quebec’s reputation was “sullied” abroad, give me a break. And that goes to show you how immature, in fact, that society is. They think that people have an opinion on them. Well they don’t. And also, it was the fact that to remind people that there had been anti-Semitism was something very bad, because they had forgotten. They really had honestly forgotten that their maîtres à pensée like Lionel Groulx and all these guys had been anti-Semites too. And to them it was like saying, your father drank, and he drank a lot. And boy, that was very hard for them. And again, you go back to the affect and the intellect disappears. You know, it was knee-jerk. [...] 

JM: If you had been able to write a paratext, and you were able to express what your goals were for the translation, what would you have said? I’m just curious, what your goals were for the translation and whether you think you achieved them.

DP: My only aim in translating Richler was to give the guy a chance. Give him a break. Let’s listen to him. Let’s listen to what he has to say, and you will realize that it’s no big deal. It’s really no big deal. Also, read the full page. That’s the thing that my Quebec friends would tell me: “il a dit que nos mères étaient des truies.” Mais c’est pas ça. Il n’a pas dit ça, il a dit: “on les faisait reproduire comme des truies.” C’est différent là. “Non, non, non, he said, our mothers were sows.” And that’s it. And there was something very bizarre at play here, the sense of [...]
they hate me, they despise me. But that again is part of the adolescent makeup of that society at that time. Nationalism is an adolescent ideology as well, so they sort of needed that. And there’s a very troubling passage in Mavis Gallant’s—it was one of her short stories—[and] she describes growing up in a small, Quebec village. There’s a movie in town—it’s an American movie—and she goes to the movie and then she talks about it with her young, French-Canadian friends. They say to her, “We’re not allowed to see the movie” and she notes: “There was a certain pride in what they said.” And I thought that’s sort of what writers are for. To find the unconscious and to feel, to find and say, “Moi, j’ai pas le droit, eh, j’ai pas le droit, non, non.” And it’s part of that here too, in their reaction, and it goes to show you, what an immature society it is.

In, the same vein when Mordecai wrote about Edmonton, he peed all over them [peeved off all of them?], like there was no tomorrow, and Wayne Gretzky was furious, and he responded. I said, “Well, this is nice in a way,” because here you have a great hockey player responding to a writer. Not many societies you’ll find that. Sports and literature talking to each other. Talking stupid things. But what he had said about Edmonton was very fierce, and a parvenu society, big oil and all that. And also, Mordecai being a fierce Montrealer, to see the Oilers beating his Canadiens was too much. So he attacked them and again, the reaction was very knee-jerk, was very immature. Like, “We have good restaurants in Edmonton, okay?!” Come on! Instead of just laughing about it.

And also, there was this very British side with Mordecai, he would have this very cartoonist vision of things and sometimes because he did not understand. Some things, and he would go overboard. And the big problem with the translation, before I forget, if I’m allowed to talk about it [...]?

**JM:** Oh, absolutely...

**DP:** The big problem, the enormous problem I had. You’ll notice that the translation says, “This is dedicated to Karen Eck, researcher extraordinaire,” or something like that.²⁴⁶ I was going out with Karen and she needed a summer job. I said, “Look, could you check all the references? Because there’s some French references I have to use.” [inaudible—someone’s name] said, Mordecai’s documentation is probably found in a, what do you call it, a blue box.

**JM:** Oh, yes, it looked like he just had a big pile of papers that he was just rifling through, and...²⁴⁷

**DP:** Yes, and he was sitting on the privy, reading that stuff. I think it’s true. Because I checked some references, and they were all wrong. And so it was very poor scholarship on the part of Mordecai, which you can forgive. I mean he’s a polemist, he’s doing his job, so polemics first, but the publisher did a very bad job. [...] Sometimes, it was: “Jean Drapeau wrote, in 1941, in

²⁴⁶ Note: the dedication in the translation reads as follows: “Le traducteur tient à remercier sa recherchiste émérite, Karen Eck, sans qui la traduction de ce livre n’aurait pas été possible.”

²⁴⁷ The *Globe and Mail* reviewer made a comment to this effect: “Far from being ‘at large,’ Richler seems to have sat in his study in the Eastern Townships for a couple of years, reading a pile of books and sifting through the French and English newspapers for signs of the times” (Graham 1992: C20)
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the *Quartier Latin*, dah, dah, dah, the Jews are this.” Okay. Could you find the right quote? Well, she went through all 1941. It was 1940. Now imagine the time that you have to spend, just for that. That was a real pain in the arse, I mean, as a translator. In the course of my collaboration with him, that was very difficult.

In some cases, you can do that in six weeks. It’s dictated, typed up and then you check everything as far as you can, and you have your researcher doing the work too. You do what you can. And, so I made some mistakes. For instance, I had not understood the use of the word *wampum*.248 “What about new *wampum*?” I missed it completely. So [it’s] the publisher’s job to say, “Well, you missed out, my friend. This is what he means. He means, the currency of that new country.” So, anyways, so they caught that one.

And in some cases, [the publishers] attacked me: “Why did you translate like that, shouldn’t you do this or that?” And I said, no, no, you, you are the guys who are wrong, this is right. This is accurate. What happened in the final edition, I don’t know. They made some choices. Another thing, one other reason I quarrelled with Mordecai. He said, “I submitted your translation to some friends. They say you’re no good.” I said, “What?” He said, “Yeah, you’re no good.” “What do you mean?” “He said, well, this is Quebec French!” Hey, pal, where is it being published? It’s published in Quebec, here. “Yeah, but I would like some really good French, like in Paris.” Well, this is where you are *colonisé*, Mordecai. This is when we had our little argument. I said, this is nuts. This is nuts. It’s for public consumption. And there again, Mordecai was very much an author of his time, in that he was very *colonisé*. He wanted to be published in Britain, and in New York. And what’s the French equivalent of Britain? Paris. So, he would submit that to friends. If I had the choice between say a Quebec word or a French word, I would prefer the Quebec word. And he said, no, that’s no good.

