

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI[®]

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600



Université d'Ottawa • University of Ottawa

**THE IMAGINED CANADIAN: REPRESENTATIONS OF WHITENESS IN
FLASHBACK CANADA**

by

Kenneth Edward Montgomery

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa

© Copyright by Kenneth Edward Montgomery 1999



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-38757-7

Canada

Abstract

This anti-racist study is one which critically investigates the representation of whiteness in a Canadian history textbook approved for use in Ontario's intermediate division schools. Fundamental to the study is the identification of racializations and the manner by which these representational processes work with and through concepts of nationality and ethnicity to separate whiteness from otherness. To facilitate this critical analysis, the historical narratives of the textbook are examined for redundant portrayals of individuals and groups in terms of their power, problem-resolution, and performance. In addition, the stories of Canada's past are analyzed to determine the extent to which diverse perspectives are included and the degree of significance attached to historic and contemporary racisms. The findings suggest that, in *Flashback Canada*, processes of racialization articulate with signifiers of ethnicity and nationality to imagine Canada and Canadians along white supremacist lines.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to a number of people who supported me in the research and writing of this thesis, while recognizing that any of its deficiencies are, of course, my responsibility alone.

First of all, thank you to committee member Dr. Sharon Cook for your perceptive and critical questioning which has enabled me to more fully comprehend the implications of my work for teachers and historians. Thank you as well for helping me to appreciate the salience of social and historical contexts as they relate to curricular production and analysis.

Thank you to committee member Dr. Judith Robertson for your provocative and revealing insights into the functions and effects of language, but most importantly for your invaluable assistance in shaping a methodological framework for this study. Your advice permitted me to transform a vague idea into a functional and worthy project.

To my thesis supervisor, Dr. Tim Stanley, I am tremendously grateful for your thoughtful direction and thoroughly constructive criticism. Over the past two years, and throughout numerous preceding drafts, you have guided me to formulate and sharpen the ideas now presented in finalized form. My thinking about racism has been deeply affected by your expertise, writings, and our conversations over this period. Consequently, you have profoundly influenced not only the course of my professional career, but also the ways I view the world and act within it. I am indebted to you for this most meaningful education.

I would also like to thank my parents, sisters, aunts, uncles, in-laws, and friends for your continued support and encouragement. Though the final written product bears my name, the motivation for the actual writing was provided by all of you.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Tomoko, for your intelligent questioning, patient listening, enduring self-sacrifice, and your inspirational enthusiasm for learning. It is beyond my capability to describe appropriately in either of our languages just how grateful I am, except to assert that this thesis is as much yours as it is mine. It is for this reason that you will find your name on the next page.

朋子に

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------------|--|------------|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| II. | Overview of Textbook Analyses and Textbook Representations..... | 19 |
| III. | Methodology..... | 44 |
| IV. | Discussion of Findings..... | 59 |
| | 1. <i>Imagining The Great White North</i>..... | 59 |
| | a) Exemplars of the Canadian Citizen..... | 59 |
| | (i) The British, Scottish, and English | 59 |
| | (ii) The ‘unmarked’ and Canadians..... | 72 |
| | b) Flawed but Compatible Canadian Citizens | 75 |
| | (i) The Irish..... | 76 |
| | (ii) The French..... | 78 |
| | (iii) The Americans | 83 |
| | c) Desirable New Canadian Citizens | 87 |
| | (i) The Icelanders..... | 87 |
| | (ii) The Ukrainians | 89 |
| | (iii) The Finnish..... | 91 |
| | (iv) The Mennonites..... | 91 |
| | d) ‘Seeing’ Whiteness..... | 92 |
| | 2. <i>Imagining The Other</i> | 101 |
| | a) The Métis | 101 |
| | b) The Chinese..... | 107 |
| | c) The Blacks..... | 110 |
| | d) The Natives | 112 |
| V. | Summary and Conclusions | 121 |
| VI. | References..... | 131 |

I. Introduction

This project involves a critical examination of the racializations contained within a secondary school Canadian history textbook entitled *Flashback Canada* (Cruyton & Wilson, 1994). The primary goal is to understand how the racialized concept of whiteness is represented in the textbook. It is my contention that too few studies dealing with representations in school history textbooks have interrogated whiteness as a category. I argue that through the historical narratives located in this history textbook approved for use in Ontario's public schools, whiteness can be viewed in relation to markers of nation, race, and ethnicity. With such a focus on whiteness, the project represents an "effort to avert the critical gaze from the racial[ized] object to the racial[ized] subject; from the described and imagined to the describers and imaginers; from the serving to the served" (Morrison, 1992, p.80).

This work is grounded in the theory and pedagogical principles of what has been termed both "anti-racism" (Dei, 1996a, 1996b; Thompson, 1997) and "critical multiculturalism" (Goldberg, 1994; McCarthy, 1994). I have chosen here to use "anti-racism" for purposes of uniformity, but also to highlight the significance of both 'race' and 'racisms' to this study.

The significance of race lies not in any scientific or natural reality of the concept. Physical or biological differences between groups commonly thought of as 'races' are inconsistent and empirically insignificant. Indeed, "the extent of genetic variation among individuals within supposed racial groups typically exceeds the variation between the groups" (Cornell & Hartmann, 1998, p.22-3. See also Miles, 1989). While differences certainly exist among humans, these differences form a continuum of gradual change and not sharply demarcated divisions. Furthermore, "No persuasive empirical case has been made for ascribing common psychological, intellectual or moral capacities or characteristics to individuals on the basis of skin colour or physiognomy" (Donald & Rattansi, 1992, p.1). Consequently, the idea of race as a product of natural or biological forces has been entirely dismissed by most contemporary scholars (e.g., Gould, 1996). Nevertheless, as a social 'reality', a product of human perception and classification, the concept of 'race' persists and has very real consequences for those either privileged or marginalized by their racial status. The significance of 'race' to this anti-racism

project, therefore, lies in the actual and potential 'effects' which arise from the use of the race concept.

Clearly, the act of dividing the human population into mutually exclusive groups called 'races' is, in itself, not enough to produce either negative or 'positive' consequences. Racial categorization is a fundamental pre-condition, however, if the problem is to be considered racist. Following Miles (1989), I will refer to this process of racial categorization as "racialization". Racializations are processes of representation through which mutually exclusive groups of the human population are imagined on the basis of real or putative difference(s) which is (are) assigned moral value.¹ Groups or 'races' have historically been socially imagined on the basis of phenotypical differences (e.g., skin colour), alleged psychological differences (e.g., intelligence), or on the basis of cultural characteristics such as language and religion. Precisely because 'races' are socially constructed, as opposed to natural divisions of the world's population, there are a multitude of ways in which the categories can potentially be established. What differentiates racializations from processes of mere descriptive categorization, however, is that racializations involve assigning characteristics with different moral weightings to the mutually exclusive groups and the individuals who comprise those groups. In this way, racializations produce a hierarchy of 'races' or categories of real "human bodies that are classified, ordered, valorized, and devalued" (Goldberg, 1993, p.54).

It must be noted that racializations are not in and of themselves racist. Racializations, imply a unity which can be used to affect positive and beneficial transformations in opposition to racisms (c.f., Goldberg, 1990, p.304). Nevertheless, because "ascribing a real or alleged ... characteristic with meaning to define the Other necessarily entails defining the Self by the same criterion" (Miles, 1989, p.75), racializations provide the defining boundaries by which exclusion of the other based on perceived differences from the self can be orchestrated. This exclusion of the other can take various forms including denial, alienation, disenfranchisement, restriction, and prohibition to entry, participation, or services (Goldberg, 1990, p.307). The interrogation of

¹ Although I prefer not to engage the question in this thesis. it seems to me that there is an argument to be made that sexism (both heterosexual and homosexual) require, as one of several preconditions, a process of racialization.

dominant racialized structures (e.g., whiteness in Canada) requires an understanding that racializations can also be used as 'objective' bases of *inclusion*. As such, they become grounds for entitlements, endowments, enfranchisement, and rights of accessibility to goods, opportunity or treatment (Goldberg, 1990, p.307).

Goldberg (1993, especially chapter 5) suggests that racisms can be thought of as racialized exclusions which produce negative, non-trivial effects for racialized groups. Disconnecting the inverse side of this exclusionary process from the definition of racisms is problematic. That is, to define racisms entirely on the basis of the racially excluded and the adverse consequences suffered by them conceals the fact of racial inclusion and the privilege associated with racisms. It allows for explicitly naming the racially excluded, but exempts the racially included from such direct identification. Exclusion and inclusion comprise different moments in the same act or process (Miles, 1989, p.78); thus to define one without mention of the other leaves the definition incomplete. Consequently, I would like to view racisms as dependent upon racialized exclusions *and* inclusions which result in *both* non-trivial negative consequences and non-trivial 'positive'² consequences for groups racialized respectively as excluded and included. This coupling of both sides of the exclusion/inclusion process to the definition of racisms permits the privileged and the marginalized to be studied in relation to one another. Such a requirement must be fulfilled since racisms (like other forms of social oppression) benefit some groups or individuals at the expense of others. Those individuals, groups, institutions, or processes privileged in some way by racisms must be set against those harmed by racisms in order to view both the privilege and the harm that much more lucidly. Indeed, when whiteness constitutes the privileged, this may be the only way to 'see' it.

There is no essentialized form of racism. Goldberg states, "There is no generic racism, only historically specific racisms each with their own sociotemporally specific causes. There is no single (set of) transcendental determinant(s) that inevitably causes the occurrence of racism[s] - be

² I use the term 'positive' warily. Since any benefit (i.e., positive effect) gained through a form of racism necessarily entails that others are affected negatively, and since all societal members are stakeholders in the relations of society, there really are no 'positive' effects of racisms. Furthermore, these 'positive' effects of racisms may be manifested simply as the lack of any negative effects. Put another way, privilege may arise merely through the absence of oppression.

it nature, or drive, or mode of production, or class formation” (1993, p.90). This supports Hall’s earlier claims (1980) that there have been multiple, “historically-specific racisms” in contrast to any “unitary, transhistorical or universal ‘structure’”, and that these racisms “articulate” differently with various social relations (p.336). Miles (1989) has also acknowledged that racisms “differ on a number of dimensions” including “the group identified as its object, the features signified, [and] the characteristics attributed to the group and negatively evaluated” (p. 84). There are racisms which are irrational and those which, under certain circumstances, may be rational (e.g., the planned selection of predominantly white jurors by prosecution lawyers in order to obtain a guilty verdict against a black defendant), though none are ever moral (Goldberg, 1990, p.297). There are racisms which produce horrific consequences for large segments of a population (e.g., slavery in the U.S.) and those which result in less severe (though negative and non-trivial) consequences for much smaller groups (e.g., RCMP officers denied permission to wear turbans). Additionally, racisms can also differ on the extent to which actions and consequences are intended. Although they may be intentionally malicious processes (e.g., ‘the Final Solution’ of Nazi Germany), they are not always or necessarily either malicious or intentional (Goldberg, 1993, p.102; Goldberg, 1990, p.296; Dei, 1996b, p.253; Miles, 1989, p.78). These multiple forms of racism lead Gilroy (1992) to state that “there can be so single or homogeneous strategy against racism because racism itself is never homogeneous” (p.60-61), a point echoed by Goldberg who writes, “There is no single explanation for racism for there is no single racism to be explained” (Goldberg, 1993, p.209).³ Challenging multiple (potentially infinite) racisms, therefore, requires an approach broad in scope and focus.

Conceptions of multicultural education such as those put forth by Baker (1983) and Lynch (1986) nevertheless tended to adhere to the notion of a singular racism, one resulting from ignorance and prejudiced attitudes about ‘other’ cultures. Seeking to change these attitudes and eliminate prejudice, the “educational prescription” included celebrations of diversity and a “curricular dose of knowledge about ‘other cultures’”(Rattansi, 1992, p.28). The work of Troyna

³ Psychoanalytic theories have, however, posited more uniform explanations of racisms as constituted in the dynamics of constructing the ‘self’. This point was brought to my attention by Dr. Judith Robertson.

and Hatcher (1992) suggests, however, that teaching about 'other cultures' may not have a significant impact on reducing prejudice or changing attitudes. Rattansi (1992) has further argued against multicultural assumptions "that individuals hold prejudiced views consistently and express them and act in accordance with them in a systematic and uncontradictory manner" (p.25).

According to Rattansi, these assumptions have tended to "essentialize the prejudiced teacher or student" (p.25), as well as the approach to 'curing' them of what is viewed chiefly as an irrational pathology (Rattansi, 1992). Moreover, Rattansi has argued that these overly simplified multicultural pedagogies have ignored the salience of historical change, geographical variation, context, and the relationship of racially prejudiced attitudes and practices with other forms of oppression including sexuality and class. Many of these same criticisms were extended to earlier conceptions of anti-racist education (e.g., Troyna, 1987) which confronted racist ideologies by targeting institutionalized practices of racism. Addressing forms of racism primarily as ideologies reduced racisms to a singular "form of false consciousness", and pitted a supposed rational pedagogy against an irrational racist subject (Rattansi, 1992, p.31; c.f., Goldberg, 1993, p.69). This narrow focus on ideology ignored the social consequences of race and racisms, those real effects on the bodies of real people which create "actual lived experiences of being violated, constrained, and dominated" (Dei, 1996a, p.28) or, conversely, of being the one who violates, constrains, and dominates. Gilroy (1992) also criticized these earlier forms of antiracism for their inclination to isolate race and racisms from "other political antagonisms" such as class, gender, and the nation and for their tendency to reduce antiracism to "nothing more than a response to racism" which essentialized racialized others as victims (p.60). These particular antiracist pedagogies would, for example, present non-white histories "primarily as narratives of resistance and struggle against racism" (Rattansi, 1992, p.33).

The more recent conceptions of anti-racism education (Donald and Rattansi, 1992; Dei, 1996a, 1996b; Thompson, 1997) and critical multicultural education (Goldberg, 1994; McCarthy, 1994), on the other hand, view multiple forms of racism as systemic and owing to unequal relations of power and, consequently, advocate critical investigation into how the unequal and institutionalized relations of power are created. Anti-racism and critical multicultural pedagogies

differ from 'non-racist' approaches in that the former are necessarily proactive, seeking transformative change to naturalized presumptions of privilege and power. The point is to problematize and reconstruct the 'obvious', to take essentialized and reduced notions of difference and examine how they frame racial categories and to see how these racial categories, in turn, contribute to the many historical and contemporary productions and reproductions of racisms. In this respect, anti-racism education is much more than a pedagogy of resistance to racisms. It is a pervasive process emphasizing the political nature of education and representing a quality pedagogy which cannot be reductively defined (Goldberg, 1994; see also Nieto, 1992, pp.207-224). The purpose of anti-racism education is to promote social justice for *all* students by assertively engaging with multiple sources of oppression including race, but also sexuality, gender, class, physical ability, national identity, ethnicity, and so forth.

By acknowledging the prominence of race and using it as the lens through which other sources of social oppression can be understood, a textbook study such as this one can meet one of the fundamental requirements of anti-racist pedagogy. That is, it can contribute to an understanding of the social effects of race by examining the intersections and articulations of race with other social relations (Dei, 1996a, pp.55-74; Dei, 1996b, p.256). To make the most significant contribution to anti-racist education, it is necessary to put racisms in the foreground and give them the central position in the subsequent analyses of intersecting oppressions (Dei, 1996a, pp.66-67). This is not to deny the worth of other studies (including history textbook analyses) which examine a different primary object (e.g. physical ability or gender), nor is it to deny the integral relationship of other forms of social oppression with anti-racist education. Rather, it is to emphasize the racialized nature of all social relations and the necessity to "consciously see or be made to see" the salience of race and racisms (c.f., Frankenburg, 1992, p.58).

This project is particularly concerned with how 'race' articulates and intersects with concepts of 'the nation' and 'ethnicity'. The three terms have at times been used interchangeably, or conflated as though instances of the same phenomena. Though they may function in similar ways, together, or one within another, they are not identical. Hall (1992), for one, argues that

ethnicity needs to be decoupled “from its equivalence with nationalism, imperialism, racism and the state” (p.257). Cornell and Hartmann (1998) point out that ethnicity and race sometimes overlap and that ethnicity and nationalism can be related, but that none of these concepts are the same. Goldberg (1993) claims close identification of race and ethnicity, insisting that they may at times be used synonymously, but that the two are not synonymous (p.77).

Having already discussed race, I would like here to illustrate what I understand to be the difference between the concepts of nation and ethnicity. I would also like to show how both, like race, can become racialized or act as racializations. I will begin with nations which, like races (and ethnicities for that matter), are not natural divisions of the human populations. Rather, nations are socially constructed systems of signification linked to “material arrangements of territory and resources” (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.139). While presently “nestled firmly in virtually all print-languages” and effectively “inseparable from political consciousness” (Anderson, 1991, p.135), the concept of nation has “a chartable history” which indicates that nations and nationalisms, like races and racisms, are “relatively modern phenomena” (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.139).