**JM:** I’m surprised he thought there was an audience for this outside of Canada. I mean...

**DP:** Well, again, you find that with some Canadian writers, like Mordecai, like Margaret Atwood. She wants to be published in Quebec, and then one day, she had a French publisher, and they said, “Non, non, non, les Québécois, merci beaucoup.” Not because they’re not good. That’s what they won’t say. The real reason is, “We’ll give this contract to some famished cousin of mine who’s desperate for work.” So Mordecai, when he published, was published by Pineault, I think, they hired a guy—and he was very proud of that, “pas un traducteur québécois.” He was hired by guys who were from France and who had never set foot here. And in *Gursky*, you’d have some *perles*. One of them is this one: “The guy was eating a bagel.” En français: “Le type bouffait un petit pain ronde avec un trou au milieu.” What? And then the good one, “Hockey Night in Canada” becomes “Nuit du hockey au Canada.” The guy didn’t check anything at all! So “La reine des glaces” for “Dairy Queen”, and bullshit like that, and I said Mordecai...

[recording cuts off]

**DP:** Not that I’m getting all this beef against Mordecai or publishers or whatnot, but just to tell

248 Note: Poliquin is referring to page 204 of *Oh Canada! Oh Quebec!*, where Richler writes: “Then there was renewed squabbling over what would pass for the local wampum should Quebec separate”
you the context in which we all operate. So, now you have the full story of how it evolved, but I maintain my judgement on Mordecai: I don’t admire him as a writer. I admire much more Michael Ondaatje, some of Atwood and Munro and all that. But he is a lion for a lot of people, because he was accessible and they loved his privy humour and stuff like that. But to me, for instance, the novel by Leonard Cohen, *Beautiful Losers*, is a novel a thousand times better than everything Mordecai wrote in fiction. In *non-fiction*, he was great. He was a real polemist and he did what polemists usually do: they piss off people. And that was something that we were not used to at all in Canada. Such a small country, especially in Quebec. Either it’s going to be all hell breaking loose, or nothing at all. That’s the context in which I operated. [...] 

So, this is the environment in which we all work and live and all that, and it’s fun too. Some doors will slam on you. It will happen. I recall this restaurant with two guys there, and one of them walked out and said, “Well, he can’t stand you, like your ideas and whatnot.” Well, it’s all right. And one Quebec writer once told me, you are Franco-Ontarian, you can say things like that. You can write *Le roman colonial*. He said, “I couldn’t do that.” I asked, “What would happen to you if you expressed your thoughts, your inner thoughts about literature and all that?” “Ah, mais je perdrais ma place au restaurant. Des gens, ils voudraient plus s’asseoir avec moi.” And then I was thing about these Algerian thinkers and journalists who are getting their throats slit. This is the danger we have here. It’s not bad at all. Or Rwanda, they all got killed. But here, you know, if the waiter is not smiling at you, well, big deal. That shows you how much of a village we live in. Any more questions?

**JM:** Well, I was actually just wondering whether you have contact information for André Beaudet? I was wondering if I could talk to him about some of their goals when they were publishing, although you answered quite a few of the questions I was thinking of asking him anyway, so if you don’t have contact information for him, it’s not--

**DP:** I don’t know what happened to Balzac. Do you know?

**JM:** I was looking into it, and it looked as though they had been bought by a French publishing house. And that they were now based in France.

**DP:** No.

[...]

**DP:** I think they’re out of business.

[...]  

**JM:** So, six weeks to translate it.

**DP:** Yes, it took me six weeks to translate it and another three weeks for revisions and whatnot. But so, I would say to Balzac, listen, try to find anyone in this country to get you to that result right away. And of course, even if you had a long time, [like] when I did Jean Chrétien last year for Boréal, you need help. You always do. And on the English side, it’s even fiercer. The hand of
the editor is much heavier. And, but [Les Éditions Balzac] had no experience, I guess, with translation. They expected a perfect translation coming out in six weeks, and that’s impossible. Then you will have mistakes like the wampum. But then, look at the number of words and the number of mistakes you found, and the average is pretty good. [...] 

JM: That’s right, because this was one of the first books they published, wasn’t it, Les Éditions Balzac?

DP: Yes.

JM: Ok.

DP: I thought it was a good gamble. The other publishers, for instance, would not have taken the gamble to publish that in the fall. In ‘92. Because most of them have some sort of programming for this year, and the other year and all that. And they’re not like the French—equipped to work very fast. The French, what they will do is—for instance, with the Harry Potter books—they will hire 25 translators and make them work [in] slave-like conditions and they will produce the book. We don’t do that here. So, it’s a different technique. That’s why they didn’t translate it. I’m very surprised every time to see Bill Clinton’s autobiography coming out three months after. Why’s that? Well, because they have teams. And they have one reviser who will polish the whole thing, and they don’t care about mistakes. C’est pas grave, ça. Non, non, c’est pas grave. And that’s why you will see the député d’Indiana, plus tard le représentant. You wonder what happens. The reviser didn’t do his job, so they have less stringent conditions, or less stringent requirements when it comes to the quality of translation. And they pooh-pooh us all the time. They say we’re no good. It’s the amount of competition, and there’s nothing fiercer than intra-linguistic competition. They’re very tough.
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This interview was conducted between June and August 2008, via email. The following is a revised and edited collection of the questions and responses exchanged during this interview.

Question 1:
I was hoping to start with a bit of background information about you as a translator, as I have been unable to find very many details about you either online or in your other translations. Attached is a PDF file with a list of works I found in various library catalogues. I think you translated all these works, and possibly authored one of them, but I wanted to double-check with you before mentioning them in my thesis. If you would like to add any other works to the list, please let me know.

In this same vein, I am also interested in where you grew up and what your background in translation is. Judging by the number of translations you published in the 1970s and 1980s, translation seems to have been your primary career at this time. Is this the case? Is there a reason you chose to translate non-fiction texts instead of fiction? In general, is there a particular reason why you choose your translation projects? For example, did you actively choose works with a political stance you supported, works with a theme you found particularly interesting, or works by a particular author (e.g. Henri Troyat)? Or did your reasons vary from project to project? I am interested in anything you would like to share.

Question 1: Response from Joan Pinkham

I’ll start by sending you my résumé, which will give you the basic information you want.

* * * *

[Excerpts from Joan Pinkham’s résumé]

Experience
Teacher of editing to Indian speakers of English (3 semesters, 2001-2003)

Taught a course at Asian College of Journalism in Chennai, India, critiquing articles published in the Indian press. Goal was to help graduate students increase their mastery of English grammar, usage, and style.


Wrote The Translator’s Guide to Chinglish, a 561-page textbook (in English) designed to help Chinese translators and advanced students perfect their English. Book was written with the collaboration of Jiang Guihua, the retired Chief of the English Section at the Central Translation Bureau in Beijing, and was published by Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, the leading Chinese university press.
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Editor of translations from Chinese to English (8 years during period 1979 - 1994)

Worked as “foreign expert” in Beijing, revising drafts of English translations prepared by Chinese translators, first with Foreign Languages Press, then with Central Translation Bureau.

- English-language reviser for *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping* (3 volumes), *Selected Works of Chen Yun* (2 volumes), and other speeches and writings by leading figures in government (Beijing, Foreign Languages Press, 1984 - 1997)

- English-language reviser for Deng Xiaoping, a photo album and biography, limited edition of 10,000 (Beijing, Central Party Literature Publishing House, 1988)

- Responsible for editing and adapting for Western readers English version of *The Roof of the World: Exploring the Mysteries of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau*, by Zhang Mingtiao and other members of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (a joint venture of Foreign Languages Press, Beijing, and Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1982)

- Member of international team assembled to translate into English Volume I of the *Selected Works of Zhou Enlai* (Beijing, Foreign Languages Press, 1981)

Translator from French to English (1965 - present)

*Flaubert*, by Henri Troyat (Member of the Académie française): New York, Viking Penguin, 1992

*Peter the Great*, by Henri Troyat: New York, E. P. Dutton, 1987
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Various magazine articles: Monthly Review, 1965 - present

Bilingual secretary (English/French) (1952 - 1961)

At United Nations, New York, chiefly in Liaison Office of World Health Organization. Duties included both oral and written work in French and frequent translation from French to English.

Education

M.A. (French), Middlebury College, 1952 (including graduate study at University of Paris [Sorbonne] on Fulbright Fellowship, 1950 - 1951)

B.A. (French), Barnard College, 1950 (magna cum laude, Phi Beta Kappa, awarded French Club Scholarship for summer travel to France after graduation)

Travel

France (many visits, including a 14-month residence)
Italy, Netherlands, Germany, USSR, Denmark, England, Scotland
China, Japan, Thailand, India, Malaysia, Australia
Canada, Mexico, Nicaragua, Virgin Islands

* * *

Now to turn to your specific questions:

1. List of works

Please note that the list you were able to put together is not entirely accurate. A corrected an expanded list appears in the résumé above.

2. My background in translation

Since you ask, I grew up in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., because my father was a government official. My mother (Anne Terry White) was a prolific and acclaimed writer of non-
fiction books for children. She taught her daughters the love of literature and a curiosity about words, and throughout their childhood she provided them with the constant and fascinating sound of an Underwood standard typewriter.

As you will see from the résumé, I studied French in college and graduate school (including in Paris) and had the good fortune to improve my knowledge of the language during ten years as a bilingual secretary at United Nations, where I worked for and with French staff members.

As a translator, I am basically self-taught. At the time I was in school, there were no official academic programmes in translation in the U.S. (or none that I was aware of). Courses at the British Institute in Paris and at Middlebury College in Vermont -- they were called "Stylistics" -- were invaluable but insufficient for my purposes. So I studied on my own, reading such books as I could find, preparing translations of Maupassant and comparing mine to the many different printed versions, learning much from the bilingual documents that constantly came across my desk at UN.

3. My career

In the course of my ten years at United Nations I did quite a bit of informal translation from F to E but soon gave up my ambition of becoming an official translator. I don’t know whether my French would have been good enough for the job, but proficiency in a third language was required, and it would have taken too much time and effort to bring my feeble Spanish to the required level. (It turned out that I had an increasingly responsible and interesting job as a bilingual secretary with WHO, and I never regretted having abandoned the other possibility.)

It was only after I left United Nations and began raising children that I started translating for publication. That was owing solely to a stroke of good luck: I was friends with the founding editors of the independent socialist magazine Monthly Review (Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy), and it was they who asked me if I could translate an article for them. I did, they loved my work, and that led to other articles and to my first three books: the Nizan, White Niggers, and the Césaire, all published by MR Press.

These assignments all came to me unsolicited, but when MR had nothing more for me to do, I had to hustle jobs. Making the rounds of the New York publishing houses, I eventually got contracts for the next couple of books (Goldman, Israël) and then for Troyat’s Catherine the Great. Dutton liked my work, as did Troyat, so I went on to do everything else of his that Dutton took on.

Then, as you will see from the résumé, nothing. To the extent that I had a career and my name was known to a number of editors in New York, that career and those connections were interrupted by my eight years in China (whither I first went in 1979 because my husband had been invited there to teach journalism). I’ve done other things since our final return from China in 1994, but they haven’t included the daunting task -- résumés, letters, cold calls to editors, job-hunting safaris -- of trying to re-establish a career as a translator.
4. My choice of projects

I never chose my projects, except in the sense that I could have rejected them when offered. I was hungry for work and would have accepted anything that I didn’t think was actually pernicious. (I seem to remember that I did that once, with Viking, but perhaps I was not dealing with a firm offer.)

Fortunately, I had total confidence in the MR editors and was proud and happy to undertake the jobs they proposed. I felt that this work constituted my small contribution to the propagation of ideas that I believed in. . . my justification for being, as Sartre says somewhere in the introduction to Nizan. I felt an affinity for Pierre Goldman, and was more than pleased to do Dr. Lucien Israël’s fine book on cancer. As for the Troyat books, although they were not political, I thought they were good and marvelously well written. They were a pleasure to work on.

Fiction would have been harder than non-fiction, but I would have cheerfully attempted it if any had been proposed.

5. Typical aspects of my career

You didn’t specifically ask about this, but your questions suggest that you may be interested in the following more general comments about the profession.

Unless circumstances have changed for the better in the past twenty years since I was active in the field -- and I believe they have changed for the worse -- literary translation is not a "career" in the United States.

Technical translation, for staff members of international organizations and for inkstained wretches hired and exploited by commercial agencies, has always been a career. There may also be professional literary translators in the U.S. who make a living as such, but I have never met one (e.g. at a conference), or even read about one.

The distinguished translators who introduce the new works from Latin America or Europe, and whose names guarantee reviews, all seem to be academics, writers, lecturers in their own right. Presumably, they have separate sources of income. And no doubt the most celebrated ones command a part interest in the books they translate.