Anderson (1991) argues that the discourse of nation expresses a perception of “a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history”, acting within (or from) preordained or immutable frontiers and toward a common destiny (p.26). In so doing, it contrives and disseminates a conception of a ‘national character’, defining members of a nation (e.g., Canada) by a particular set of personality traits and attitudes thought to be shared commonly among people of the imagined community (Anderson, 1991; Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.141). Conversely of course, this allows for distinctions to be made with respect to others (e.g., Americans) who supposedly do not share this national (e.g., Canadian) character or temperament. In this way, the nation sets up imagined ‘boundaries’ which can serve as the basis for inclusion or exclusion, for defining individuals as belonging to the nation, foreign to it, or even as unwanted interlopers within it. These boundaries may also provide the benchmark for moral judgments of the other or a way to assign, on the basis of one’s perception of one’s own national identity, inferior or superior characteristics to those perceived to be or represent the essence of another

nation. Constructed frameworks “of rituals, icons, anthems and flags” (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.141) help to ‘naturalize’ these unnatural boundaries, solidifying the ground for towers of patriotism and pride to be erected. But xenophobia and overzealous devotion get built here too, and thus the consequences of such boundary formation are negative for some, positive for others, and consequently non-trivial. They may even be racist, though not necessarily recognized as such. Gilroy (1992) states,

[A new form of racism] links ‘race’ with nationhood, patriotism and nationalism ... [and] has taken a necessary distance from crude ideas of biological inferiority and superiority and now seeks to present an imaginary definition of the nation as a unified *cultural* community. It constructs and defends an image of national culture - homogeneous in its whiteness yet precarious and perpetually vulnerable to attack from enemies within and without. The analogy of war and invasion is increasingly used to make sense of events. (p.53, emphasis in original)

Although the construction of a nation is “typically based on real or assumed ethnic ties”, this is not necessarily the case (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998, p.36). Similarly, while ethnicities may become nationalist, they do not always. Nationalism “refers to the expressed desire of a people to establish and[/or] maintain a self-governing entity” and has as its core the themes of “autonomy, unity, and identity” of which autonomy “most clearly distinguishes nationalism from ethnicity” (Cornell and Hartmann, 1998, p.34-6; see also Anderson, 1991, especially ch.1).

Various forms of ethnicity are united as examples of the same phenomena by their reliance on three claims, none of which need be founded in ‘fact’: “a claim to kinship or common ancestry (e.g., descent from a common homeland); a claim to a shared historical past of some sort; and a claim that one or more cultural symbols capture the core of the group’s identity” (Cornell & Hartmann, 1998, p.19, following Schermerhorn, 1978). These symbolic elements might include real or perceived “kinship patterns, geographical concentration, religious affiliation, language, and physical difference” (Cornell & Hartmann, 1998, p.19). These authors also make clear that an ethnic group is self-consciously ethnic even if this self-consciousness has its source in outsiders. This self-conscious aspect of ethnicity is also evident in the writing Simon (1988) who defines ethnicity as:

An ideological and social construction which works as an active, ongoing process of identity production, in which one draws on the history one owns (materially organized and produced) to construct a position in subjectivity from which to understand oneself, although inevitably as the Other. (p.36)

More than a singular entity or a simple abstract category, *ethnicities* are concrete relations that have to do with “how people define themselves and how they participate in social life” (Ng, 1993, p.50, emphasis added). Ethnicities engage those differences and unequal experiences (based on other diverging and changing relations such as race, gender, nation, and class) which locate individuals in cultures, histories, and geographical places, but does so without necessarily containing them in those differences or inequalities (Hall, 1992). To put this differently, ethnicities are dynamic social constructions. There is nothing inherently ‘natural’ about them. The significance of ethnicities, however, is that they (like races and nations) can be perceived as natural, more or less set, divisions. They can then work as signifiers which organize how individuals understand the other, naturalizing boundaries, and creating ‘natural’ criteria for group membership (c.f., Goldberg , 1993, p.76).

The concepts of race, nation, and ethnicity refer to non-static social constructs which create boundaries between groups. These boundaries *can* be used to essentialize the other and the self in terms of moral worth by creating more or less mutually exclusive categories of supposed superior and inferior people. Whether or not any of the three concepts become racist, however, (i.e., racially include/exclude *and* produce non-trivial consequences) is a different, albeit related, matter. This project is not about identifying racisms *per se*; it is about identifying racializations, those preconditions for racisms manifested as mutually exclusive groups of people who are assigned inferior or superior status based on real or imagined difference.

I turn now to where I perceive this analysis of textbook racializations can make the most significant contribution to anti-racist pedagogy. Anti-racist education “questions White (male) power and privilege and the rationality for dominance in society” (Dei, 1996a, p.28). Thus, it is crucial to examine not only the racialized representations of oppressed groups, but also to “think about the invention of the category of whiteness” (Carby, 1992, p.193). As Dyer (1988) suggests,

[Many valuable] studies have looked at groups defined as oppressed, marginal or subordinate ... ethnic and ... minorities ... [with] ... such passion and single-mindedness ... [that] it has had the effect of reproducing the sense of oddness, differentness, exceptionality of these groups, the feeling that they are departures from the norm. Meanwhile the norm has carried on as if it is the natural, inevitable, ordinary way of being human. (p.44)

The norm to which I am referring is the racialized category of 'whiteness'. The difficulty in thinking about whiteness as a racially constructed category (e.g., in school history textbooks) is that white power secures its dominance by seeming to be nothing in particular or by revealing itself as emptiness, absence, or denial (Dyer, 1988, p.44). White power and privilege is often "rendered invisible when viewed as the normative state of existence: the (white) point in space from which we tend to identify difference" (Carby, 1992, p.193). Yet, the power of whiteness is very real. There is a "disproportionate advantage enjoyed by white people in nearly all sectors of [North American] society" (McLaren, 1997, p.11). Indeed, precisely because "whiteness is so pervasive, it remains difficult to identify, to challenge, and to separate from our daily lives" (McLaren, 1997, p.6). Put differently, whiteness is institutionalized and internalized as the 'natural' or 'normal' way of being. Contesting this institutionalized white supremacy and the discourse used to support and reproduce it is central to anti-racist education. Alternatively, failure to contest white privilege and hegemonic control not only ignores the role of the oppressor in the oppression, but lends support to that role since it "amounts to a hidden affirmative action for white people" (McLaren, 1997, p.11). Indicative of this failure are the "multicultural proponents [who] have not pursued the very premise that set the multicultural project in motion in the first place: the interrogation of the discourse of the Eurocentric basis of the school curriculum" (McCarthy, 1994, p.88). Frankenburg (1997) insists that asymmetric analyses which have meticulously scrutinized "everyone-but-white-people" and consequently left whiteness unexamined, have perpetuated whiteness as "unqualified, essential, homogeneous, seemingly self-fashioned, and apparently unmarked by history or practice" (p.1). The result has been that race has become viewed as synonymous with those positioned as racially subordinate (Roman, 1993). A tendency for 'whites' to ignore the salience of racialized whiteness to historical and contemporary racisms is noted in the work of Sleeter (1993) who points out that "white people

usually seek to explain persistent inequality in a nation in ways which do not implicate white society” (p.160). Additionally, Daniels (1997) contends that “whites are not, by and large, organizing to dismantle institutionalized white supremacy or to combat white supremacist discourse in arenas outside extremist groups” (p.6). This is not a suggestion that the work itself has not existed. Roediger (1998) has compiled a collection showing that Blacks have, for years, examined what it means to be white. Nevertheless, anti-racist education demands “more emphasis on the analysis of white ethnicity, and the destabilizations of white identity, specifically [the] white supremacist ideology and practice [located in the school curriculum]” (McLaren, 1997, p.16). Analyzing the racializations that contribute to white supremacist authority and legitimacy can demystify the hegemonic processes by which such domination is constructed. In so doing, this makes explicit how ‘whiteness’ is privileged and, perhaps more importantly, strips away some of this authority and legitimacy (Giroux, 1997a, p.235).

In the process of interrogating whiteness, however, one must be careful not to fall into the trap of essentialism. Whiteness is not always or only invisible. In fact, it may not necessarily be difficult to ‘see’. bell hooks (1992), for example, argues that black people can ‘see’ whiteness quite clearly as being associated with “the terrible, the terrifying, [and] the terrorizing” (p.170). This representation of whiteness as “terror” in the “black imagination” is part of “the legacy of white domination and the contemporary expressions of white supremacy” (p.177) and is frequently inconceivable to white people in a white supremacist society who “can safely imagine that they are invisible” to the other since their historical and present-day power over the other has permitted them to control the other’s gaze (p.168). Giroux (1997b) also attacks the notion of whites as the invisible race by claiming that within the last decade whiteness has become increasingly visible as a “privileged signifier of racial identity” (p.294), particularly among white youth. The emergence of identity politics after the 1960s made it difficult for whites to continue to see themselves as colourless or invisible to people of colour. Moreover, changes that have led to an increased visibility of people of colour in the mass media have meant that whites “can no longer claim the privilege of not “seeing” Blacks and other people of color” (Giroux, 1997b, p.294-5).

Giroux (1997b) also contends that a “new racism” has emerged in which discourse about “family, nation, traditional values, and individualism” has used language such as “toughness on crime” and “welfare reform” to rewrite whiteness as a “besieged racial identity”, threatened by alien and less civilized cultures (p.287-8; See also Roediger, 1994, pp.6-9). One of the consequences of this reworking of whiteness, argues Giroux, has been a proliferation of media forms which provide a defense of racial hierarchies in which whiteness is positioned as supreme. Giroux cites *The Bell Curve* (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) and *The End of Racism* (D’Souza, 1995) as examples of widely discussed books which do this, but also mentions the popular 1994 film *Forrest Gump* (might we also include the 1998 hit, *The Truman Show*?) as an example of attempts “to rewrite the racial legacy of the past” so that the pure and innocent white male is portrayed as the real victim (Giroux, 1997b, p.287-8).

It would seem that whiteness is not invisible at all (certainly not always), though it may very well be frequently concealed. For example, Roediger (1994) has shown that white power and privilege in labour has been historically masked, though he argues that it can be viewed through examination of its pernicious effects. However, unveiling whiteness as synonymous with domination, oppression, or a racist identification risks representing whiteness as a fixed essence (Giroux, 1997b). Giroux claims that the pedagogical implication of a singular whiteness confined to notions of domination and racism may be inhibition of the processes by which white students are able to create an oppositional space to fight for equality and social justice. That is, the essentialization of whiteness as “the common experience of racism and oppression ... makes it difficult for White youth to view themselves as both White and anti-racist at the same time” (Giroux, 1997b, p.294).

To address this perceived problem, calls have been made for “the abolition of whiteness” (Roediger, 1994) as the only recourse available to whites intent on taking anti-racist stands (see also Ignatiev, 1997, p.608 and Garvey & Ignatiev, 1997). But this ignores that which is central to anti-racism pedagogy, the recognition that race matters. As Giroux (1997b) puts it, “However arbitrary and mythic, dangerous and variable, the fact is that racial categories exist and shape the lives of people differently within existing inequalities of power” (p.297). Rather than trying to

eradicate the concept of whiteness, it makes more sense to attempt to understand how whiteness works to shape various forms of representations, social relations, and institutional structures (e.g., secondary school history textbooks). Giroux (1997b) proposes that whiteness be theorized within the parameters of Hall's "new ethnicities" as that which works "only in conjunction with other identities such as those informed by class, gender, age, nationality, and citizenship" (p.299).

Excavating whiteness in its many dimensions and complexities can serve as a ground for examining white selves, and as an entry point into the anti-racism critique of all racial and cultural positions (c.f., Maher & Tetreault, 1997, p.322; Frankenburg, 1993; Frankenburg, 1997). Such an approach can rearticulate whiteness as "a politically and culturally constructed category, which cannot be grounded in a set of fixed transcultural or transcendental racial categories and which therefore has no guarantees in Nature" (Hall, 1992, p.254). This may free whites (e.g., white youths) from their "bondage within" (Goldberg, 1994, p.12) by fracturing the notion of an essential white character. Thus possibilities are opened up for whites to, in the interest of the oppressed, understand the racisms which underpin white supremacy in its various forms.

Anti-racism pedagogy commits itself to helping *all* people (including those racialized as white) to critically and self-critically think about how systems of oppression and domination historically began and how they continue to shape conditions in contemporary societies. It thus concerns itself with "promoting an enthusiasm among students and teachers alike for always learning more (and more variously) about the subject matters at hand" (Goldberg, 1994, p.17). This requires interrogating the "knowledge claims and truth values being advanced" and "challenging the dominant [e.g., white] interpretation and underlying structures of institutional and ideological power presented in prevailing pedagogical narratives"(Goldberg, 1994, p.17). The pedagogical narratives which concern this study are those found in a secondary school history textbook.

The rationale for choosing a textbook as the unit of analysis is based on an anti-racist understanding that the state-sanctioned education system is implicated in the production and reproduction of racisms in society (Dei, 1996a, p.34). Troyna and Hatcher (1993), for example, have demonstrated that the racialization of childhood cultures (history textbooks represent part of these cultures) works to reproduce racisms as ideology by providing children with meaningful

ways to both understand and act in daily life. This affirms a mandate to question the preconditions (i.e., racializations) necessary for the production and reproduction of these racisms. Textbooks provide a logical point of entry, not only because they make up part of the cultures of childhood, but also because the language through which racializations work is readily accessible. Furthermore, textbooks organize social reality as knowledge and are, in practice, a primary source of knowledge in schools (Cronon, 1992, p.1367). History textbooks, in particular, may be “the only history books that most people will ever read” (Francis, 1997, p.13-14). As such they potentially represent a very influential source of historical knowledge.

Anti-racist education “problematizes the marginalization of certain voices in society and, specifically, the de-legitimatization of the knowledge and experience of subordinated groups in the education system” (Dei, 1996b, p.254). This, of course, holds true for the knowledge and experience represented in textbooks. Textbooks which contain exclusively or predominantly one group’s knowledge and experience (e.g., white) indicate that the *processes* of production and reproduction of knowledge and experience have become racialized. The very existence of a narrative whose central characters are all white and whose perspective is white bespeaks a history of racist structuring of that narrative (c.f., Frankenburg, 1993, p.47). When textbook narratives (e.g., those found in Canadian high school history textbooks) are constructed so that the kinds of knowledge and experience included are exclusively associated with a particular racialized group, the knowledge and experience of ‘other’ groups becomes de-legitimatized and insignificant while that of the dominant (e.g., white) group is reproduced as the only worthwhile knowledge and experience. This problematically contradicts one of the central tenets of anti-racist education, that is, the engagement with “different and multiple ways of knowing our world” (Dei, 1996a, p.30). Indeed, one must question whether textbooks which restrict the presentation of knowledge and experience in this way can even be defined as educational. To the extent that students receive only a partial education that deprives them of the diverse historical knowledge and experience necessary for understanding contemporary society, they are miseducated (c.f., Nieto, 1992, p.212-213; Thompson, 1997, p.15-18; Stanley, 1996, unpublished manuscript, p.15-17).

A space needs to be made for the “excluded realities” (hooks, 1994, p.89) which, despite omission from educational curricula, are historically “woven into the fabric of ... [Canada’s] plurality” (Greene, 1993, p.193). Creating this space entails more than the multicultural approach of content addition premised on attitudinal models of reform; it is about a multi-perspective and sustained examination of the racializations in textbooks (c.f., McCarthy, 1994, p.94). Anti-racist pedagogy “calls for creating spaces for everyone, but particularly for marginal voices to be heard” (Dei, 1996a, p.30). Examining how racialized inclusions in history textbooks privilege one or more groups’ knowledge and experience over others can provide the justification for “transformative change” (hooks, 1994) toward truly educational textbooks with multiple and collective sources of knowledge and experience. I recognize that it is neither feasible nor practical to expect all textbooks to be immediately re-written. Neither do I wish to presume the existence of a single, correct way for textbook content to be presented. Nevertheless, changes are warranted if textbooks represent groups of people in ways which define some as inferior and others as superior. There is a more immediate advantage. By becoming aware of how relations such as ethnicity and nationality become racialized, educators at all levels can use the textbooks differently in the classrooms such that students and teachers take a more critical and liberating approach to ‘reading’ the texts.

This is related to another way in which a study of textbook racializations can contribute to the field of anti-racist education. Specifically, such a study establishes a connection between anti-racism theory and the actual pedagogical tools used in classrooms to educate real children. Anti-racist education requires that such a link be made between theory and practice to empower liberating education for critical consciousness, thereby challenging conditions that perpetuate and reinforce collective exploitation and oppression (hooks, 1994, p.69; see also Dei, 1996a).

It would, of course, be a misplaced assumption to regard textbook content as the sole determinate of what goes on in the classroom. Teachers’ unique use and interpretation of the textbooks, background knowledge brought to the texts by both teachers and students, and students’ individual and collective reactions to the textbooks and to their teachers’ interpretations of the textbooks are just a few of the many factors to be considered. Nevertheless, teachers are

required to teach a particular curriculum which includes certain recommended textbooks. When brought into the classroom, these textbooks cannot help but to influence (in various ways) what are already non-neutral and racialized positions occupied by teachers and students. I recognize that although teachers are advised to use mandated textbooks (e.g., in Ontario, those published in *Circular 14*), the extent to which these textbooks are actually used likely varies considerably among teachers and regions. Nevertheless, justification for this study lies in the fact that these textbooks represent officially state-sanctioned views on what should be taught in the schools. This says something about the desires which emanate from or constitute the structures and processes of educational institutions and of the power which resides in the curriculum. Mandated textbooks which privilege the knowledges and experiences of dominant groups, attest to the unequal relations of power and privilege within the educational institutions. The regulation of this power and privilege occurs largely through the material and ideological control of the means of representation (c.f., Jay, 1994, p.19). History textbooks, as one form of representation, reflect this power even as they regulate, reinforce, and naturalize it.