In this regard, my own experience is probably typical. That is, my work was subsidized by another source of income -- not mine, as it happens, but my husband’s (he was a university faculty member). Even in the years when I was working full time, the income I earned was dérisoire in terms of the hours of skilled labor required to secure it, and I could not have supported myself in that way. Possibly in Canada, which is an officially bilingual country, the conditions of employment for translators are better.

Once, when I was doing the Troyat books for Dutton, I complained to my editor there about my rate of pay (a flat fee at the time; later I insisted on royalties). I was told that a certain literary
agent, who was then the "gatekeeper" of foreign works brought into this country, negotiated the contracts with the French publishers even before the rights were sold to an American house, and that it was to him that I must apply if I objected to the terms. I made bold to write to this agent. Making the case that the work of the translator was fundamental to the success of the imported work, I asked if it was not reasonable for him or her to expect a greater share of the benefits. The Great Man’s assistant replied that the translator’s case did not merit special consideration: after all, the jacket designer likewise thought he deserved a larger share.

That experience was consistent with what I had found to be the general level of respect accorded a translator. At the time -- the situation may have somewhat improved by now-- most reviews of translated books never mentioned the work of the translator, for good or ill. Often, indeed, one would never have known that the book had been originally written in another language.

Nor is the translator necessarily respected by the publisher. In dealing with one of the biggest houses, I repeatedly had to wait months for replies to correspondence and even came to the point of considering legal action before I was paid what was owed me for completed work.

6. Why I translate

Despite these grievances, I have continued to translate so long as I could get jobs. Because I love the work. Because I believe in my authors. Because once every few years a reviewer or an editor praises my work. Because some of my authors --Amin, Vallières, Goldman, Israël, Troyat -- kindly answer my queries, thank me for my collaboration, and tell me that they prize what I have done for them.

For example, I was touched and honored by the note that Pierre Vallières, whom I had the great pleasure of meeting at last in Quebec in the summer of 1971, inscribed on the flyleaf of my copy of the English book:

A Joan Pinkham, pour son travail extraordinaire et sa profonde amitié, je dis ma plus sincère estime, ma grande admiration et mon amitié indéfectible. Vive le Québec libre! Vive la révolution mondiale! Nous vaincrons! Pierre Vallières 29-7-71.

Question 2:

You have partially addressed this question when you discussed your reasons for translating in general. I know that you did not specifically choose to translate _Nègres blancs d’Amérique_, since it was the publisher who approached you rather than vice versa. However, you mentioned that you translated for Monthly Review Press because you believed in the authors and felt that translation was one way of helping to make available ideas that you supported. So, was there a particular reason you agreed to translate _Nègres blancs d’Amérique_ into English? By this, I mean is there a certain aspect of the book that appealed to you or did you feel a particular
affinity for the author? Did the political atmosphere at the time (Vallières’ hunger strike, his arrest outside the United Nations, his trial in Canada) affect your decision?

**Question 2: Response from Joan Pinkham**

This is hard because I don’t even have *Nègres blancs* with me here in Hawaii to refresh my memory.

What I can tell you is that even before I read the book I was eager to translate it because it came to me from my friends at Monthly Review. As you will note from my résumé, I had already done several magazine articles for them and the books by Nizan and Sartre, both of which I thought very fine and was proud to make available in English. So I trusted their judgment. As I recall, my only hesitation -- and this question will no doubt come up later -- was whether, without any relevant cultural or linguistic background, I was capable of doing a good job with a Canadian book.

Perhaps I should explain that Monthly Review and its press was then (and is now, to a lesser extent) not just a magazine but a remarkable institution on the Left. Founded in 1948 by the experienced writer and teacher Leo Huberman and the brilliant Marxist economist Paul Sweezy, throughout the fifties and sixties -- a very tough time in the States for progressive thinkers -- it was an exceptional source of insightful, non-doctrinaire analysis of public events from a socialist point of view. I might add that it was written and edited for educated but not specialist readers, so that it could be understood even by people like me, who had little knowledge about economics and less about Marxism.

After Leo Huberman’s untimely death in 1968, Paul Sweezy was joined by two other outstanding editors, Harry Magoff and Harry Braverman. Under their leadership the magazine and the press continued to be an unfailing source of education and inspiration to people trying to understand the world they lived in and to conceive of a better one.

At different times the magazine came out in several foreign-language editions. A marginal publication at home in terms of readership, it nevertheless had an international reputation. During travels many years after the period when I was working for MR, I have met people from England, China, India, Nepal, and Peru who knew the magazine and slipped easily into conversations about the editors and authors.

I have since learned that Pierre Vallières and the people at Parti Pris read the magazine, or at least were aware of it. Apparently, MR Press’s early bid to translate the book was quickly accepted because of their sympathetic outlook. (I often wondered why it had not been picked up at once by some Canadian house, as it was later.)

If I have carried on about MR and MR Press, it is because my admiration and affection for the editors, and for the circle of friends who were more or less associated with them, was the basic reason for my eager acceptance of the translation. Then, when I read the book, I was delighted with the author. I particularly liked the early autobiographical chapters. I do remember thinking that a large portion of the book -- a section on politics and philosophy -- was tedious, heavy-handed, and ill-fitting; fortunately, Vallières himself suggested that it be omitted in the English
version.

Since you ask, the political atmosphere in Canada at the time scarcely affected my decision, because I knew nothing much about it. (Of course, I was well aware of the repressive atmosphere in my own country.) I learned of PV’s hunger strike, arrest, and trial -- was the trial included? -- only from the book itself. His courage and commitment were evident from the rest, and in any event, I would have wanted to be his English voice.

**Question 3:**

[Note: The translation of *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* was originally published in 1971 by New York-based Monthly Review Press, but it was republished that same year by the Canadian publisher McClelland and Stewart.]

Did you know when you were preparing your translation that it would be published in Canada as well as the United States? Did you write your translation specifically for an American audience or were you trying to reach a general North American audience?

**Question 3: Response from Joan Pinkham**

No, when I was working on the translation I didn’t know it was going to be published in Canada. In fact, I don’t think that arrangement was made until after the E edition came out in the U.S. You could verify the dates of publication.

Incidentally, it now comes back to me that at the time I was annoyed (euphemism) that although the author, the U.S. publisher, and the Canadian publisher profited from the agreement, there was no additional compensation for Trans. No doubt the rights belonged to MR and the sale of them did not concern me. That’s just by the way.

To return to your question: Even if I had known in advance about potential publication in Canada, it wouldn’t have made any difference to me technically. That is, I have never directed my translation of any book to any particular audience, in the States, Canada, or UK. I write the kind of English I write (which is, I guess, American) and have never considered whether it was appropriate for one place or another. For example, I use the American spelling that comes naturally to me.

My chief concerns, then as always, were to be as faithful as I could to the content and tone of the original and to write decent E that didn’t sound as if it had been done out of the French. At the same time, since this was a first-person narrative, to use neutral expressions (especially for slang) that would not jump off the page as being American, thus making the reader suddenly aware that it was not a Québécois speaking. (By the same token, later I tried to make sure that the young Catherine the Great [in Pinkham’s 1980 translation of Henri Troyat] didn’t sound like an American teenager.)

I guess, come to think of it, that I did have an American audience in mind, since I believe I added some explanatory footnotes -- about joual, say, or some historical event -- that would have been unnecessary in Canada. But that notion didn’t affect the trans. itself. That is, I don’t know what I would have done differently if I had been deliberately trying to reach “a general
North American audience.”

I do remember constant correspondence with my absolutely bilingual Canadian consultant over whether to use one term or another. Almost always that was because I wanted him to check my interpretation of the French. But occasionally I would ask him what an English Canadian would say in such-and-such a case.

The only instance that sticks in my mind had to do with organizing fellow union members to get rid of do-nothing officers. I don’t remember the French, but the text was approximately: “Let’s get the (1) __________ together and throw the (2) __________ out.” Fill in the blanks. (1) The boys, the lads, the guys, the men? (2) The old ladies, the old farts, the mossbacks, other alternatives? I liked "lads" for its warmth but was afraid it might sound too British. Can’t remember what I wound up with, but I do remember that we agreed it didn’t really matter what an E-Canadian would have said bec. I wasn’t pretending to have an E-Canadian voice.

Once again I am writing at night after a long day’s work on my own book, and I can’t take time to revise this into a more concise and coherent reply. If the above doesn’t answer your question, just let me know and I’ll try again.

**Question 4:**

In some of your previous emails, including your response to the last question, you mentioned that you worked with a bilingual Canadian consultant while translating *Nègres blancs*. Could you tell me a little about him or her, such as where (s)he lived and what (s)he did for a living? I am interested in anything you think is relevant.

**Question 4: Response from Joan Pinkham**

As soon as I read the book I knew that I couldn’t do a creditable trans. without help. I would need to be able to consult someone who knew Québécois French and who could enlighten me about the many historical and cultural allusions.

My first thought was to get in touch with the author, but as I recall, he was in jail at the time and correspondence was not easy. So I told Harry Braverman, then editor of MR Press, no consultant, no translation. Harry said no problem, we have your consultant. And early in 1970 he put me onto Malcolm Reid.

Malcolm was an English-Canadian writer in Québec -- I can’t remember what he was doing there at the time, probably working as a journalist -- who turned out to be exactly the person I needed.

I cannot praise Malcolm enough. In the end, I sent him pages upon pages of draft trans. -- there was no email then, so this was all typescript – with countless questions about cultural references, local language, and my interpretation of the French. He sent my stuff back copiously annotated in red handwriting, with detailed comments and charming illustrative drawings in the margins.
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He answered all my queries and more. He explained words that were allegedly French but not to be found in any of my dictionaries, chose between alternative English versions I proposed, suggested others, and corrected my misunderstandings. He identified political figures on the Canadian scene, introduced me to literary personalities that were mentioned, and generally filled in all that cultural background which I lacked and without which the most skilled translator is only a hack. I could not have had a more knowledgeable or more obliging collaborator. We became good friends, although we did not meet until some years later.

You may be surprised that although Malcolm Reid made such an important contribution to the translation, there is no mention of him in the book. For once, this neglect was not the fault of the editor or publisher.

Toward the end of our work, in June of 1971, I sent Malcolm a proposed Translator’s Acknowledgment that I wanted to appear at the beginning of the book. I was certain that the Press would have no objection, but I wanted his permission to publish it. It was to read as follows:

I wish to cast blessings on Malcolm Reid of Quebec City, who read this book in manuscript, suggesting many judicious changes and providing a great part of the explanatory information that appears in the Translator’s footnotes.

His intimate knowledge of political life in Quebec, his mastery of both French and English and his comradely spirit in replying to questions have been my salvation on countless occasions.

To my surprise and distress, Malcolm replied in essence, thanks but no thanks. I don’t remember the details -- he probably gave none -- but it was just at the time of the kidnapping and murder of [Pierre Laporte], when nobody wanted to be officially associated with the FLQ. I was disappointed but by no means naïve, and I understood without elaboration that at that moment he might not wish to have his name associated with the book.

Since I have been in correspondence with you, I have written and phoned Malcolm to ask if I might now mention his name and perhaps put you onto him. As I anticipated, he replied that the situation had long since changed and that he no longer had any objection to being identified. Also, with his typical generosity, that he would be happy to respond to any questions you might wish to ask about the book or the times in which it was published.

Question 5
You’ve mentioned that Vallières himself suggested dropping a section on philosophy and politics, and I wanted to check with you which section this was. I’ve been comparing the 1969 version of Nègres blancs with the translation, and it seemed to me that the English translation was based on this revised edition rather than the earlier 1968 publication. From what I’ve noticed, the tables of contents for the 1969 French edition and the 1971 English translation are identical. Differences between the source and target texts were apparent only when I compared the translation to the 1968 edition. This earlier version contained four appendices, as well as a
text by Charles Gagnon, another by Vallières, and two chapters that were not included in the English edition, namely “Le temps de l’action III: L’action révolutionnaire” and “Le F.L.Q., and V.”

Since your translation included only the two previous “Le temps de l’action” sections—“L’apprentissage” and “Notre idéal”—I’ve been assuming that “Le temps de l’action III” was the section Vallières advised you not to translate, but I wanted to be sure.

Finally, I have always found an English translation for any passage I’ve read in the 1969 French ST, so I wondered whether any cuts—other than the omission of the section on politics and philosophy—were made to the translation. If so, do you remember the reasons why certain passages were omitted? And was your translation based on the 1969 revised edition of Nègres blancs, as I’ve surmised, or was there another source text?