As representations, history textbooks contain not truths or 'natural' depictions, but rather suppositions or truth claims about history (Said, 1978). History, taken as "the sum total of previous human activities and experience" (Stanley, 1998, p.41), for obvious reasons cannot be 'known' let alone recorded in a textbook. The histories told through "historical narratives" can at best approximate selective portions of the past and at worst distort, delude, or create entirely fictive versions of the past (Stanley, 1998). The historical narratives located in high school history textbooks about Canada, for example, are not 'facts of nature' or "a delivered presence, but a *re-presence*, or a representation" (Said, 1978, p.21) of decisions made about Canada and being Canadian. What is more, 'Canada' and 'Canadian' are themselves constituted entities. "The notion that there are geographical spaces with indigenous, radically "different" inhabitants who can be defined on the basis of some religion, culture, or racial essence proper to that geographical space is ... a highly debatable idea" (Said, 1978, p.322).

Thus, "nationalist historical narratives" (Stanley, 1998) which purport to tell the history of Canada are representations of a history which cannot be known as any unconditional truth or fact.

Furthermore, these narratives construct Canada (and by extension, Canadians) as they represent it (them). Canada as “imagined community” (Anderson, 1991) gets re-imagined, re-interpreted, re-represented in ways which construct it into being (or being different). This can present several problems. First, and already mentioned, it provides the boundaries for defining and refining the essence of a ‘Canadian’ which is problematic because it can serve as the basis for exclusion of those deemed to be something other than Canadian. The second, and related, problem is that history textbooks are frequently predisposed to narrate the histories of those who dominate in a society, so that pasts are constructed with certain “unwanted elements, vestiges, and narratives” removed from them (Said, 1993, p.15; see also Nieto, 1992). Thus, histories of domination and oppression turn into historical narratives of conquering glory. This *can* lead to inclusions which portray a particular group (e.g., male, upper/middle-class, heterosexual, physically able) consistently as the norm, “the ‘real’ makers of history, or the ones to have left their mark on civilization”(Nieto, 1992, p.213). The problem with all of this is that it can confound understanding for *all* students, preparing them for a mythical world with only heroic ‘white guys’, no racisms, and an unblemished place in the world for the nation whose history is represented (e.g., Canada).

It needs to be stressed at this point, that while racializations may direct the ways in which children construct their ideas of race and difference, they do not entirely determine them. Children interpret the racisms in their world in different ways (Rizvi, 1993). Nevertheless, by looking at how ‘normal’ becomes defined in racial terms and how power is allocated, maintained, and constrained through narratives that privilege dominant groups or individuals along racial lines, a study of the racializations in history textbooks can help to understand how children might be directed to evaluate individuals and groups positively or negatively depending on their relationship with the figure in dominance (c.f., Corrigan, 1988, p.21).

Racisms cannot be reduced to a singular form of prejudice, a set of erroneous beliefs, intolerance, hatred, an aberration, a problem of diversity, or irrational behaviour. They are systems which operate through political, ideological, scientific, psychological, or educational means to organize and hierarchically categorize social relations such as ethnicity, the nation,

culture, identity, class, sexuality, physical ability and gender to privilege a dominant group (i.e., those in Canada racialized as white) and that group's knowledges, histories, and experiences. By naturalizing this privilege as normal, legitimate, or appropriate, racisms reassert and reproduce the power of the dominant group. In so doing, they sustain and perpetuate the subordination of groups racialized as the other by relegating their knowledges, histories, and experiences to the realm of abnormal, deviant, de-legitimate, or inappropriate.

Because contemporary Canadian society is historically structured on systemic racisms, all social relations are necessarily racialized. This is not to say that all social relations are racist (i.e., racialized, involving inclusionary/exclusionary processes, and producing non-trivial negative effects). They are not. Rather, it is to say that racialized categories and relations must be assumed to be relevant to every situation, "despite our hopeful belief that, in our capacity as private individuals, we can and should be colorblind" (Thompson, 1997, p.14). One of the implications of this is that in order to understand racisms, the systemic structures which are required for their production and reproduction must be understood. This requires analysis of the processes by which humans are categorized into hierarchies of mutually exclusive groups and assigned what are seemingly fixed characteristics differentiated by moral worth. Representations are one of the ways in which these groups are established. History textbooks, as a means of representation and narrativization located in the social institution of schooling, must be analyzed on the basis of how they categorize humans in racialized ways. This process demands that all racializations be analyzed, but that particular attention be paid to the ways in which the category whiteness is represented and storied. This strategic analytical intervention is necessary to challenge the power held by the dominant group in a racist society and to produce transformative changes in the control of this power through the education of the consciousness in readers. Change is fundamental to anti-racist pedagogy and it is in leading to change that a study of the racializations contained within textbooks can make a significant contribution to anti-racist pedagogy. Anti-racist education is dedicated to bringing about positive changes through positive action and, consequently, is built on a foundation of optimism which trusts, for example, that "white males can and do change how they think and teach" (hooks, 1994, p.132).

II. Overview of Textbook Analyses and Textbook Representations

For this part of the project, I reviewed a number of key studies which looked at the content of school textbooks. Some of these studies examined textbooks from the turn-of-the-century, others looked at much more recent textbooks, and a few were overviews of textbooks used during several historical periods. The studies focused primarily on history textbooks, although other social studies textbooks, readers, and teacher resources were occasionally included. My focus was on studies which involved Canadian textbooks, but several important studies of American history textbooks were also examined. Where possible, I attempted to support the observations and findings of these American studies with those from Canadian studies of textbooks from a similar period.

My objective with this part of the review was to gain an understanding of the methods used by other researchers to examine textbooks for their representation of diverse groups of people, and thereby work toward the development of a methodological framework for my own study. I found that several of the studies acknowledged the singular and narrow perspective of the textbooks. This suggested a need to examine the degree to which multiple-voiced accounts were included in the textbook narratives, the role of diverse groups within the story-line of the narratives, and the use of primary sources and direct quotations to support the authenticity of narrative claims. It also underscored the importance of examining not only the representation of groups outside this narrow perspective, but also at the representation of the groups located at its center (i.e., 'whites'). Seldom, however, did the analyses explicitly concern themselves with the representation of 'white' groups or the concept of 'whiteness.' Indeed, only one made any concentrated effort to interrogate whiteness as a category (Sleeter & Grant, 1991). Nevertheless, the insights gained from studies of oppressed or marginalized groups occasionally permitted authors to recognize the relative dominance of what Swartz (1992) has termed "the master script": that is, the legitimization of "white, upper-class, male voicings as the "standard" knowledge students need to know" (p.341).

A problem, however, was noted in what appeared to be a taken-for-granted understanding that a single correct history can be told and that 'white, Anglo-Saxon, Christian, upper-class,

males' both define and constitute the norm of this history. This was pronounced in studies arising out of some perceived threat to this 'norm' (e.g., Lerner, Nagai, & Rothman, 1995), but also apparent in those studies in which groups racialized as white were used as the control group. It was also noticeable in studies which approached the representation of racialized others primarily as narratives of resistance. That which was resisted (i.e., whiteness) became immune from the analysis and, thus, situated itself as the 'norm'.

It was clear from the beginning that these studies would provide more than methodological guidelines for the study of racialized whiteness or otherness. That is, their interpretations, evidence, and extracts from actual history textbooks provided an understanding of how various racialized groups (including those racialized as white) have been historically represented. Thus, I drew on their sources and combined their work with my own review (admittedly, an impressionistic one) of Canadian history textbooks selected from different periods in the last century, in order to reach some basic understanding of how whiteness *has been* represented in Canadian school history textbooks. I believe that my findings here were important to the development of a methodology for determining how whiteness *is* presently represented, specifically, because they underscored the salient relationship between concepts of race, ethnicity, and nationality.

Textbooks at the turn-of-the-century showed whiteness to be anything but 'invisible'. The "white race" was explicitly and consistently portrayed as morally and intellectually superior than other clearly differentiated races. Moreover, these and somewhat later textbooks often conflated ethnicity and nationality with race, positioning British or Anglo-Saxon races at the top of a hierarchy with the moral responsibility of carving a civilized nation out of the Canadian wilderness (see Clark, 1996 and Stanley, 1995). To be a Canadian was to be a loyal and Christian British subject. Gradually the definition expanded, and groups who conformed to the Anglo-Saxon (and to a lesser extent, French) norms were recognized as existing (though not necessarily equal) parts of the Canadian 'mosaic'. With more recent textbooks, Canada was portrayed as a legitimate nation in its own right, unique in its tolerance for diversity, respect for humanity, and civic morality. Increasingly, clear black and white distinctions concerning race were avoided and issues

of ethnicity were carefully framed in terms of contributions made to the 'Canadian project'. Yet, the centrality and moral superiority of British-ness to this project never ceased. The heroic, virtuous, and wise people from (or guided by) the British Isles still dominated the pages of the textbooks, but as representatives of Canada and not the Empire. These 'important' and 'true' representatives of Canada remained, for the most part, both white and male. In other words, little had changed except the directness of the language and the explicitness of the racial categorization. Whereas these white men had once been cast as the Empire's best stock in moral opposition to the uncivilized Indian, they became portrayed as representatives of a virtuous 'Canadian' nation largely in contrast to imperfect, second-rate, or inferior others found within the nation (e.g., Métis, Natives, Asian immigrants) or exterior to its boundaries (e.g., Americans).

What follows is a review of the methods used by various researchers since 1970 to analyze textbooks *and*, simultaneously, an attempt to elucidate how diverse groups have historically been represented in school textbooks used since the turn-of-the-century.

I will begin with a 1976 study by Lupul in which high school history textbooks recommended for use by the Alberta Department of Education from 1905 to 1936 were examined. The expressed purpose of the study was to examine the portrayal of "Canada's 'other' peoples" (p.1). Indeed, the author acknowledged in the opening sentence that "Canada's largest minority peoples, the French and the Anglo-Celtics" were "excluded" from the study (Lupul, 1976, p.1). No apparent explanation or justification was offered for this exclusion, but the study did, nevertheless, provide valuable insight into the racialized content of textbooks during this time period.

Drawing primarily from textbooks such as *The History of the Dominion of Canada* (Clement, 1897), *The Story of the Canadian People* (Duncan, 1904), and *History of Canada* (Grant, 1927), Lupul found that generally little was said about "other people" such as "Natives". This same observation was made by Francis (1997) who noted that "the earliest textbooks virtually ignored the Indian" (p.71). But what *was* said clearly divided the population into distinct races, and positioned whites as superior to others such as the "Native races" (Duncan, as cited in Lupul, p.2). Native people were typically characterized as 'savages' and described in derogatory

ways, particularly when war and religion were discussed (Lupul, 1976, p.3). An extract given from Clement's text described "the Indian" as being "of unclean habits and without morals", "fiendish", "false and crafty" to his foes, and possessing a religion of the "purest superstition" (as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.3). This was in stark contrast to the "energetic", "devoted", and "hardy" Jesuit priests who, "in absolute seclusion from all white influence save their own", worked to pacify the "savage nomads" (Duncan, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.4). It also contrasted with the "gentle Christian missionaries from Europe" who helped the "Eskimo" to "cast their cruelty and love of war aside, and [become] the peaceful race we know today" (Clement, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.2). Perhaps to highlight this indigenous people's move toward a more 'civilized' way of being, another text commented that "if their faces were well washed ... [Eskimos] would be found to be white" (Duncan, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.2). Lupul cited numerous examples such as this illustrating the explicit use of the term 'white' to refer to a distinctly 'civilized' race. Another example was contained in Duncan's discussion of the Iroquois practice of adopting prisoners of war: "Even white men, French and English, in this way became members of an Indian tribe, and in the enjoyment of the freedom of forest life refused to return to civilization" (as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.3).

In these texts, being English and French was equated with being white and civilized. Through Lupul's analysis, one could see that whites were represented as clean, Christian, civilized, devoted, *and* French or English. But also brought to the foreground was the notion that whites, particularly Canadian whites, were humane, tolerant, and just in their treatment of certain others. For example, in reference to "Indians", Grant made the claim that, "As a result of the honesty and justice of our treatment of the Indians, we have had none of the terrible wars which have cost the United States so much blood and treasure" (as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.5). Similarly, Lupul noted that although "Blacks" received little attention, they were usually portrayed in the textbooks as having been "well-treated", an adjective apparently equated at the time to 'not enslaved': "The unhallowed institution [of slavery], however, never took root in our soil, and it hardly needed legislation to bring it to an end" (Clement, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.6).

Another group of “other peoples”, the Métis, were frequently described as “lawless” and termed “half-breeds” or “near relatives” of “Indians” which, given the representation of “Indians” as uncivilized, positioned the Métis as ‘nearly uncivilized’ (Lupul, 1976, p.6-7). Not blessed by any ‘natural’ leaders, the Métis “found a leader in one of themselves, Louis Riel, who had been partly trained for the priesthood, and was thus a man of some education. Though sometimes rash, vain, and cruel, Riel was also a man of deep religious feeling” (Grant, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.7). Moreover, Riel came across as violently insane, particularly when indirectly compared to an ‘innocent’ Thomas Scott:

A sudden fit of madness on Riel’s part precipitated a tragedy. Among some prisoners who the latter had thrust into Fort Garry ... was a young Ontario immigrant named Thomas Scott. This unfortunate youth, Riel picked out to be his instrument in terrorising his opponents. (Duncan as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.6-7)

Those positioned in opposition to the irrationally violent Métis were “white” characters like Lord Selkirk who was portrayed “like an avenging angel, bringing with him retribution and peace” (Lupul, 1976, p.6).

“The Orientals” too, received little attention in these textbooks (Lupul, 1976, p.8). The role of “Chinese navvies” in the construction of the CPR, for example, was entirely overlooked in *History of Canada* (Lupul, 1976, p.8). The ramification of this is that only white men like George Stephen were responsible for building the railway. Additionally, the province of British Columbia was claimed to be “the home of a white race” and fearsome of Japanese and Chinese immigrants, the latter inexplicably characterized as being “so frugal and thrifty that they could live on wages on which a white man would starve” (Grant, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.8).

Lupul’s method of identifying themes or patterns which ran through these early textbooks and supporting his interpretations with extracts from the texts in question, thus proved effective in shedding light on the representation of “Canada’s ‘other’ peoples” while simultaneously, if inadvertently, showing whiteness to be represented as something morally superior to otherness.

Another study took a much closer look at whiteness in these turn of the century textbooks, specifically the construction of white supremacist ideology in history textbooks, school readers, and geography textbooks used in British Columbia schools (Stanley, 1995). In this textbook examination, Stanley observed that themes of patriotism and citizenship linked Canada and the British Empire so that the two identities became virtually “inseparable” (p.44). This could be seen through the simultaneous physical inclusion of “Canadian and British contents” such as songs or poems explicitly about Canada and stories clearly marked as British (Stanley, 1995, p.43). This link between Canada and the Empire could also be viewed through narratives of the textbooks which did not distinguish between Canadian nationalism and British imperialism (Stanley, 1995, p.43). A passage from *History of Canada* (Wrong, 1921), for example, discussed Canadian WWI casualties as “only part of the vast cost to the British Empire for its share of the victory” (cited in Stanley, 1995, p.43). Francis (1997) has noted that an imperialistic view of the construction of the Canadian nation could be also be seen through the portrayal of British Loyalists as “the real makers of Canada” in texts such as *The Story of the Canadian People* (Duncan, 1904, as cited in Francis, 1997, p.56).

But there was more than a simple connection here. British imperialism was portrayed in the texts as a moral necessity bringing civilization and virtue to its subject peoples, and Canada represented the “direct heir of this benign imperial tradition” (Stanley, 1995, p.44). Thus, textbooks such as *The History of Canada* (Gammell, 1921) tended to present Canada’s treatment of First Nations people as “honest and generous” and British rule in British Columbia as “just and far-seeing” (cited in Stanley, 1995, p.44-45). An extract from *A History and Geography of British Columbia* (Lawson & Young, 1913) left no doubt that both Canada and Britain were to be considered ‘white nations’ when it was claimed that the skill of British fur traders “in the management of the native races did much to save Canada from the horrors of Indian warfare, and made it possible for the more capable among the Indians to share in the occupations and adopt the pursuits of White men”(as cited in Stanley, 1995, p.45). Also reflected in this passage was the notion of “character” which Stanley argued was central to these textbooks, in that the supposed superior character of the British was offered as justification for British rule over others with

characters presumed to be inherently inferior (Stanley, 1995, p.45). Textbooks of this period frequently portrayed imperialists as modeling this superior character through the exhibition of virtues such as selfless sacrifice, hard work, heroism, honesty, far-seeing wisdom, tolerance, and loyalty (Stanley, 1995, p.46; Francis, 1997, pp. 56-60). The subject peoples under imperial rule, on the other hand, were usually presented as ‘others’, “morally depraved and illegitimate in their presence” (Stanley, 1995, p.39). Chinese and First Nation people, in particular, were defined as others through descriptions which reduced entire peoples into a collective ‘they’ or, more precisely, an “iconic *he*” (Stanley, 1995, p.49, emphasis in original). Furthermore, this creation of racial selves and others involved linking the notions of character and ‘fixed’ difference to presumed scientific and objective descriptions of the world (Stanley, 1995, p.49-50). Such was the case in *The Dominion School Geography* (1910) which arranged people into a hierarchy that positioned “The White Race” as the “positive norm” against which the “Yellow”, “Red”, and “Black” races were subsequently evaluated (as cited in Stanley, 1995, p.50). Racial categorization was unambiguous in this and other turn-of-the-century textbooks and clearly positioned a supposedly superior white race as “the most active, enterprising, and intelligent race in the world” (as cited in Stanley, 1995, p.49) while constructing morally inferior others.