**Question 5: Response from Joan Pinkham**

As you guessed, I’m going to have some trouble with your next question. At this point, you know more about the book in both languages than I do: I couldn’t name a single chapter. And I have no idea which version (1968 or 1969) was my source. Indeed, I don’t think I knew there were two Fr. editions.

Your research suggests that it was the revised or 1969 edition that I was given, but I can only check that at home. As for the long section that the author decided to omit from the E version, I’m at a loss there too. If it consists of the two chapters you mention, they would appear in the 1969 Fr. edition (as well as the 1968), and not in the E. Again, I can only check that at home by comparing the two books.... but then, you have apparently already done that.

So far as other cuts are concerned, I am almost certain there were none. I don’t believe the author volunteered any others, the editor would have had no reason to, and Trans. would not have presumed to omit anything without the permission of both. In any event, it would not have been a line or a paragraph or even a page --only a complete section, such as one or more of the appendices you mention. So it shouldn’t be hard to check by comparing the tables of contents of the two versions, 1969 and mine... which you have also already done. You might ask Malcolm if he recalls anything that was left out... though that was not his department.

Whatever cuts were made, I imagine there was correspondence about them between me and Harry Braverman. If I can find those ancient files again after I return home -- I dug them out of dead storage only in the flurry of departure for California and hope I left them in some logical place -- I will look through them for any mention of the subject.

[Update on August 11, 2008, once Pinkham had returned home:]

It seems that the question of cutting the original 1968 text had come up even before MR Press sent me a copy of it in September of that year. Their Reader’s Report had made the suggestion, describing certain sections as “tedious,” “wandering,” “repetitious,” and, indeed, “unreadable.” I agreed. But it emerges from the correspondence that the cuts—about 165 pages’ worth—were made a couple of months later, by the author himself, not at MR’s request but at the request of the publisher of a French edition in Paris (Maspero).
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Apparently Vallières suggested (or agreed) that we should use the same cuts for the English. Early in January of 1969 Parti Pris sent us another copy of the 1968 edition modified in the author’s own hand. That amended version became my “source text,” and I think it is identical to the one that appeared later in 1969 as Parti Pris’s “nouvelle édition revue et corrigée.”

The material cut from the 1968 edition was the last half of page 371 (starting with FN 22) through page 542, with the following exceptions:

- Page 397 (starting with old section 4) through page 401. This was retained and became section 7 of chapter 6.

- Pages 503-506. This part was also retained but retitled “en guise d'épilogue.”

I was also sent some additional material written by Vallières in February of 1969. This appears in the English as Chapter 7, “After the Trial,” (pages 258-278) and similarly in the revised (1969) French (pages 369-397).

The Table des matières, both for the English and for the revised French, was corrected to reflect these changes.

**Question 6:**

My final question is about ideology and translation, but again, you might not be able to answer it very well without a copy of the books. In my interview with a translator who wrote the French edition of a controversial English-language work on Quebec nationalism and independence, he noted that his own ideologies played a role in his translation on several occasions. For instance, the English author made disparaging remarks about several Quebec politicians, and the translator noted that his own antipathy for one of the politicians led him to “help” the author a bit when he translated these comments into French. (e.g. “small-town lawyer” in English became “small-time, small-town lawyer” in French). You may not be able to remember any examples now, but would you like to comment on how your own ideologies and the political atmosphere at the time of the translation may have affected the translation? Or did you feel that your own ideologies did not play a role in the translation process?

**Response from Joan Pinkham:**

To answer this one, I guess I need to explain my attitude about translation in general. I’ve been thinking about it off and on for the last couple of days, ever since I received your latest email.

In the first place, I wouldn’t undertake a trans. unless I admired the author and was in general sympathy with his or her views as they were revealed in the text. Otherwise, why spend all that time and energy propagating a text you didn’t believe in? (Surely not for the insulting pay.) That’s a basic rule that governs my work. I don’t know about other translators.

I’ve already talked about how I came to do Nègres blancs. For a non-political example, take
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Lucien Israël’s book on cancer. On first reading the work, I thought he was not only enormously capable but also modest, hopeful, and above all, humane. A privilege, says I to myself, for me to bring his knowledge and attitudes to an E-speaking audience. As for Henri Troyat, I thought he was a marvelous story-teller. But I guess I wouldn’t have done him either if I hadn’t liked his cool assessment of Catherine et al.

Once the decision is made to translate a book, my "ideologies" (plural?) play no role in my work. At least, so far as I am aware and so far as I intend. Still, it has to be recognized that especially with a political text, your sympathies, your background, and the vocabulary you pick up from your current reading in the target language ("the political atmosphere at the time") inevitably inspire your translation. I mean that these play a large part in determining the words and phrases that come to mind when you are translating. But that happens automatically and is not a deliberate intervention in the author’s text. Which I regard as impermissible. Apart from my private – I’d say moral, if I were not afraid of appearing pretentious -- convictions in this regard, I was trained in a rigorous school. In courses at the Institut britannique in Paris and at Middlebury Graduate School in Vermont, students were held to the strictest standards of fidelity to what you call the ST. Official translators and interpreters at United Nations when I was working there -- the best of the best -- were, I think, equally dedicated to rendering the original, period.

In the example you give, I can’t think what the Fr. equivalents might be (would be curious to know). But to translate E "small-town lawyer" into Fr. "small-time, small-town lawyer" would have been entirely unacceptable to my professors and probably to the UN pros as well. It may be a trivial addition, but to me it's a small betrayal of trust. Nobody asked the translator to "help" the author. Indeed, I am surprised that the translator you cite defended his intrusion at this and apparently other points.

As I see it, the translator’s task is to correctly perceive the author’s meaning, allusions, literary devices, tone -- all those things you (Julie) have no doubt been studying for years -- and to convert them all, as well as possible, into the target language. In principle your (my) opinions are irrelevant and should not affect the trans.

The poor author is, after all, dependent not just on our skill but on our honesty as well. He or she -- seldom bilingual, sometimes dead -- usually can’t, or anyway doesn’t, read our work to check what we may have added or subtracted. Which ideally, in my opinion, would be zero, if such a thing were possible.

I take this stuff for granted. My loyalty as a translator goes first and always to my author. And to me, the rules of the game are clear and simple. If it’s in the original, you have to try to convey it in the translation. If it’s not in the original, you have no right to put it into your version. That’s my conception of fidelity. Pas compliqué.