Clark’s 1996 examination of social studies textbooks approved for use in British Columbia elementary and secondary schools from 1925-1939, suggested that little had changed with respect to the portrayal of ‘others’. In this section of her three-part study, Clark was primarily concerned with how the texts treated “immigrants to Canada in the nineteenth century or later and Native peoples” (Clark, 1996, p.68). With respect to immigrants, she found that the textbooks generally presented them “in a positive light” and as Canadians, unless they had come “from the Orient” (p.68). For example, *All About Canada For Little Folks* (Dickie, D.J., 1928) described children from Holland as “New Canadians” and children from Japan as “visitors to Canada” even though all were the children of strawberry farmers living in Canada (as cited in Clark, 1996, p.71). Clark’s contribution to the study of whiteness was to interpret why the textbooks looked the way they did. In the above example, for instance, she explained that this captured the social reality of the time when, partly due to “the important place Orientals had assumed in the production and

distribution of fruits and vegetables ... many white British Columbians [desired] for the Orientals to turn around and go back to whence they had come” (Clark, 1996, p.71).

Regarding the portrayal of “Native peoples”, Clark identified “two predominant attitudes toward [them]...paternalism and repugnance” (p.75). She noted “blatant” paternalism with respect to Native peoples in textbooks such as *The Romance of British Columbia* (Anstey, 1924) which referred to Natives as “almost child-like in their simplicity” and *The Romance of the Prairie Provinces* (Burt, 1931) which claimed that Natives “were like troublesome children but the Hudson’s Bay Company was a wise father to them”(as cited in Clark, 1996, p.75). Repugnance was evident in textbooks such as *In Pioneer Days* (Dickie, D.J., 1926) which described Native peoples as “veritable demons” or “worthless Indians” and *Pages From Canada’s Story* (Dickie & Palk, 1931) which referred to Natives as “unreasonable savages” (as cited in Clark, 1996, p.78). It was also clear in textbooks like *A First Book of Canadian History* (Wallace, 1928) which described the First Nations population as “drunken bands of marauding Indians ... thirsting for revenge” (p.107). The same text minced no words in the following passage: “On the whole, it is clear that the original inhabitants of Canada were savages of a very low order” (p.3). The implication was, of course, that at the time of writing there existed people who were not savages and who were of a ‘higher order’. Quite often this hierarchy was expressed through narratives about immigrants and the extent to which they could be assimilated depending on their perceived racial grouping or ‘stock’. An excerpt from *Canada Today* (Scott, 1939), a grade twelve social studies textbook used in Alberta, illustrated this:

The assimilation of immigrants, in the form of intermarriage and a mixing of stocks, is slow. The “melting-pot” is not producing a uniform racial alloy. The British races - English, Scotch, Irish and Welsh - intermingle freely, with each other and with the German, Dutch and Scandinavian settlers, but not with immigrants less racially akin. Racial diversity is especially noticeable when a foreign group settles in a community, forms a “colony,” and preserves its own language and customs, as do the Ukrainians, the Doukhobors, the Orientals, and some other peoples. (as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.10)

As this selection shows, what immigrants were assimilating into was a ‘British world’ and their success in doing so (from a ‘British’ perspective) relied on the degree to which their prescribed race was akin to one of the four “British races”.

Textbook content during the following decade was no less ethnocentric and reflecting of limited tolerance for diversity. The ethnic or national background of immigrants still received a great deal of emphasis during this period, though not always expressed explicitly in terms of 'race'. Take for example, the following passage from *A History of the Canadian People* (Wallace, 1944) which mirrors that from *Canada Today*:

Not all of the immigrants were of an equally desirable type. Among them were large numbers of people whose standards of living were inferior to those of native-born Canadians; and especially unhappy was the importation of the Doukhobors - a group of Russians whose ideals were scarcely compatible with Canadian citizenship. But there were also among the immigrants ever increasing numbers of settlers of the best type - Americans ... settlers from the British Isles ... who were of sound stock with sound ideals ... and Scandinavians, people of a stock akin to the Anglo-Saxon, who were destined to prove the most desirable of the non-English-speaking newcomers. (p.341)

Clearly, an hierarchical order was established in these textbooks in which the superior position was occupied by British (or Anglo-Saxon) people, and others ranked below according to their compatibility with this perceived highest "stock" of humanity. That this compatibility was largely based on notions of white supremacy was evident in passages such as the following from *Canada: A Nation* (Chafe & Lower, 1948): "On the west coast Chinese, Japanese and *even* Hindus began to enter in numbers which alarmed the white people" (p.396 emphasis in original). "White people" occupied the established norm into which people positioned as non-whites intruded. More than simply undesirable or incompatible, these non-whites were 'alarming'. Since no alternative reason was given for this alarm, the implication was that it was based on their perceived non-whiteness.

Other groups of people were portrayed more as obstacles than intrusions. Francis (1997) has observed that First Nations people continued throughout this period to be represented as "sinister, vicious figures, without history or culture ... introduced to young readers not as another civilization with which Europeans came into contact, but as part of the landscape which had to be explored and subdued" (p.72). The explorers and subduers included missionaries whose inclusion in the textbook often worked to clearly illustrate the moral supremacy of whiteness. Chafe and Lower (1948) refer to Father Brebeuf as a man of "giant like stature and military being" who

“must have presented a striking figure as he stood before his dark-skinned audiences ... reaching the souls of the savages” (as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.12). The triumph of Christianity was a common theme in the textbooks of this era. Frequently, the entire nation was exhibited as being saved (i.e., ‘Christianized’) by this ‘victory.’

In a hundred different ways, the long uphill fight waged by the churches ... bore fruit in a higher standard of morality and spirited life; and what had threatened to become a half-heathen country became largely religious and God-fearing.
(Wallace, 1944, p.197)

By the late 1940s, some textbooks were beginning to transform Louis Riel into a “folk hero” by using language that was less exaggerated and including a Métis point of view regarding the western rebellions (Francis, 1997, p.78). The Métis were still referred to as “half-breeds” (Wallace, 1944, p.265), Thomas Scott was still presented as blameless for the Red River rebellion (see Lupul, 1976, p.14), and Riel was typically presented as one “unbalanced in judgment and with weaknesses, such as vanity and indecision” (Brown, 1950, as cited in Lupul, 1976, p.14). However, in textbooks such as *Our Canada* (Dorland, 1949), Riel’s faults had become secondary to the justness of his cause: “With all his faults, Riel’s aims in standing up for the rights of the Métis and Indians were not entirely unworthy” (as cited in Francis, 1997, p.78). The themes of ‘Canadianism’ which imbued the textbooks by this period permitted such a portrayal. Tolerance, respect for human rights, and peaceful harmony were becoming perceived traits of the Canadian nation and thus Riel’s cause, but not necessarily his ‘character’, fit well into this definition (c.f., Francis, 1997; Lupul, 1976).

History textbooks published in the 1950s and 1960s were examined by McDiarmid and Pratt (1971) in a study which would be recognized as a benchmark for textbook and curricular analysis (Dhand, 1988, p.23). Among the 143 texts examined, 30 were Canadian history texts approved for Ontario grades 7-10 . The study was an attempt to objectively document the existence of “negative social attitudes” in textbooks through the use of systematic and statistically reliable methods (McDiarmid & Pratt, 1971). The researchers looked at the words used in the

text to refer to six target groups and assigned numerical values to each word depending on the degree to which each was considered a positive or negative evaluative assertion.

McDiarmid and Pratt found that the texts were devoted to the Christian “control group” (p.34) and, taking the term most frequently applied to each group, were most likely to present “great Jews, hardworking immigrants, infidel Moslems, primitive Negroes, and savage Indians”(p.45). Problematically equating “Christians” with “white Canadians”, McDiarmid and Pratt found that these “negative stereotypes” were reproduced through the pictorial representations of “Africans, Asians, and North American Indians” (p.47). The quantitative methods used did not permit much insight to be garnered with respect to dominant (i.e., white) structures. For example, other than recognition that Christians and Jews “were highly favored” in comparison to other groups, there was no acknowledgment of any ‘positive stereotypes’ (p.45). That this was primarily a study about ‘the other’ was made even more clear in the third part of their study in which they developed protocols which outlined “the main established facts” about historical incidents relating to “the overall question of the treatment of minorities” (p.57). Moreover, the selection of “white Canadians” and “Christians” as equivalent “control group[s]” further equated whiteness with being Christian and Canadian while it concurrently established whites as the unquestioned norm with which to judge others.

McDiarmid and Pratt (1971) did acknowledge, nevertheless, the ethnocentric perspective of what was written in the texts. In particular, they noted, “an unspoken assumption in the texts that immigrants must adopt ‘Canadian’ characteristics and values, to which they represent, in some way, a threat” (p.92). This was more than an “unspoken assumption” in some texts. In *Canada, Our Country* (Garland, 1961), it was explicitly stated that “people from Europe ... would have become [Canadian citizens] more quickly if they had associated with English-speaking Canadians from the first” (p.328). Elsewhere, “newcomers” such as Mennonites and Icelanders were described as “good settlers” who “proved that people, knowing no English, unacquainted with Canadian laws and customs, could prosper in the new land, if they were willing and able to work” (p.326), implying, of course, that certain others were not so good, willing, or able.

Most textbooks during this period abruptly ended such stories about immigrants shortly after the newcomers arrived in Canada. Lupul (1976) observed that such artificial and sudden narrative terminations neglected any long-lasting contributions made by people from these groups, ignored the problems posed by Canada for these immigrants, and overlooked the roles of “Anglo-Celtics and French” in either encouraging or discouraging the efforts of these newcomers (p.14-15). The latter two observations in particular suggested an obligation to investigate the portrayal of dominant (e.g., “Anglo-Celtic and French”) structures and groups.

Though he made no explicit attempt to examine the role of dominant structures in the textbooks of this era, Lupul (1976) did recognize the tendency for these textbooks to act as “Anglo-Celtic and French-Canadian melting pots” (p.16) which reduced Canadian histories to those of the two dominant groups. Chafe and Lower’s *Canada - A Nation; And How it Came to Be* (1958) described Canada as a nation of “two peoples ... [who] together go on to the conquest of the stern nature that surrounds them” (cited in Lupul, 1976, p.16). Similarly, in *Canada and the World* (Brown & Careless, 1954), there were only “two Canadian ways of life” to which any newcomers could subscribe. One was the “culture of English-speaking Canada” and the other, the “culture of French-speaking Canada”, with the latter defined in terms of “what French Canada brings to the nation” (pp.137-145). Francis (1997) examined this last point more closely and found that “to at least the 1960s” history textbooks (in the English language) depicted Quebecois as either “rugged, venturesome, and carefree” voyageurs or as habitants “who lacked ambition, feared change, and [were] content with the status quo” (p.96). Meanwhile, the serious work of running the country was performed by those whose origins were to be found in the ‘Mother Country’ (i.e., those people from the British Isles).

To be sure, there was a clear tendency in the textbooks of this period to highlight the Anglo-Saxon background of important political figures in the Canadian nation. George Cartier’s French ancestral roots were not discussed in *Canada, Our Country* (Garland, 1961), but John A. Macdonald (“born in Glasgow”), George Brown (“a young Scotsman”), and Alexander Galt (“a son of a Scottish novelist”) all had their Scottish origins pointed out (p.241-264). Similarly, a lengthy discussion of “the men who built the railway” was centered on those men who “came

from Scotland” including Sandford Fleming, George Stephen, and Donald Smith (Garland, 1961, p.309). While obviously excluding the role of Chinese and Irish labourers, this also functioned to fix those of the highest “British stock” (Brown & Careless, 1954, p.133) as superior leaders and thinkers. Thus, although textbooks of this period presented Canada as “a product of that world-wide spreading of European civilization” (Brown & Careless, 1954, p.118), British-ness remained central to the definition of a Canadian.

The texts from this period also clearly racialized groups, using terms such as “Negroes”, “Indians”, and “whites” to delineate the racial positions of characters who then were assigned different moral qualities. Perhaps, this was most apparent in distinctions drawn between the occasionally unfair “white” man and the violent, irrational, vengeful, and drunken “Indian”:

Sometimes Indians who had been unfairly treated by a white man would take revenge on the next white traders they happened to meet...[and]... Many of the Indians craved liquor and would barter anything they had for it ... A group of drunken Indians could be very dangerous. (Garland,1961, p.297)

Evidently in response to such negative portrayals, The Manitoba Indian Brotherhood released a report in 1974 entitled *The Shocking Truth About Indians in Textbooks*. The stated purpose of this textbook study was, “to help eliminate the persistence of omission and bias...[and]...to introduce alternate information to provide a more balanced portrayal of native peoples” (p.ii). The study included eight social studies textbooks published in the 1960s and approved for use by grade six students (p.iii).

For each of the texts, problematic quotations “dealing with native people” (Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, 1974, p.iii) were extracted, assessed according to the kind of bias they were deemed to exhibit, and recorded next to an explanation detailing why the passage was deemed to be problematic. This was done primarily through illustrating the one-sidedness of the perspective taken by many textbook authors through the provision of other perspectives on the same historical event from different sources (p.32). While effective in demonstrating that histories have been (and are) told in different ways, such a methodology moved dangerously close to implying that a ‘real’ history, against which narratives could be measured, existed and could in fact be

known (c.f., Stanley, 1998). Still, the study was significant in that it was not a study ‘of Indians by non-Indians’, but rather a study *by* representatives of this racialized group on themselves and their relationship with Europeans. From this vantage point, the dominant groups (i.e., Europeans) were seen in a somewhat different light. For example, the authors of the report were critical of tendencies in Canadian history textbooks to represent the annihilation of Indian culture as part of the “march of progress” by European settlers, to create the impression that Europeans were solely responsible for positive developments, and to deny any oppressive actions by the Europeans “such as broken treaties, forced marches, displacement of whole tribes and further incursions into Indian territory” (Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, 1974, p.119). It would seem from this study that the denial of oppressions (e.g., racisms) was endemic to history textbooks of this period. The study also illustrated the significance of perspective and the use of sources (primary and secondary) in writing histories.

Despite the noticeable proliferation of primary sources and documents in this era, however, there was an overbearing tendency to speak *for* the people of the First Nations. Such was the case in *Challenge and Survival: The History of Canada* (Herstein, Hughes, & Kirbyson, 1970) where the sources used for descriptions of “the way of life of the first Canadians” were written by Europeans like Samuel de Champlain: “The women make all the clothes, but not neatly enough to prevent one seeing the skin under the armpits, for they have not the skill to make them fit better” (Herstein *et al*, 1970, p.22-5). The voices of the First Nations people were lost in this account of their own histories. The attempt to balance the perspectives by tagging on a few comments from “Indians and Métis speak[ing] of Canada today” (p.26-7) were completely removed from both the historical context and theme of the chapter.

By no means was such textually imposed silence restricted to the First Nations population. Take for example the following statement written earlier in the century by Rev. W.D. Reid and entitled, “A View on non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants”:

... often they [immigrants] underbid the labor market, driving out the white man. They raise vexing municipal questions, they strain our charitable organizations ... expose healthy people to disease, and often herd themselves together in certain

localities of the cities, constituting a real problem of the slums. (Herstein, *et al*, 1970, p.289)

The textbook authors intended the passage to show “the contempt in which these immigrants were held by their Anglo-Saxon neighbours who regarded themselves superior” (p.289), but did not offer an account from the immigrants’ perspective nor did they attempt to explain any of the prejudices evident in the historical passage. In other words, the “white man” or “Anglo-Saxon” (which, apparently, were one and the same) continued to march through the textbook in a position of unquestioned superiority. Part of this superiority lay in the ability to impose silence by determining what and how representations appeared in the textbook.