**Question 7:**

As my last question, I was wondering how much time you had to do the translation. During my interview with the other translator, I was surprised to learn that he had to translate the entire 250-page book in six weeks, with three weeks for revisions, and I wondered about your time
frame. I assume you had a longer period in which to translate the book, as the written correspondence between you and Malcolm Reid would have taken some time, and the translation itself appeared two years after the French version—unlike my other case study, where both the English and French versions were published in 1992.

**Response from Joan Pinkham:**
According to my notes and the correspondence, I started working on the trans. in November of 1968 and submitted it early in August of 1970. I was not able to work full-time on the project, because I had small children at home then and precious few hours to myself. I also remember that the winter of 68-69 was a particularly difficult one for me, with illness and death in the family, so that I lost at least two months of work time. Nevertheless, by the end of that first year (November 1969) I had completed a second—normally final—draft.

But there was still to come the very detailed and all-important consultation with Malcolm. That began only in February of 1970, after attempted correspondence with the author and several other potential consultants. Then another complete retyping.

We were all aware, of course, that the book had an element of timeliness that was important, but the MR folk trusted me to work as fast as I could and did not press me with a deadline. They apparently had a heavy publishing schedule anyway.
**APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW WITH MALCOLM REID, CONSULTANT ON THE NÈGRES BLANCS D’AMÉRIQUE**

**TRANSLATION**

In August 2008, I corresponded with Malcom Reid about his role in the translation of *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*. What follows are his responses to my questions, which were in his August 5th, 2008 letter, as well as excerpts from two letters dated August 4th, 2008.

**Letter of August 5th, 2008**

**Question 1:**
How did you come to be the consultant for the English translation of *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*?

**Response from Malcolm Reid:**
I helped Joan Pinkham because Monthly Review asked me to.

**Question 2:**
What motivated you to act as a consultant for Joan Pinkham on this project?

**Response from Malcolm Reid:**
For me, the pay-off was a friendship with an unusual American family. The translation was Joan’s, the judgement at work was hers. My contribution was modest. But perhaps it was reassuring for her to have me there to ask things of.249

**Question 3:**
What did your role as a consultant involve?

**Response from Malcolm Reid:**

249 On August 16th, Joan Pinkham wrote to me about Malcolm Reid's responses, as he had forwarded her a copy of his letter. She noted that Malcolm Reid deserves more credit for his collaboration than he gives himself here. According to Pinkham:

I must repeat, though, that his contribution to the trans. was crucial. He is modest and has anyway forgotten.

I have just been reviewing some of our correspondence: the xeroxed ms. pages I sent him, typewritten queries from me relating to almost every page, handwritten responses in red from him explaining an allusion, approving or altering an interpretation, selecting one E version over a proposed alternative.

Yes, as Malcolm says, the trans. was mine and the ‘judgement at work’ was mine. But it is thanks to him that I felt absolutely confident of my work when I submitted it to MR. And it is surely thanks to him (see Harry Braverman's letter to New Canada) that Laurier LaPierre approved the trans. by a U.S. translator.
I answered her questions. I can’t remember them now, nor my answers. But it seems to me they were mostly about Canadian history. And about one other important thing: the feelings of French-English relations in Canada. What I thought gnawed at each group’s soul. (These feelings have changed a lot, haven’t they, Julie?)

**Question 4:**
What were your reasons for remaining anonymous when the translation was published in 1971? I imagine the recent October Crisis had a significant effect on your decision—was this the case? Were other factors involved as well?

**Response from Malcolm Reid:**
That I turned down a mention by Joan Pinkham is not something that stuck in my memory. But yes, it was the October Crisis that was my reason. Fear was in the air. (All gone now...).

**Question 5:**
Can you think of any ways in which the political situation in the early 1970s affected your decisions or the advice you gave regarding the translation?

**Response from Malcolm Reid:**
For me the importance of translating the *Nègres blancs* was making it available to the English-Canadian left, which I hoped would draw inspiration from Quebec culture. Would get in on the fun. Also, it was to put Quebec on the world map of lefts. Every culture has its own style of rebellion, I believe, its own style of yearning for social justice.

---

**Excerpts from Malcolm Reid’s first letter of August 4th, 2008**

[...]

What essence is *Nègres blancs*?

It’s the essence of radicalism, it is hardcore. I’m doing some guesswork here. (Deciding where I’m right and wrong in my guesses will help you here, I think). Vallières is a separatist, but to this widely-held position he adds extremizing things. He adds socialism, he adds Marxism. Socialism seems to interest you here as a deep-red extremizer of Pierre’s nationalism. He’s more of an enragé than say, Bourgault, than say, Lévesque. Perhaps his version of things scares anglophones more? Or perhaps it appeals to them more, having more echoes of universality. Or perhaps it seems less sleek, more integrity-filled?

Pierre’s book has a deep anger to it, which comes from his childhood in poverty. This is deeper than the ordinary indignation of a politician, arguing a case, arguing against the opposed case. (Bourgault, say, or Lévesque, even). And finally, his book is only superficially a book of arguments. More fully, it is a “confession d’un enfant du siècle,” it is a work of art.

Mordecai’s case is a bit different, I think. English Canada is not a people in revolt, like the Québécois. We don’t look to its spokesman for an extreme book, a knife-blade of a book. We’re looking instead for a voice that is characteristic of the people spoken for, we’re looking for an average-guy kind of voice.

Well, Julie, I haven’t read *Oh Canada!*, I can’t speak of it. May I speak instead of the figure Mordecai cuts? I’ve read several of his novels, I’ve read him for years, since before I
was learning French and taking an interest in Quebec. I’ve often read his journalistic pieces on the Quebec situation, too. I tend to chuckle at them (rather than getting hopping mad, like my wife Réjeanne), for I love Richler’s work.

What essence does Mordecai offer?

I’d say he’s the essence of older-generation wariness of French Canada. He knows there’s been a Quiet Revolution. Yeah... but has everything really changed? On the matter of anti-Jewish prejudices, for example? He doesn’t trouble to hide that much of his childhood disdain for the French persists in him. He’s not ashamed of it. It springs from his suffering.