There was, however, a recognizable difference in the textbooks from this era than those from previous years. It appeared that attempts were made to ‘tread lightly’ over issues of ethnicity and the full force of racist and stereotypical representations was tempered somewhat by patronizing ‘tag-ons’ or utopian passages that seemed intended to forge cultural neutrality. Consider the following passage from *Canada: Colony to Centennial* (1970) in which “Chinese” people were “imported” (but only as a result of desperation), lumped into a category with criminals, reduced to ‘rice-eating work machines’, and then happily declared to have added “character” through their roles in the restaurant business:

Any man was employed, as long as he could handle a pick and shovel; criminals and the toughest characters on the Pacific coast ... Desperate for help, the resourceful Andrew Onderdonk imported 2,000 Chinese from Hong Kong ... Fifty pounds of rice would keep them going for a month. Still, these men of the Orient added character to the Canadian Pacific region. When they left ... many became excellent cooks and restaurant operators. (Willows & Richmond, 1970, p.275)

This same textbook claimed that, “The Doukhobors at first reacted badly [to Canadian government], but in years to come they settled and accepted most laws” (p.323) and that the Germans “were perhaps the first ... to integrate with the Anglo-Saxon and French of Canada” while “the Ukrainians had perhaps the most difficult time in integrating with the other early Canadians” (p.316). The message was clear: if ‘they’ eventually fit into Canada’s growing cultural mosaic, ‘they’ were good Canadians. But the chimerical language used did not hide the prevalent racisms within which it was embedded.

In 1977, The Council on Interracial Books for Children published an analysis of thirteen American history textbooks. They examined the texts (of which all but one were published after 1970) for “their treatment of six groups: Women, African Americans, Asian Americans, Chicanos, Native Americans and Puerto Ricans” (p.12).⁴ The authors highlighted significant aspects of each people’s historical experiences in the US and juxtaposed these with excerpts from the history texts in order to illustrate perceived distortions or omissions. Although this study tended to characterize ‘non-whites’ as possessing histories comprised entirely of oppression and/or resistance, it contributed to investigations of whiteness by critiquing the centrality of a white perspective to the telling of American histories.

The authors concluded that the textbooks exhibited a single perspective depicting “US history through the eye’s of society’s white majority -- in particular through the eyes of its most privileged members” and further argued that there was a wide disparity between the way textbooks reported “the origins of US third world cultures, compared to their treatment of the origins of the European colonists and immigrants” (CIB, 1977, p.126). This, they claimed, contributed to a “one -sided, Eurocentric perspective” which underscored “the importance of white roots and European backgrounds” and conveyed the impression that non-whites “lack[ed] a cultural heritage, [were] definable only in terms of their relationship to white people, and [were], therefore, inferior to whites” (CIB, 1977, p.126). This observation was significant because it highlighted the importance of examining the ways in which people of different groups have their roots or origins represented in history textbooks. Further, it implied that whiteness could be ‘seen’ in characters who had their European origins described, and viewed in relationship to other racialized groups (e.g., “third world people”) who did not.

A conclusion was also reached that the textbooks interpreted “the past to be the activities and accomplishments of a relatively few statesmen, generals, inventors, and merchants -- almost invariably white and male”, and that the “moving-forces in human history” were portrayed as a cast of “Great Men” and only sparingly as “Great Minorities” or “Great Women” (CIB, 1977, p.126). Under-representation of the working class ignored “the skills, concerns and struggles of

⁴ Hereafter, I will abbreviate The Council on Interracial Books for Children as CIB.

the average citizens who ... played a primary role in creating and shaping events” (CIB, 1977, p.126-7). Evident in these observations was the salience of intersections between other sources of inequality and oppression (e.g., gender and class) and racial categories (e.g., whiteness).

A further strength of this study was that it attempted to examine the extent to which racisms were dealt with in the textbooks. The researchers observed that racisms (and sexism) were “treated as aberrations, as isolated mistakes of the past” and never linked to exploitation.

Since oppression is rarely examined from the perspective of its victims, these brief inclusions appear as footnotes to a grander, happier story. Yet even these isolated “mistakes” are treated in a simplistic, casual manner which downplays their significance. (CIB, 1977, p.129)

This excellent study also noted that “third world people” were frequently included in the texts only through lists of their contributions. The implication was that these people and their achievements were “valuable only insofar as they prove[d] useful to [whites]” (CIB, 1977, p.127). A similar point was made in the Canadian context as part of an examination of social studies textbooks approved for use in British Columbia elementary and secondary schools from 1960 to 1975 (Clark, 1996). Clark identified examples of this contribution tendency in textbooks such as *Canada in the World Today* (Rogers *et al*, 1952) which stated, “Canadians who came from many countries ... have brought with them some of their famous songs and stories” and in *The Great Adventure: An Illustrated History of Canada for Young Canadians* (Dickie, D., 1950) which claimed that these minorities “had gifts in music, art, dancing and handicrafts that would greatly enrich our nation” (as cited in Clark, 1996, p.158). Significantly, Clark noted that “two minority groups [were] exceptions to this ‘contribution’ perspective” (p.159). “Orientals” were often presented as problems if not ignored altogether, and “Native peoples” were most frequently presented as problems. An example of the former could be found in *Our Canada* (Dorland, 1949) in which the following statement was made: “The presence of a large number of Chinese, Japanese, and East Indians, has created many problems” (as cited in Clark, 1996, p.160). Several questions which arise from Clark’s study, however, include: For whom or what were “Native

peoples” and “Orientals” problems, and why were people racialized as ‘Black’ apparently ignored in the study?

Clark did observe that British Columbia textbooks from this period attempted to “present a different perspective on the actions of Native peoples” and to show how the arrival of the Europeans disrupted “their ways of life” (p.164-5). Nevertheless, many of the texts still talked of “the discovery of the New World” by Columbus (Herstein *et al*, 1970, p.8). Others informed readers that the land was virtually empty prior to the arrival of the Europeans: “When the first white man arrived, there were probably no more than 220,000 people scattered across the vast area of Canada” (Willows & Richmond, 1970, p.1). Taken with the use of the word “scattered”, this passage implied that the First Nation population was less settled or permanent and with little sense of community or tradition. In this way, it justified the claim to the land by “white man” (c.f., CIB, 1977, p.71).

American high school history textbooks published in the late 1970s were examined by Glazer and Ueda (1983) in a study which arose from their concern that textbook publishers’ accommodation to “every possible pressure group [would] lead to a Balkanization of American history” (p.2).

Their first step toward appraising the substance of this concern was to determine how much space was occupied by minorities in textbooks. The method used was to count the number of pages devoted to specified “ethnic groups”. They found that “Blacks” received the most attention, followed by “Indians”, and that “only a few pages” were given to any discussion of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, Japanese, or European immigrant groups (p.18). It was also noted that themes of “native culture” and “warfare with whites” characterized “Indians” while “blacks” were characterized by “slavery and its aftermath, continuing prejudice and discrimination” (Glazer & Ueda, 1983, p.18). Additionally, by counting the number of pages deemed to represent “ethnic minorities” as either “victims” or “beneficiaries” of prejudice or discrimination, Glazer and Ueda found that “Blacks” were shown as both beneficiaries and victims while “Indians”, “Mexicans”, “Puerto Ricans”, “Chinese”, “Japanese” and “post-European immigrants” were portrayed primarily as victims (p.19). Their idea of trying to identify the

“beneficiaries” of oppressions (e.g., racisms) was a particularly significant one. Yet, absent was any recognition that the main beneficiaries of North American racisms have been majority groups, not “ethnic minorities”. Besides a myopic focus on groups racialized as ‘the other’, a significant problem with this textbook analysis was a narrative dotted with defensive statements that portrayed the “white” majority as “a besieged racial identity” (Giroux, 1997b). Glazer and Ueda appeared threatened by the textbooks which had presented histories from diverse perspectives. They claimed, for example, that “the writers of these texts want to stress the heroism and integrity of the Indians in the face of an overwhelming power” (p.36). Obviously, they were not concerned with a critical investigation into the representation of this “overwhelming power” or the extent to which the white majority engaged in (and benefited from) historic racisms.

The same problems characterized a much more recent study by Lerner, Nagai, and Rothman (1995) which looked at American history textbooks up to the 1980s. The examination was based on a quantitative, content-analytical study of the portrayal of characters in textbooks. It was found that the “white-black ratio dropped substantially from 1.85 (2.59/1.40) in the 1960s to 1.24 (2.38/1.92) in the 1970s” (p.73) and that the more recent texts tended to “present blacks positively far more frequently than they [did] whites” (p.70). The authors clearly lamented the further inclusion of what they termed “disadvantaged groups” (Lerner *et al*, 1995, p.152). They expressed concern about “the elaborate evaluational and pictorial overrepresentation of women and minorities”(p.84) and were critical of what they perceived to be a “rush to include minorities in the texts” claiming that these changes had “played a role in the overall decline in educational achievement” (Lerner *et al*, 1995, p.152). The significance of this study was that it *may* have revealed a tendency to represent whiteness in essentialist terms as simply a form of oppression (see Giroux, 1997b). On the other hand, the authors’ defensive posturing exposed their attempts to “rewrite the politics of Whiteness as a besieged racial identity” (Giroux, 1997b, p.287; see also Roman, 1993 on “white defensiveness”).

A study on Canadian textbooks from approximately this same era was conducted by Irving in 1986. The purpose was to determine the ways in which minority groups were portrayed in social studies texts authorized for use in Ontario’s junior division schools. Twenty five textbooks

published between the years 1976 and 1984 were selected from *Circular 14* and used to examine portrayals of a number of different groups including “Scottish-Canadians” who were chosen as a “control group” (p.70).

The method of analysis was to record evaluative terms (adjectives, adverbs, nouns, or verbs) as they were applied to each group. All the words were scored as favorable, unfavorable, or neutral and the results were expressed as the three most frequently occurring words used for each group (p.74). “Proud, able and raiding were the terms most frequently used to describe Canadian Indians” (Irving, 1986, p.75-6) while “skillful, able and helpful were the terms most frequently used to depict the Inuit” (Irving, 1986, p.77-8). The Japanese were described most often as “hard-working, popular and able” while “the terms most frequently applied to Jews were active, eager, and warm” (Irving, 1986, p.78-9). “Proud, hard-working, and strong were the terms most frequently used to describe Scots” and “helpful, careful, and able” for the Ukrainians (Irving, 1986, p.80). Irving summarized as follows:

Non-white groups (the Indians, the Inuit, and the Japanese) and the more recent white immigrant group (the Italians) were less favorably treated than the charter group (the Scots), the established group (the Ukrainians) and the Jews. (Irving, 1986, p.81)

Thus, this analysis disclosed that some white groups were represented differently than others, and that white groups in general were usually portrayed more favorably than groups deemed to be something other than white. Yet, ethnic and racial categories were conflated through assumptions that all Italians, for example, were white. Furthermore, even Irving acknowledged that the focus on isolated words did not take into consideration “the continuity of the narrative” and, consequently, tended to “oversimplify the meaning of a text by reducing its content to a single positive-negative dimension when the overall picture may [have been] considerably more complex” (Dean, Hartman, & Katzen, 1983, p.40).

Indeed, such a quantitative approach would not have recognized that Ontario’s history texts of this period were extremely ‘Canadianized’. This had come about through the commencement in 1971 of a compulsory core curriculum designed to have students acquire a deeper understanding of Canadian history (Stamp, 1982, p.247). Texts such as *Discovering*

Canada: Shaping an Identity (Kirbyson *et al*, 1983), took steps to differentiate Canada from other countries, but particularly America, with statements such as, “We [Canadians] have tried to control U.S. influence in Canada, and thus shape our identity”(p.324). The textbooks of this era reflected an expansion in the concept of who was to be considered Canadian. To be sure, the notion of a ‘cultural mosaic’ pervaded these textbooks. But the “ethnic groups” who comprised this mosaic were not always equitably or fairly represented. Many were portrayed as passive victims such as “A Japanese Canadian family wait[ing] to be taken to camp in the interior of British Columbia” (Kirbyson *et al*, 1983, p.165). Still numerous others came across as quaint cultural oddities, including some “Polish dancers at a festival of multiculturalism” (Kirbyson *et al*, 1983, p.300). Attempts to be more inclusive often resulted in oddly-placed ‘appendages’ in the texts. For example, in a section related to historical debates around culture, one text placed a tiny picture of a man in the margin outside the main text. The caption read:

People of various ethnic origins have played important roles throughout Canada’s history. The first Canadian to be awarded the Victorian Cross was a Nova Scotian black, William Hall. (Kirbyson *et al*, 1983, p.308)

This de-contextualized inclusion positioned William Hall not as a typical Canadian or Nova Scotian, but as a “black” one. Furthermore, his racialized identity was reduced to “ethnic origin” and when combined with an absence of discussion on the significance of his accomplishment in such a racist era, contributed to the textbooks’ denial of racisms in Canadian history. But even this seemed better than the complete omission approach taken by texts such as *Canada’s Century* (Evans & Martinello, 1978) in which the prominent and contextualized positionings seemed reserved for Canadian (white male) heroes like Billy Bishop (p.153). The ‘homegrown’ heroes received far more attention than they had in textbooks of previous years, but it didn’t necessarily follow that all people ‘from’ Canada were represented fairly. In a discussion of “The Northwest Rebellion”, for example, one textbook implied that the execution of Thomas Scott was an indefensible and irrational action against a man guilty only of voicing his displeasure with a questionable authority. Part of this discussion read, “He [Thomas Scott] constantly quarrelled

with Riel. At last Riel's patience came to an end and he had Scott executed" (Evans & Martinello, 1978, p. 131).

A 1991 study by Sleeter and Grant examined social studies textbooks that were published between 1980 and 1988 and approved for use in American schools with grade 1 through grade 8 students (p.83). The stated objectives of the study were to "show the extent to which the dominance of Whites pervades the various subject areas, discuss patterns in the portrayal of various racial groups, and demonstrate the extent to which current issues of concern to various racial groups are presented" (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p. 81). This was the only study that I came across which explicitly focused on the interrogation of 'whiteness' in history textbooks. In fact, they made "Whites" one of the categories of analysis, along with groups identified as "Asian-American", "Black-American", "Hispanic-American", and "American-Indian". Their method involved analyzing whose story was being told, which group(s) resolved problems, the extent to which various groups caused or resolved problems, and "who the author intend[ed] the reader to sympathize with or learn the most about" (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p.82).

Sleeter and Grant found that the language used in the textbooks glorified and complemented "Whites" and "the story line allow[ed] Whites to be the center of attention by ignoring the roles or contributions of other groups of color, or placing people of color in the story line only during time periods or events of particular concern to Whites" (p.85-6). Furthermore, problems were most frequently presented from a "White point of view" and usually insufficient detail was provided to explain "the harshness of White men in power and why many problems that people of color face today are the result of the racism, classism, and sexism of long ago"(p.86). Sleeter and Grant were critical of texts that offered only partial explanations for "Asians" emigrating to America, contained "contextual benign" discussions of "Black Americans", viewed "Native Americans" primarily as "historical artifacts", and excluded from their discussions the viewpoints of "Hispanic Americans" (p.84-5). The conclusions reached were that the textbooks focused primarily on the White male, downplayed or ignored the accomplishments and concerns of others, and continued "to legitimize the status of White males, despite the inclusion of other groups" (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p.98-9).

Canadian history textbooks used during this same period (i.e., up to 1989) in British Columbia schools were examined as a third part of Clark's 1996 study. Clark examined the texts to determine the manner in which "race/ethnicity" influenced "conceptions of the ideal Canadian" (p.46). She found that the textbooks did not ignore the "multicultural nature" of Canadian society, but lacked any thorough discussion of what it meant to be a Canadian within this multicultural reality. With respect to the treatment of "Native peoples" and "Orientals", two significant changes were observed in these recent texts compared with those used prior to the 1970s. The more recent texts acknowledged "the historical presence and contributions of Orientals in Canada" although they frequently offered limited descriptions which could not give students sufficient knowledge of the broader issues surrounding the events they described (Clark, 1996, p.240). In *Our Land: Building the West* (Bowers & Garrod, 1985), for example, the internment was presented only "in the context of a discussion of Japanese involvement in the commercial fishery" (as cited in Clark, 1996, p.240). The broader issues of white supremacy and racisms were ignored. Another significant change was a shift to "a respectful tone" toward First Nations people, but most often presented in terms of the assistance they provided European explorers. This was illustrated in a passage from *The Explorers: Charting the Canadian Wilderness* (Langford, 1984): "Matonabee knew the way to the arctic coast. He and other Chipewyans knew how to hunt caribou and buffalo for their food ... Without the Chipewyan men and women, Hearne would have starved or frozen to death" (cited in Clark, 1996, p. 241). Additionally, in contrast to the textbooks of earlier periods which "focused too much on the problems experienced by contemporary northern communities, to the point where such communities were defined by their problems", the more recent texts were inclined to show "no hint ... of the poverty and destructive behaviour sometimes found on reserves and in Inuit communities" (Clark, 1996, p.244). As part of the histories which led to such conditions, racisms (and the role of the dominant groups in producing them) should be a fundamental inclusion in textbooks.