And so it ends up as if he were expressive of, say, backlash feeling out across the Canadian West. But there is a twist. He’s not an Alberta farmer, he’s a Montreal Jewish intellectual. He mocks the Christian right, too. “Jake was a liberal,” he says in Saint Urbain’s Horseman, and mightn’t Jake Hersh be a pretty close approximation of Mordecai? The ethos of Montreal Jewish intellectual life is its leftism, its reformism, its socially prophetic tone. Mordecai benefits from this, leans on it. He asks if it isn’t the Québécois who have a few things to be ashamed of. Fascist leanings? Just yesterday? The 30s, the 40s... But then he bounces back to a more conservative outlook. He is, I would say, very “English Canada” in his politics. Very cautious. He’s aware of social injustice, but wary, oh so wary, of changing things too much.

And he’s an artist. A poet, even. He’s loved. He’s average in views, but extraordinary in talent. Even before he wrote his first thinkpiece, he already had a name, because of Duddy; lively, lovable, hateable Duddy! And so his presenting of these cautious views will be lyrical, witty, humane. Not to be charged with stodginess.

When he died, and the Globe and Mail put the story as its front-page-headline story, I said to myself: “This is the first time I’ve seen English-Canada feeling itself reflected in a culture hero. His death is not cultural news, but NEWS period. (Like Félix Leclerc’s here).

Now: my work, dear colleague.

I’m gratified that you know it, are reading it. You’ve found my Quebec Sketch Book columns in Canadian Dimension? Amazing.

I took The Shouting Signpainters to Monthly Review Press before I knew that they were involved with Vallières. I worked on the manuscript with Susan Lowes, one of their editors, and a fine editor she was. She became a friend: not quite as great a friend as Joan Pinkham, but the relationship was warm. Réjeanne and I visited her family in Brooklyn. The Signpainters were published in Canada by McClelland & Stewart, in a deal with MR, and exactly as edited and polished by MR. M&S are a grand publishing house, I admire Jack McClelland, but the link wasn’t necessarily as warm with his people as it was with the folks on Fourteenth Street in Greenwich Village. The book never counted as much to them.

I don’t consider my book is really connected with Nègres blancs. It touches on the FLQ, but is about another group, an out-in-the-open group, which I could get to know, hang out with. And what drew me to parti pris was that they were artists, creative people. They blended politics and art. They were not all-out politicos like Vallières. They were a counterculture, and I was trying to say what kind of a counterculture they were.

[...]

**Excerpts from Malcolm Reid’s second letter of August 4th, 2008**

I published the Shouting Signpainters three decades ago, and it’s been around, all that time, part of Quebec-Canada studies. I guess it’s had quite a few francophone readers... but
despite my efforts earlier on, it’s never been available in the language of its protagonists.

Now it will be!

*The Shouting Signpainters* are becoming “Notre parti est pris...” The Presses de l’Université Laval will publish them at the end of this year. My translator is Héloïse Duhaime—you may meet her some day, she’s also studying *traductologie*.

Héloïse and I owe much to Sherry Simon, who wrote a commemorative piece on my book, and revived interest in it. Léo Jacques at the Presses read it; his interest was kindled. It was a rave, I was surprised by it, touched. The book had marked her youth, she said.

Her essay appers in her book *Translating Montreal*.

I’m also illustrating the book *Translating Montreal*. I’m asking the historian Jean Provencher to preface it. For now, *parti pris* is a part of history.

[...]

And now here’s my thought about the Monthly Review Press. Perhaps you already know all the things I’m going to say... but I wanted to say them anyway, just in case.

Monthly Review Press has such a plain and colorless name. But in the sixties, it was Something!

It was the scholarly voice of socialist revolution in American culture. “The university press of the left.” Especially the revolution against U.S. domination of Latin America. The book-translated -from-the-Spanish was the characteristic MR book. Monthly Review began as a magazine in the fifties, and established then that you could be Marxist without being aligned as pro-Soviet. It pulled Marx away somewhat from Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, Trotsky, even Mao. Marx was a Western European, his ideas had been strong in the West, even in the U.S.A., already in 1900. That was MR’s message. That was its way of finesse-ing the Cold War, of surviving McCarthyism. Einstein wrote a famous essay for it, saying socialism was the great question of the age. MR’s books also said, more and more, that culture, and tradition, and ethnicity, were as important in changing the world as economics and military doings. They developed the idea of the Third World. Only on the issues of feminism and sexuality was MR a little slow. Otherwise, it was busy helping with the founding of what was coming to be called the New Left. (Both magazine and publishing house are still going strong.)

Because of all this, it was admired by Pierre Vallières and other open-minded young leftists in the West. That MR should see Pierre as worthy of inclusion in its concert of voices from cultures around the world that needed socializing... this, I’m persuaded, was flattering for Pierre, exalting for him.

I knew Pierre Vallières a little bit. We chatted when we ran into each other. Pierre was very open and friendly to me. We never talked systematically, though, as in an interview; so I don’t have these things from his mouth. I’m constructing my picture from my sense of him, and also from my sense of Monthly Review. Other things might be cited in the story of how the *Nègres blancs* came to be translated in the United States, but I feel this was the basic one. Pierre must have had the say on to whom his book was to be sold for English translation... and Monthly Review had won his approval. There was, I’d say, an MR mystique.

Joan as translator, me as advisor, we flowed and followed from this. Monthly Review had an equivalent in France, and that was François Maspero. So let’s say the MR-FM mystique. Pierre had been educated by this mystique! He was part of it, it was part of him.

---

250 Note: this is the Paris publisher of *Nègres blancs d’Amérique*. 
Once Joan got the assignment, however, she had a big challenge. She took up the challenge magnificently, wouldn’t you say? And in the process she passed from being someone who knew little about Quebec, to being a friend of things Québécois for life. (You’ve discovered this, I’m sure.) This in spite of the fact that since the Nègres blancs era, she’s been busy with many other things. Travels to China, travels to India, travels around North America, all with her husband Larry, a journalism professor. And the raising of their kids.

I thought all this might help you, Julie.

Malcolm Reid.
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*Moreau, François. (1995). *Le Québec, une nation opprimée.* (Michel Mill, Trans.). Hull : Vents d’Ouest. [Note: The English source text for this work was never published, due to Moreau’s death. The French edition was translated based on Moreau’s unpublished manuscript].


*Scowen, Reed. (1999). *Le temps des adieux: plaideroy pour un Canada sans le Québec.* (Brigitte Chabert, Trans.). Montréal : VLB.


**ENGLISH-LANGUAGE COLLECTIONS**


Howard, Trans.). (Ramsey Cook & Michael Behiels, Eds.). Vancouver: Copp Clark.
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