It can be concluded from this overview that turn of the century textbooks unambiguously presented 'whites' as morally and intellectually superior to presumably 'non-white' peoples such

as Orientals, Blacks, and Natives and 'half-white' peoples such as the Métis. Whiteness was equated with being British and, furthermore, no distinction was made between British imperialism and Canadian nationalism. Explicitly recognized as a race, whites were characterized as civilized, Christian, peaceful, clean, tolerant, honest, hardworking, heroic, loyal, justly authoritative, and wise. Moreover, whites were presented as the legitimate deliverers of such superior moral character to other races deemed inferior and heathen. Well into the 1930s, groups explicitly racialized as others (e.g., Orientals, Natives, and Métis) were painted as savage obstacles or illegitimate intrusions blocking the formation of a civilized nation based on the moral leadership of the 'British races'. The term 'white' was frequently used to favorably include French and other Europeans who were positioned somewhat below the 'British races' in a racial hierarchy that viewed 'other races' with repugnance and paternalism. The emergence of 'Canadianism' saw the explicit use of the terms 'race' and 'stock' gradually give way to 'ethnicity'. Likely due, in part at least, to the multicultural policies enacted by the government in the early 1970s, Canada came to be characterized in textbooks of this decade as a tolerant, peaceful, and respectful mosaic in which inferior others attempted to contribute to what was fundamentally an Anglo-Celtic and French project. Even so, Scottish and English individuals represented the moral and intellectual heart of the Canadian project while French and certain European immigrants (e.g., Ukrainians) were presented as unequal, but significant contributors. Métis individuals became represented more ambiguously, the clearly negative images of Blacks transformed into benign and decontextualized representations, the savage Indians became noble savages, and the problematic Orientals were more likely to be represented as Japanese or Chinese ethnic groups who had struggled to fit in. Though the explicit use of the term 'white' faded from its earlier prominence, the same representations of moral and 'natural' white supremacy remained attached to an hierarchy of racialized ethnicities in which British ethnicity was positioned at the top.

Another set of conclusions to be drawn from this overview had to do with the textbook analyses. First of all, it was evident that there has been a dearth of history textbook analyses explicitly concerned with the representation of whiteness. This was especially true in the Canadian context. It was also apparent that studies purporting to examine the representation of

diverse groups have frequently promoted whiteness as 'normal' or 'natural' through positioning whites as control groups.

This overview also accentuated the value in examining the role of language in, for example, euphemistically disguising (or outright denying) oppressions such as racisms. Further, it brought to the foreground the importance of considering the narrative means by which diverse groups have been afforded privileges of point-of-view, perspective, problem-resolution, and power. What was most markedly revealed by this overview of textbook analyses was the necessity to examine the inter-relations and articulations among race, ethnicity, and nationality.

III. Methodology

The guiding purpose behind this study was to generate a theory about the representation of 'whiteness' in public school Canadian history textbooks, and particularly, to see what role, if any, whiteness might play in the production and reproduction of racisms in contemporary educational curricula. The first step was to select which textbooks, authors, publishers, and time periods might be best suited for the study. To keep the project close to manageable dimensions, I decided that only those Canadian history textbooks approved for use in the province of Ontario would qualify for consideration. The Ontario Ministry of Education publishes its list of approved learning materials in a document entitled *Circular 14*. From among these approved materials, I selected intermediate division textbooks because they were the only ones almost exclusively concerned with 'Canadian' histories. Primary and junior division textbooks focused more on present-day Canadian society while senior and OAC division textbooks placed greater emphasis on American and world histories. I was left with 35 English-language textbooks approved for use in the intermediate division under the subject heading "History and Contemporary Studies". Since my project was concerned with racisms in present-day society, I further narrowed the list by including only those published after 1990. Once four textbooks dealing primarily with contemporary Canadian politics were excluded, I had brought the number down to eighteen. Of these, I then selected the most recently published to which I also had relatively easy access. Initially, I had intended to supplement my analysis of this one textbook with analyses from three other recent texts which met the requirement of having different authors and publishers. However, once I began the analysis in earnest, I found that the data from one textbook would be more than adequate for the purpose of generating a theory about the representation of whiteness. Thus, all data for this study was collected from a single textbook approved for use in the intermediate division of Ontario's public schools and entitled *Flashback Canada* (Cruyton & Wilson, 1994). I believe that I can make some claim to the generalizability of this single textbook inasmuch as *Flashback Canada* represents one of a set of textbooks. That is, it has, like other history textbooks published in *Circular 14*, 'passed' a common 'test' of suitability or appropriateness for Ontario's high school children. Certainly all of the textbooks in this 'set' are

not identical, but if one is problematic, there is a definite possibility that others share the problem since all are published according to certain government guidelines. I want to make clear, however, that a single textbook which legitimizes, reinforces, or naturalizes any form of social oppression is, in and of itself, problematic. This is all the more the case for a textbook officially sanctioned by the province and thus likely receiving widespread use.

Representatives of Oxford University Press call *Flashback Canada* one of their “most successful textbooks” (D. Salusbury, personal communication, April 16, 1998). It is organized into four units. The first unit is entitled “Conflict and Change” and is comprised of four chapters which deal with the rebellions of 1837 in Upper and Lower Canada. The second unit is entitled “Shaping the Nation: Confederation” and contains seven chapters related to the various stages (pre- and post-) of Confederation. The third unit is called “The Nation expands 1867-1914: Opening the West”. It deals with a number of historic events including the Red River and North-West rebellions, the formation of the North-West Police, construction of the railroad, and settling of the west. The fourth and final unit is entitled “The Nation Expands 1870-1920: Changing Society” and it looks at how workers, women, and farmers demanded changes. Each unit begins with a brief introduction and several “focus questions” to prepare students for purposeful reading of the text. The kinds of questions asked involve searching for specific information contained within the text (e.g., “Who were some of the key persons involved in making Confederation happen?”, FC, p.52).⁵

The chapters within these units are all formatted along similar lines. Each is composed of a main historical narrative linked to the general theme of the chapter. Sub-headings are used to separate discreet sections of the narratives. These narratives are interspersed with illustrations (e.g., photographs, paintings, cartoons, maps, tables, timelines) and the occasional boxed-insert. The boxed-inserts are highlighted sections of narrative separated from the main narrative of the chapter by borders or distinctive colouring. Most often these are biographical sketches of individuals or groups. Every chapter also contains a skill-building section designed to help

⁵ For the duration of this thesis, ‘FC’ will be used in citations to refer to *Flashback Canada* (Cruyton and Wilson, 1994).

students learn a variety of important skills such as identifying cause and effect relationships, interpreting political cartoons, debating, preparing reports, working in groups, and role playing. Two skills which are not unrelated to this project are “recognizing bias” (FC, p.169) and “analyzing bias” (FC, p.233).

An “activities section” is located at the end of each chapter. This has three parts. The first, called “check your understanding”, requires students to recall key vocabulary and to retrieve ‘facts’ from the text to answer questions or summarize. The second part is called “confirm your learning” and it requires students to answer more complex questions related to specific events in the text. Some of these questions ask the students to use their own opinions and judgments to come up with an answer. The third part, entitled “challenge your mind”, requires students to use skills taught through the skill building exercises such as debating and role playing. In many cases, students are required to call upon their own personal experiences, insight, and creative differences to compare issues raised in the text with other ‘real world’ issues.

Any (or all) of these components of the textbook could have been chosen as a focus (foci) for this study. My specific interest was in the narrative means by which the stories of Canada’s past were told. Thus, it was the historical narratives, “nationalist historical narratives” (Stanley, 1998) in this case, which were chosen as the primary focus of the study. To be considered an historical narrative, the narrative had to contain individual or group characters within a plot that evolved over an historical time period related to the telling of Canadian histories. This meant, for example, that a narrative about the procedure for writing a research report was not analyzed, but a boxed-insert about John A. Macdonald’s life was. This is not to say that other aspects of the text were disregarded entirely. I did take note of images, captions, questions posed by the text, and inclusions in the index while conducting the study.

Since my main interest was in how historical figures exhibited whiteness or qualities of whiteness, I chose to begin by determining who was in the textbook. The first reading of the text involved the identification of personally named individual characters. This included characters identified by two or more names (e.g., John Powell and Mary Ann Shadd), one name (e.g., Mrs. Pittman and Poundmaker), and even a few left unnamed (e.g., “the superintendent of nurses of a

Winnipeg hospital” (FC, p.317)). Although it must be recognized that the names used in the text can be very significant (see p.112, this thesis), I was concerned with more than names alone. I also wanted to see how these characters were identified as belonging to a specific group and what kind of characteristics they were assigned (i.e., how they might be racialized). To address the first concern, I looked for the ways in which the text categorized these people. Some were clearly identified in terms commonly perceived to be racialized (e.g., Blacks and Natives), but not a single individual character was identified as ‘white’. This was not entirely unexpected and I initially grouped all unidentified characters together under the category ‘white’, based on Morrison’s observations (1992) that we know narrative characters to be white simply because nobody says so (p.72). But as Wetherell and Potter (1992) point out, such categorization assumes whiteness to be an *a priori* given; it reifies as natural that which is socially constructed and historically contingent (p.146). Since the text did not say, for example, that John A. Macdonald was white, it was somewhat problematic to assume that he was. To do so was to create ‘white’ as a category myself when, in fact, the goal of my project was to see how the textbook created the category. I wanted to see if whiteness was more than something to be assumed, if it could actually be identified and its reality recognized without reifying it as a ‘natural entity’. I decided that I would use only the markers of the text to label characters as belonging to a particular group. Not surprisingly, narrative characters were marked by the text as belonging to numerous kinds of groups (e.g., according to religious association, gender, occupation, class and so forth). I made note of many of these as I examined each character, but two kinds of markers seemed particularly reoccurring: ethnicity and nationality. Furthermore, from my review of textbook analyses and history textbooks used throughout the past century, it was clear that these two kinds of markers had been used to designate supposed naturally occurring kinds of humans (i.e., ‘races’). I decided, therefore, that these ethnic or national markers of identification would be used along with the textbook’s racial markers as the organizational categories for this study. Two complications emerged here. First, it became apparent that some characters were not clearly marked as belonging to any particular ethnic or national group. Consequently, I grouped these into a distinct category. Second, none of these markings were actually called “ethnic” or

“national” by the textbook. This posed a problem, for how could one unambiguously classify “Ukrainians”, “Irish”, or “French” to be either ethnic or national groups? Indeed, the same dilemma presented itself for terms which, on first reading, seemed clearly racial (e.g., “Blacks” and “Natives”). For the purpose of this study, however, it did not matter so much what terms *I* used to refer to these groups as it did what terms *the text* used to make them, and whether or not the groups were subsequently racialized. In other words, it was of less importance to classify “Métis” as an ethnic, national, or even racial identity than to document that “Métis” was a term used by *Flashback Canada* to delineate a specific group of people in essentialized terms.

The result of all this was a set of categories, established through textual markers, which placed narrative characters (individuals and groups) under one of the following headings: American, Black, British, Canadian, Chinese, English, French, Finnish, Icelandic, Irish, Mennonite, Métis, Native, Scottish, Ukrainian, and “unmarked”. In this way the categories came from the text, as opposed to being imposed upon it.

I was still left with the problem of how to claim any of the characters (or the categories in which they were located) to be ‘white’ or stand for ‘whiteness’ (e.g., That William Lyon Mackenzie was marked as ‘Scottish’ was, in and of itself, inadequate for making the claim that he somehow represented whiteness). Again, I had to look to the narratives, this time focusing on how the language used could potentially signify or invoke general and abstract concepts of race (e.g., ‘whiteness’ or “Asian-ness”). Since racializations involve processes of signification (Miles, 1989), it logically followed that I would have to be aware of these processes in order to come to an understanding of how racializations were created in the text. According to Thwaites (1994, p.27), studying signification processes obligates one to analyze the written language of the texts (the signs, in this case) and determine what abstract concepts (i.e., the signified) are invoked by the mental image or sensory impressions of these signs (i.e., the signifiers). It also requires an understanding that any link between signifier and signified is arbitrary, a signifier can always have more than one signified, and a signified may be linked to a number of signifiers (Thwaites, 1994, pp.31-67). To illustrate, there is no natural or inherent reason that the graphic-image ‘white’ should automatically invoke the abstract concept ‘whiteness.’ The signified ‘whiteness’ can have

other signifiers (e.g., ‘Caucasian’, ‘English’, or even ‘Canadian’), and the signifier ‘white’ may have other signified (e.g., ‘that which surrounds the yolk of an egg’, ‘a category of wine’, ‘the outermost ring of an archery target’ (c.f., Thwaites, 1994, p.31). Subsequently, it became my goal to identify those signs (actual written text) which worked through a process of signification to stand for a category (or categories) of the human population. I found that this was not a simple unidirectional process, but a complex web of multiple, overlapping significations. That which was signified (e.g., an ethnic group) often became a signifier for something else (e.g., a racialized category). Understanding how these cascading processes of signification worked was important because it enabled me to ‘see’ how signs could ultimately stand for whiteness and other racialized categories (e.g., ‘Canadian-ness’).

I recognize that “ a sign can stand for something else to somebody only because this ‘standing for’ relation is mediated by an interpretant” and, as such, there can be no single ‘true’ interpretation (Eco, 1976, p.15). However, I support Thwaite’s claim (1994, p. 58-9) that among the potentially infinite range of signifieds (i.e., the connotations), there are signifieds which seem to “crystallise out of the mass of connotations ... [and] demand to be taken as true [i.e., the denotations]”. These denotations are “not so much the *natural* as the *naturalized* meaning of the sign” (Thwaites, 1994, p.61). Through the identification of these privileged, probable, or naturalized meanings I could establish the “trustworthiness” (as opposed to the ‘truth’) of my interpretations (Kohler Riessman, 1993, p.65).

Meanings are not simple reflections of the text, but rather constructions which arise through a complex and negotiated interaction between text and reader. While meanings may ultimately reside in the mind of the reader, they are constructed in and through various contexts. These contexts include such things as physical setting, reader motivation and desire, and the background knowledge and experience of the reader. The contexts within which I read and re-read *Flashback Canada* differ from the contexts in which students, teachers, or curriculum developers may read it. In my case, context included a motivation to earn a Master’s degree, a desire to find evidence to support my thesis, background knowledge about anti-racist pedagogy, an awareness that the racially dominant group in Canada is commonly described as ‘white’, and

the experience of having been perceived to be a white, middle-class, physically able, heterosexual, male (c.f., Stanley, 1998, p.44-45). These and other contextual factors played a role in determining the meanings that I constructed (and am presently constructing) from reading this textbook. But so too did the actual language located in this history textbook. I am merely pointing out here that language, including language in the form of nationalist historical narratives, has power to shape the meanings that readers construct. Of course, this is not an absolute power (i.e., the reader may oppose the reading entirely, accept it fully, or fall somewhere between the two), but rather, *potential* to configure the ways in which readers understand the text and the part(s) of the world it signifies. As this is an anti-racist (and therefore proactive) pedagogical project, I am obligated to engage with this potential. I recognize that no matter how probable or naturalized these meanings appear to me, in the end, they are my own interpretations of my meanings. But I contend that through keeping my readings as closely textual as possible, these meanings are supported by the text (c.f., Stanley, 1998). Having said this, I assert that these ‘naturalized meanings’ should be judged as much or more by the discussions and thoughts they produce (indeed, the meanings they yield) for myself and others than the extent to which they approximate any unknowable, single true meaning. Put differently, if my interpretations of the ‘naturalized meanings’ of the nationalist historical narratives located in *Flashback Canada* make one think, read, or teach with a greater awareness of and dedication to anti-racist principles, then they have done their job.

Thus, with the intention of fulfilling this anti-racist responsibility, I looked at how these ‘naturalized meanings’ reinforced the ethnic, national, and racial divisions which had been derived from the text and also how they constructed the category ‘whiteness’. I did not restrict the analysis to conceptions of whiteness alone, however. It was necessary to specify what other racialized categories were created since the literature suggests that one of the ways in which whiteness can be represented is in opposition to what it is not. Snead (1994), for example, argues that racialized groups are not represented in isolation, but rather have an interrelationship that fits into “a larger scheme of semiotic valuation” (p.4). I was, therefore, concerned with how groups racialized as white were positioned with respect to groups racialized as other. Beyond this, I was

interested in how racialized groups were located with respect to Canadian citizenship. Here I am using the concept of citizenship to refer to official citizenship, but also (and more specifically) to the 'unofficial', 'common-sense' ideological notions of what constitutes or defines a Canadian.

The actual approach that I used to interpret the 'naturalized meanings' of the text consisted of two broad components. The first was a sustained examination of individual characters and groups and their roles in the text. The second entailed identification of patterns or tendencies which emerged from the narratives to characterize individuals or groups as representative of a particular ethnic, national, or racial group (or combinations of these). Below, I will discuss these approaches.

I began the examination of characters in the text by recording their names (listed in order of appearance) and any information concerning groups into which the text seemed to place them. This included those racial, ethnic, and national categories already discussed, as well as, gender, religion, and class. I also noted whether the character or characters were included in the 'main' narrative of the chapter, a narrative somewhat disconnected from the theme of the chapter, or in a boxed-insert. Additionally, I recorded whether or not each character was represented in an image, named in the index, or representative of an historical figure who was clearly from outside the central time period covered by the text (approximately 1820-1920). The main portion of this part of the analysis, however, was centered on three related issues: power, performance, and problems.

Among the characters represented, I wanted to know who was portrayed as having or exhibiting power. Referring to literary narratives, Morrison (1992) states that the presence of the 'other' is often concomitant with "figurations [of] impenetrable whiteness that need contextualizing to explain their extraordinary power, pattern, and consistency" (p.33). Frequently, this power is explained in terms of a "romantic, conquering 'heroism', virility, and the problematics of wielding absolute power over the lives of others" (Morrison, 1992, p.44). When the power held by a group is not questioned or contested within the narrative, the representation of that power becomes privileged as normal, legitimate, or natural. Similarly, lack of any explanation for why power is held by particular racialized groups and not others tends to sanction

such distribution of power (c.f., Grant and Sleeter, 1989, p.108). I hoped that identifying narrative representations of this sort could render 'visible' institutionalized or dominant (e.g., white) power and privilege.

Whether or not characters have power can also be determined from their placement and performance in the narrative. Therefore, I asked which of these characters were positioned as 'main' characters and which took supportive or peripheral positions. The centrality of white characters to film narratives has been observed by Dyer (1988) who noted that "black" characters are often "foregrounded" only as intrusions into the main frames occupied by "whites" (p.54). In her literature studies, Morrison (1992) has noted that:

[Representations of whiteness] appear almost always in conjunction with representations of black or Africanist people who are dead, impotent, or under complete control, these images of blinding whiteness seem to function as both antidote for and meditation on the shadow that is companion to this whiteness - a dark and abiding presence that moves the hearts and texts of American literature with fear and longing. (p.33)

Here, whiteness is explained in terms of its relative power and positioning with respect to blackness. There is more to narrative performance than positioning, however. It is also significant to examine the complexity of the characters to see if they, or their actions, change as the narrative progresses. Snead (1994) argues that, even in recent films, black characters are "sealed off from the history into which whites have trapped them" and, consequently, blackness is represented as "eternal, unchanging, unchangeable" and conflicting with a narrative that mandates potential ability for white characters (p.3). Similarly, Dyer (1988) has argued that narratives can represent white characters as exhibiting not only "qualities of being but of doing - acting, discovering, taming, conquering ... challenges of responsibility, of the establishment and maintenance of order, of the application of reason and authority to situations" (p.52). Accordingly, under the heading of 'performance', I recorded for each character or group what they actually did in the narratives and noted the relative significance attached to their actions by the text.

As part of this analysis of character roles, I also determined what individuals and groups were positioned as representing the protagonist(s) and antagonist(s) of each narrative.

Continuous, frequent, or exclusive roles for particular racialized groups in either the role of the hero or adversary tell us something about the narrative construction of 'normal'. Incessant representations of 'white' as protagonist or 'other' as antagonist would, for example, lend support to Dyer's observation (1988) that "white domination is reproduced by the way that white people 'colonise the definition of normal'" (p.45). Closely tied to the identification of the roles of the antagonist and protagonist, was noting the source(s) of their conflict. I wanted to identify not only the perceived problem, but also, where possible, who defined the problem, who was portrayed as (or seen to be) the cause of the problem, and who was instrumental in the resolution of the problem. My hope was that any patterns which emerged here could be helpful in understanding how whiteness was represented. For example, if the problems were seldom defined by groups racialized as 'other', it might be concluded that the texts privileged an understanding that it was 'normal' for whites to make such decisions. Or, if 'other' racialized groups were seen to frequently cause but infrequently solve problems, further understanding might be gained as to how taken-for-granted notions of 'white' morality and power are positioned favorably by the narratives. The disturbance of narrative equilibrium through the presentation of a conflict that needs resolving might, itself, create the conditions necessary for whiteness to be represented or, to paraphrase Dyer (1988), a character's ability to resolve the conflict might be part of her/his whiteness (p.52). While the ability to resolve a problem may have reflected perceived qualities of whiteness, the tendency to cause problems may have reflected perceived qualities of otherness if these others were seen as the sole or primary causes of conflict. Furthermore, by asking if the narratives attributed difference (e.g., ethnic, cultural, religious, or national) as the cause of problems, I could gain valuable information with which to interpret the representation of whiteness. For if difference was indeed seen as the source of conflicts, I then had to ask difference from what or whom?

The result of this section of the analysis was some 60 pages of textual extracts, notes, and observations for each of the characters in the textbook organized according to how their power was represented and explained, what they actually did in the narratives, and the extent to which they caused, defined, or resolved problems.

The second way in which I attempted to gather the 'naturalized meanings' represented in the text was one particularly aimed at identifying the characteristics ascribed to characters (individuals and groups). I observed and noted patterns that emerged in the redundant marking of characters and groups, as well as, the separating strategies used to reinforce real or perceived differences among the characters (and the groups they represented).

Following Snead (1986) marking involves supplying significant "characteristics with internal value equivalents, sharpening, by ... antithesis, their conceptual utility" (p.x-xi). It thus registers representational difference and constructs that difference in overt and unambiguous ways. In the narratives of *Flashback Canada*, I looked at the ways in which certain characteristics and qualities were "repeatedly overdetermined" and "marked redundantly", almost as if to force the reader to see differences (or similarities) across diverse characters (Snead, 1994, p.5). The focus of this part of the analysis then was to note how racializations work through repetition to privilege racialized understandings of certain representations.

As I read through the text, certain patterns or trends began to emerge with respect to the way characteristics were ascribed to characters. That is, characters within a particular ethnic, national, or racial category were marked in similar and reoccurring ways as others from this category. As well, differences between the categories became apparent when certain groups were unmarked, or marked in opposition to others.

Those characteristics or qualities which most clearly emerged as redundant markers of difference or similarity were associated with: spirituality, 'electedness' (i.e., marked as an elected or chosen representative of a people), leadership ability, familial links, peacefulness, loyalty, perseverance, education, intelligence and achievement, wealth, communicative ability, personal sacrifice, personal background, and life contributions. Quite obviously, I realized that redundant marking was occurring only after I had seen numerous instances of it. Thus, these categories of marking developed as I constantly returned to the text, re-reading from the beginning once I had interpreted another form of marking.

Examining the various forms of marking allowed me to identify characteristics associated with the ethnic, national, and racial categories established by the text. It also helped me to see

how certain characters were marked somewhat indirectly as belonging to a particular ethnic, national, or racial group (e.g., an emphasis on knighthoods and titles allowed me to see how characters were marked as British). Significantly, this approach also helped to identify other racial and national categories not explicitly established by the text (i.e., whiteness and Canadian-ness). The explicit and redundant marking of racialized otherness within the narratives, for example, began to show whiteness as a category marked *by not being marked*.

The second component of this part of the analysis was to look for the separating strategies used to create binary or mutually exclusive categories that defined groups in opposition to, or accord with, a perceived norm. Anchan and Holychuk (1996) have described dualities such as “civilized vs. uncivilized, developed vs. undeveloped, modern vs. primitive, rich vs. poor, believers vs. heathen, and us vs. them” (p.94). Morrison (1992) states that the establishment of such absolute categories works to fix differences even in the absence of any significant or real difference (p.49). My goal was to see whether or not there was a pattern with regard to the position whiteness occupied. That is, I wanted to know if the narratives organized themselves around a rigid binarism through which ‘whites’ were represented as standing for such qualities or conditions as “modernity, reason, order, stability” while ‘other’ groups were represented as standing for “backwardness, irrationality, chaos and violence” (Dyer, 1988, p.49).

It became apparent early on that the way to ‘see’ whiteness was not through neat binaries, but rather complex hierarchies in which the ethnic, national, and racial categories established by the text were representatively ‘ranked’ according to certain characteristics and qualities (i.e., these categories were racialized).

Snead (1986) claims that the use of “separating strateg[ies] against difference” (p.x-xi) draws boundaries between absolutist views of racial identities and suggests that these racialized identities are further tied to such notions as culture, ethnicity, and national identity. Separating strategies are used to signify ‘white’ difference from ‘others’ and to set ‘others’ apart from ‘white’ norms. I found that the characteristics and qualities ascribed through processes of redundant marking also worked to separate others from the norms, while simultaneously defining the norm and the centrality of whiteness to it. The representation of whiteness could be seen for

example in historical narratives which seemed to arise from a certain concept of Canadian-ness that was separate from and unaccountable to the presence of racialized others (c.f., Morrison, 1992, p.5).

Along with the examination of narrative characters, their roles in the text, and the identification of redundant marking patterns and separation strategies (all intended to assist in mapping out racializations), there were two other fundamental questions which guided my readings and analyses: 1) To what extent did the text acknowledge the salience of racisms in constituting the nation? 2) From what (whose) perspective were the historical narratives told?

“History, understood as the sum total of past human activity and experience, has given rise to the cultural practices of popular racisms” (Stanley, 1998, p.41). Racisms are part of history. Anchan and Holychuk (1996) claim that literary narratives which deal explicitly with historical racisms are “apt to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to make sense of differing points of view” and to give students deeper understanding of the complexities which surround racisms (p.101). Racisms have suffused European modernity and British imperialism, thus it would seem obvious that historical narratives such as those contained in a Canadian history textbook also need to engage with the historical roles of different forms of racism. Certainly anti-racist pedagogy would require them to do so (Dei, 1996a). My objective here, therefore, was to see if the text recognized the salience of the category ‘race’ in constituting history. In other words, I attempted to ascertain if the role of racisms was somehow included in the historical narratives. If racisms were discussed, I wanted to see if the oppressive roles of dominant cultures were acknowledged, denied, or somehow muted so as to ‘tip-toe’ around ‘delicate’ issues. I was also looking for what Pajaczkowska and Young (1992) term processes of “inoculation” in which a limited number of oppressive acts are admitted by the perpetrator to make themselves immune to the racist label (p.217).

The question of perspective required understanding that the construction of knowledge is unequally distributed and controlled, and is rarely politically neutral or disinterested (Castenell & Pinar, 1993 as cited in Anchan & Holychuk, 1996, p.96). School knowledge, including knowledge contained within history textbooks, conveys that which authors opt to recall from the

past. Thus, 'textbook knowledge' reflects certain perspectives while burying or disguising others. Foucault (1980) claims that within these other perspectives lie "subjugated knowledges" that have been disqualified as inferior or "beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity" and hierarchically categorized "in the name of some true knowledge or some arbitrary idea of what constitutes a science and its objectives" (pp.82-3). Foucault further insists that these subjugated knowledges must be resurrected through the provision of critical space. Part of the objective of this study was to recognize the degree to which the language of historical narratives created space for the alternative or opposing knowledges of diverse cultures, but this was only part of a greater occupation with determining how space was created and preserved for dominant (e.g., white) 'knowledges'.

The method used here for 'measuring' the spaces created and preserved for dominant knowledges was one which aimed to determine whose perspective or point of view was represented. This process began by identifying whose story was being told and who did the telling. I then tried to determine if diverse perspectives had been included and, if so, the way in which they were represented (e.g., as integral or superfluous to the narrative).

Of related concern was the means whereby the narratives were purported to be constructed from an informed point of view. That is, I wanted to investigate the evidence used by the textbook (e.g., direct quotations or summaries of first hand accounts) to show that an array of perspectives had been included or, at least, considered in each historical narrative. I had hoped to analyze how primary and secondary sources were used to support general claims made about diverse or specific groups and how each was used to create or reinforce the 'authenticity' of the narrative. Perhaps a bit overwhelmed by the complex data obtained from the other components of this analysis, I did not carry out this part as thoroughly as I had intended. I did, nonetheless, continually ask whose story was being told and noted all instances in which narrative characters were cited as the providers of knowledge through direct quotations or paraphrased comments. These I tried to relate to my analysis of characters and their roles in the text. It seemed to me that the question of primary and secondary sources used in school history textbooks was worthy of a separate and more focused study.

It is important to reiterate that the methodology for this analysis was one which unfolded as the study progressed. Data (in the form of textual extracts, comments, interpretations, and frequencies) was continually compared across categories to allow for the discovery of significant patterns and relationships, hypothesis generation, and the restructuring of categories according to themes and relationships relevant to the question of how whiteness was represented in the text. This data was simultaneously collected, coded, analyzed, and interpreted (c.f., Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Altheide, 1987). After being condensed into a manageable form, it was connected to existing relevant literature to provide an answer to the following question: How is whiteness represented in the historical narratives of *Flashback Canada*?

IV. Discussion of Findings

1. *Imagining The Great White North*

Here I will present my interpretations of how particular ethnically or nationally identified groups and individuals are represented in *Flashback Canada*. It is my contention that morally weighted qualities are attributed to these various identities in ways which distinguish them as unique groups or kinds of people. In other words, these ethnicities and nationalities are racialized. Furthermore, these various racializations incorporate themselves into representations of Canadian-ness. Toward the end of this section, I will discuss how whiteness is also represented through these racialized ethnic or national groups.

a) Exemplars of the Canadian Citizen

(i) The British, Scottish, and English

I will begin with the characters who dominate the pages of *Flashback Canada*. The great number of characters in the historical narratives of the text who are explicitly or implicitly referred to as “British”, “Scottish”, or “English” appear as exemplars of the ideal Canadian citizen. Examples of some of the more obviously marked characters include: William Lyon Mackenzie, who was “born in Scotland” (FC, p.21); Robert Gourlay, “a Scot” (FC, p.22); Billy Barker, “a British sailor” (FC, p.128); and Frederick Middleton, “a British general” (FC, p.237). John A. Macdonald’s own words apparently directed toward “cheering crowds” are used to emphasize his British-ness: “A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die” (FC, p.246). This reinforces a positive evaluation of British loyalty. Moreover, since Macdonald is also represented as having come from Glasgow, Scotland (FC, p.57), British and Scottish ethnicities are intertwined. Indeed, the similarities among characters (individuals and groups) marked as British, Scottish, or English are many, hence their inclusion here under one heading. For the sake of convenience, I will use ‘British-ness’ in reference to the characteristics ascribed commonly to these three groups.

Often the marking of British-ness occurs through narratives which surround characters with images that stand for Britain. Such is the case for David Laird who has his British-ness highlighted when he is positioned as the central character in a narrative in which the scenery about

him is filled with symbols such as the “Union Jack” and the playing of “God Save the Queen” (FC, p.183-6). Elsewhere, the text informs the reader that Sir Charles Tupper’s body was brought back to Canada by a “battleship of the British navy” (FC, p.108). In both of these representations, degrees of authority, dignity, and honour are attached to the British symbolism which marks these men and their physical presence in Canada.

Tupper and a number of other characters also have attention drawn to their British-ness through the title they are portrayed as holding. “Sir” Hugh Allen (FC, p.196) and “Sir” Henry Pellatt (FC, p.273), too, are marked in this way. But the symbolic title carries with it more than the markings of British-ness. Knighthood is a distinction of respected and privileged status achieved by only the most worthy, and honourable. This is made evident in the representations of Leonard Tilley (FC, p.105), Matthew Baillie Begbie (FC, p.128), and John A. Macdonald (FC, p.114) each of whom is overtly recognized as being honoured in knighthood by Queen Victoria in a way that confirms their noble, principled, or incorruptible ‘nature.’ And, because these characters stand for the category of British-ness, this moral nature becomes a trademark of British-ness, or more specifically, male British-ness.

In many instances, the ascription of British-ness to individual characters coincides with the marking of those characters as loyal. John A. Macdonald, for example, is portrayed as “intensely loyal to Queen Victoria and proud of Canada’s connection with Britain (FC, p.54) while “men like [Robert] Baldwin were as loyal to Britain as the governor himself” (FC, p.23). Loyalty can be seen as well through individuals portrayed as willing to make personal sacrifices for the good of the emerging Canadian nation or the democratic principles on which it would be structured. Lady Mary, for example, “urged her husband to sign the [Rebellion losses] bill” even though it was thought that the violence which would result could pose some danger to her and her baby (FC, p.43). Elsewhere, George Stephen and Donald Smith “were prepared to sell their family possessions” to “keep the railway going for another three weeks” (FC, p.205). Since the railway project is exalted as that which would bind the colonies together, eliminating any chance for “British” territory to be usurped by the Americans, the sacrifices of Stephen and Smith come across as critical to the Canadian nation’s survival.

A related characteristic that appears among many of the British characters is perseverance, often presented in the context of overcoming great obstacles or difficult conditions with hard work and determination. For example, “[William Lyon Mackenzie’s] “father died when he was only three weeks old leaving Elizabeth Mackenzie, his mother, with very little to live on. By sheer hard work, Elizabeth Mackenzie supported herself and her son” (FC, p.21). Similarly, John A. Macdonald’s mother “was determined that her son would get a good education ... Though poor, the family managed to scrape together enough money to send John to boarding school” (FC, p.57). Registered in their suffering and displayed through such “narratives of perseverance and self-help” (Wellman, 1997, p.318) is the quality of striving.

Often the determination and ability of British individuals to strive for success in the face of difficulty is presented through narratives which detail the severity of Canadian climate or terrain. General Middleton’s journey with troops from Toronto for the west is indicative of this:

Ahead of them was a journey of approximately 2200km. Four times the troops had to leave the train in freezing weather to cross gaps in the railroad. They had to drag their guns and horses through deep snow in temperatures well below 0°C. (FC, p.229)

The enterprise, discipline, and energy required to overcome vast distances, remoteness, cold and harsh weather, and challenging terrain sets in these and other characters marked as British a distinctively Canadian identity. Not only is this identity bound with the geography and conditions of the Canadian landscape, but it is also pinioned to enterprising and determined actions which most always result in material achievement and success. This is apparent even with relatively minor characters such as Billy Barker who “kept on digging” and, as a result, “found a rich vein of gold”(FC, p.128) and David Fife, who persevered in the face of his neighbour’s ridicule to eventually “develop a stronger and more healthy strain” of wheat (FC, p.261). George Stephen’s determination to see a national railway completed is made clear through “a battle cry of one of the old Scottish clans” in which he (in his own words) encourages Donald Smith to, “Stand fast, Craigellachie.”....Don’t give up! We’ll win yet!” (FC, p.206). Indeed, they did “win” with the eventual and successful completion of the railway.

The construction of the railway represents a major obstacle for numerous characters, but is represented as John A. Macdonald's dream. His determination to see this "task" (FC, p.196) as well as the related and similarly imposing "monumental task" (FC, p.99) of Confederation achieved, becomes a central theme in the textbook. Both of these successfully overcome tasks also work to portray Macdonald as a determined visionary who makes and keeps his promises. Together with George Brown he "promised to work for some kind of union" (FC, p.99). Later, Macdonald "went even further" than expected in discussions with British Columbia and "promised a railway" (FC, p.130). The eventual fulfillment of both of these promises imputes his character with far-seeing wisdom, honesty, and the ability to achieve what was commonly held to be beyond the bounds of possibility. This flair for attaining the unattainable adds to Macdonald's character (and thus the character of the group for which he stands) a capacity for inspiring hope and confidence.

Individuals marked in some way as British are also frequently represented as elected or possessing 'elected-ness'. Again, Macdonald is a good example of this with considerable attention given to his elections and re-elections and the maintenance or restoration of his political power (e.g., FC, p.58 and 197) . Even more than for Macdonald, however, the mark of elected-ness is inexorably tied to the character of William Lyon Mackenzie.

[He] was elected to the Assembly as one of the representatives for York ... Five times Mackenzie was expelled from the Assembly for his attacks on the government. Each time the people voted Mackenzie back into the Assembly. (FC, p.21)

In addition, Mackenzie's character is symbolically reinforced as Scottish and his elected-ness glorified when it is explained that he was "ushered onto the hastings to the sound of bagpipes" and subsequently, "driven by sleigh to his home and carried into his house in triumph on the shoulders of his supporters" (FC, p.25).

Such an emphasis on elections and being elected serves several functions. First, it exemplifies these characters as upstanding citizens capable and worthy of speaking for others, representing their concerns, and solving their problems. Second, it justifies the actions and

power exhibited by each elected character. As a chosen representative of the people, an elected individual's power and actions are legitimate. This is what permits rebel leaders such as Mackenzie to be portrayed in heroic terms. His rebellious actions were all in the name of achieving responsible government and justified through the support of "the people" for this noble cause deemed a pre-condition for the construction of the Canadian nation. However, it should be noted that the oft unrestrained glory attached to elected characters masks the various reasons (e.g., racism and sexism among others) which prevented certain individuals or groups from being elected or contributing to the election process. It ignores the racial basis of the franchise and effectively denies the role of whites in its construction. Elections are thus cast unequivocally as 'good things' impervious to evils and incapable of imposing harmful or negative consequences upon any segment of the populace, while simultaneously legitimizing the power and actions of those privileged by inclusion in its process. A third thing that an emphasis on elected-ness does is to assert that the notion of responsible government is central to the definition of the Canadian nation. It positions characters tied to the notion as integral to the project of developing a nation based on democratic ideals. That is, by virtue of their elected-ness and the attributes which come with it, these characters begin to represent Canada and Canadians as much as they do Britain and the British.

Discussions of the electoral process also exclude some people from Canadian-ness. This can be seen in an explanation of the women's suffrage movement. After telling how the Wartime Elections Act was a "breakthrough" which gave certain women the right to vote, the following claim is made:

It was only a matter of time until *all Canadian women* would be allowed to vote in federal elections. On 24 May 1918, women's suffrage was finally won in Canada! (FC, p.337, emphasis added)

The subsequent explanation of the historic Dominion Elections Act, however, suggests that certain women (and men) were not to be considered "Canadian" or "Canadian citizens."

Canadian citizens twenty-one years or older who had lived in Canada one year were allowed to vote in federal elections...The right to vote was not given to Native women and most Native men. British Columbia denied males and females of Asian origin the right to vote. (FC, p.337)

These are clearly racialized exclusions/inclusions which represent Native people and people of Asian origin as non-Canadians. Important here too is the complete absence of the fact that women in Quebec did not receive the franchise until 1940. While not blatantly excluded from Canadian-ness like Natives and Asians, the women of Quebec (of whom many, of course, were 'French') thus become, at best, forgotten Canadians.

A characteristic related to elected-ness also recurrently attributed to British characters is leadership ability. Leadership in *Flashback Canada* is most often explained in terms of building the Canadian nation. The text states, for example, that "above all, it was Leonard Tilley who led New Brunswick into the union" (FC, p.105) and that Charles Tupper "led his province into Confederation" (FC, p.108). Macdonald is recognized as the one who "would one day lead all Britain's North American possessions into a great union" (FC, p.57). Macdonald's leadership qualities are owed in part to his "ability to speak well and capture the attention of" his audience (FC, p.99). Tilley too is referred to as "a sincere and honest speaker" (FC, p.105). This link between leadership qualities and communicative faculty is often presented as the ability to make people listen. Mackenzie, for example, "was only 1.65 m tall, but people listened to him when he spoke" (FC, p.21) and "5000 habitants gathered to listen to Wolfred Nelson (FC, p.32). A different kind of communicative ability is presented for Susanna Moodie and Catherine Parr Trail who are described as "remarkable authors" (FC, p.14), but, as is often the case for British women in the narratives of this text, leadership ability is not explicitly attached to their respective characters.

A number of British characters have their leadership ability discussed in the context of leading armed troops. Most are pictured as successful and overpowering masters of technical superiority who dispense with ill-equipped adversaries. General Strange, as one example, is presented as leading a particularly powerful force with the "advantage of heavy guns" and producing the quick dispersal of Big Bear's followers (FC, p.230). Conversely, failure or weakness on the part of "British" military leaders is only sparingly discussed and frequently

rationalized as the result of something other than moral or intellectual weakness. Colonel Otter's defeat in the battle of Cut Knife Hill, for example, is blamed on equipment failures: "At the crucial moment in the battle, the two cannons refused to fire. They were not in good working condition" (FC, p.235). Additionally, General Middleton's failure to quickly defeat Dumont at the "Battle of Batoche" is attributed to caution as opposed to any impotency as a commander (FC, p.232). Another way in which British failure is explained is to note the somewhat dubious or dishonourable tactics of the other, such as the ambush set by Dumont during General Middleton's loss in the "Battle of Fish Creek" (FC, p.230). Middleton is ultimately presented as a powerful and victorious leader when the text explicitly notes that both Riel (FC, p.232) and Poundmaker (FC, p.236) surrendered to him. Leadership ability is thus knotted with success (because they win) and honour (because they fight fairly) for characters marked with British-ness.

Characters marked with British-ness are redundantly represented as possessing wisdom, knowledge, or intelligence. For some it is explicit. John A. Macdonald is described as "intelligent, charming, and witty" (FC, p.58) and "recognized for his excellent knowledge of the law" (FC, p.57). Family Compact members John Strachan and John Robinson are insinuated to have been "very capable, clever individuals" (FC, p.11). For other people marked as British, intelligence is implied through descriptions of their education or training. Often, this combination of education and intelligence appears to explain expeditious accomplishments. For example, James Macleod's training "as a lawyer as well as a police officer" partially accounts for his success in running the whiskey traders out "within a short time" (FC, p.173-5). Leonard Tilley too was said to have had "a fair education for those times" and this education, in part, rationalizes his rise from drugstore clerk to premier of the province "before many years had passed" (FC, p.104). The rapid achievement of Charles Tupper similarly appears to be owed to extraordinary and natural intelligence. "Before he was seven years old, he had read the whole Bible aloud to his father [and] when he was twenty-two, he graduated from medical school in Edinburgh, Scotland" (FC, p.108).

Intelligence is intertwined with swift problem-solving ability for the character of Lord Durham who "after only five months in British North America" was able to "put his finger on the

troubles” (FC, p.41). The text does note that “he made one unwise suggestion”, specifically, that “he thought that French Canadians should be made to speak English and live like the English” (FC, p.42). However, not much is made of this point which, given the present-day struggles between Ottawa and Quebec, has great significance. In other words, it would seem that *Flashback Canada* ignored the obvious possibility that rather than quickly putting “his finger on the troubles”, Durham too hastily delivered a recommendation which promoted the racial oppression of French people and, as a consequence, may have contributed to the conceivable future disintegration of the Canadian nation. The absence of any real discussion of this “unwise” recommendation trivializes French historical struggles to preserve their language and way of life and overlooks British oppressiveness. In fact, Durham’s recommendation comes across merely as an error in his personal understanding which had no consequences for either the English or French, a forgivable and “singular lapse in an otherwise magnificent achievement” (Francis, 1997, p.60). Nor is any attempt made to explain where this “unwise” idea came from by, for example, explaining the extent to which it was indicative of pervasive notions and practices of racial assimilation. Rather, the emphasis is placed on his “good” (FC, p.42) ideas and how they predicted the development of a Canadian nation while simultaneously laying the foundation for the nation’s subsequent emergence. His recommendations to grant responsible government to the colonies and to join the colonies together “into one province of Canada” are highlighted and indicated to have been eventually put into place. The far-seeing wisdom which radiates from his character is further underscored when his visions of a greater “Canadian” nation are explained (FC, p.42). Above reproach, dignified, and wise, Durham embodies superior enlightenment.

Pedagogue-like representations are also visible for individuals such as Leonard Tilley who travelled “house-to-house throughout the colony” to talk with the people and “to explain Confederation to them” (FC, p.104) and for Lord Elgin who is portrayed as delivering a lesson to the people regarding an “important decision” about responsible government (FC, p.43). After being attacked by Tories, Elgin’s carriage was badly damaged by rocks and bricks. However, the British governor “never had it fixed [because] he wanted people to see it and remember at what price responsible government had been won” (FC, p.47). Powerful enough to make weighty

decisions, Elgin stands as the enabler of responsible government, the one who places the cornerstone for the fledgling Canadian nation. In his position as an officer of the imperial empire, Elgin also comes to represent the prototype of authoritative, rational, and civilized behaviour.

Possession of the ability and power to make decisions is another way in which intelligence gets represented among British characters. Decision making by characters marked with British-ness appears throughout the text and most often the decisions made work favourably toward the development of the Canadian nation. For example, James Douglas “decided that a good wagon road was needed along the Fraser River to Barkerville” (FC, p.128). It is then explained that the completed road “opened the entire Cariboo for settlement” enabling the development of “an important [ranching] industry that exists today” (FC, p.128). Queen Victoria also demonstrated the capacity for making intelligent decisions when she chose Ottawa as the capital city of Canada, a choice that “even George Brown” would eventually accept as a good one (FC, p.55). Her resolution of the vigorously debated problem affirms in her character a sense of reasonableness, a trait further exhibited when she solves a problem which “might have led to war” with the US by persuading the British government to be satisfied with an apology after a British vessel was stopped and boarded by a Northern American ship (FC, p.64). Such rational decision making is also evident with Charles Tupper (FC, p.108) and Samuel Leonard Tilley (FC, p.86) who resolve problems related to Confederation by setting up meetings in which plans are formulated to accommodate the interests of opposing groups.

Tilley is also portrayed as solving the problem of naming the new country by being “the one who came up with the idea of “Dominion” (FC, p.116). This is an action which reflects not only intelligence, but also Christian morals since it is explained that “he got the name from a verse in Psalm 72 of the Bible” (FC, p.116). Others including Tupper (FC, p.108), Strachan (FC, p.11-13), and the Baldwins (FC, p.22) are also marked as Christians. Indeed the physical or geographical space of Canada is marked as a religious (Christian) one. “The church bells started to ring at midnight ... people of all religious faiths gathered to offer prayers for the future of the nation and its people” (FC, p.113). This sweeping claim to include “all” religious faiths seems grossly misplaced, particularly when only Christian denominations and sects are mentioned in the

text. For this reason, the signification of religion as necessary or important to the telling of these historic events works to represent the Canadian nation as an exclusively Christian one.

Furthermore, the previously discussed characteristics such as continued striving and determination reinforce (particularly, through British characters) a sense that Christian virtues are imagined to be defining characteristics of the Canadian nation.

The possession of sound judgment, intelligence, and Christian morality which characterizes many of British characters, is complemented with the portrayal of these characters as naturally civilized, orderly, and peaceful. This is true for heroic characters such as Lord Elgin for whom “the thought of violence was disturbing” (FC, p.43), but also for the few characters who are implicated as a source of a problem. Francis Bond Head’s first reaction to the Upper Canada rebellion was to “sen[d] officials to bargain with Mackenzie under a white flag of truce” (FC, p.4). Only when Mackenzie and his followers refused to lay down their arms (a demonstration of principled resolve) did Head resort to what seems to be an inherent responsibility for many British characters to forcefully attain order. This intrinsic duty to use power and force to bring about law and subservience permeates the actions of many of the main characters marked with British-ness. Indeed, this is precisely how some characters are marked as British, that is, they are portrayed as being purposely dispatched from England or Britain to resolve conflicts or problems. For example, Judge Begbie “was sent from England to bring law and order” (FC, p.127) and the British government “asked Lord Durham to go to Canada to report on ... troubles” (FC, p.40). When the entire force of Mounties are represented as having “been sent by the Queen to drive out the people who have been selling liquor” (FC, p.171), individual Mounties such as Colonel French and Colonel Macleod become representatives of the Queen and, therefore, of Britain. Such representations have the added effect of portraying Britain as the supplier of saviours who come to the rescue of the embryonic or infant nation at times of peril (c.f., Francis, p.58-9, 1997). This underlines a parental-like bond between that which is British and that which is or will be Canadian, adding strength to the notion of Canada as naturally (pseudo-heritably) British.

If the power to provide justice in a supposedly lawless territory is not explicitly stated, it is at least justified by the text. James Douglas is described as “a strong, wise man” who “had no power on the Fraser River but ...believed that as the Queen’s representative, he had to do all he could to keep law and order” and thus ordered miners in the area to “obey British law or be punished” (FC, p.126). Matthew Baillie Begbie’s power in this region is made legitimate through an explanation that he was appointed to the position of “judge” by the “British” presumably on the basis of his “harsh” but “fair” and “dignified” character (FC, p.127). In both the Douglas and Begbie representations, British-ness is the vehicle through which their powerful presence in the geographical space of British Columbia becomes naturalized and valid.

Flashback Canada takes care to clarify the situation in which Begbie wielded his power: “This harsh justice was the kind of law the miners understood. It must be remembered that Judge Begbie was dealing with a very unruly group of people” (FC, p.128). The implication is that “harshness” was not normally associated with British justice. Its necessity in this case was dictated by the existence of a particularly “unruly” people who presumably understood nothing else. It is perhaps no coincidence that the unruly group of people are identified as American. Begbie and Douglas, through just if sometimes forceful means, “kept the gold rush in British Columbia from being as violent as the gold rush in California” (FC, p.126-7). These two individuals and the unimpeachable character of each stand for British-style justice and civilization - the legitimized use of force to bring about a peaceful and orderly community (in a territory in which British sovereignty was apparently never questioned).

Those forced or enticed to come under British authority are portrayed as the beneficiaries of British guardianship. This is particularly true for Native peoples. Even the “harsh” Judge Begbie’s main task “was to protect the Native peoples” (FC, p.127). The paternalistic care of Native peoples during the process of bringing law and order to the west is a prevalent theme in the text. For example, the massacre of thirty-six Assiniboine by American wolf hunters is used to introduce the problem faced by John A. Macdonald of finding a way to “bring law and order to the North-West” (FC, p.167). The subsequent chapter positions American wolfers and whiskey peddlers as causes of the problems in the territory, and Native peoples as the victims. The

formation of the North-West Mounted Police is deemed to be the solution. The duties of the force, “to keep peace, prevent crime, and catch criminals” (FC, p.168) are nobly fulfilled by members of the police force such as Colonel French and Colonel Macleod who are credited with giving the Mounted Police “an early reputation for discipline ... law and justice” (FC, p.174-5). These men are also portrayed as winning the respect of the Native groups. Macleod in particular is singled out for his trustworthiness, fairness, and his friendship with Crowfoot (FC, p.173). Thus, these “Straight-backed Mounties” (FC, p.183), emblematic of dignified rectitude, are representatives of the moral superiority and civilized order of British-ness. They successfully ‘tamed’ the west as much through peaceful and rational methods (e.g., befriending the Native peoples) as through the use of justly exercised force. Often placed against the brute force used in the American west, this portrayal helps to define Canadian as something that is rational, humane, caring, inherently peaceful, and decidedly different from that which is American.

Individuals marked with British-ness are portrayed as actors in their own right. That is, they all do something in the narratives of the text, and most often this activity contributes positively to the development of the Canadian nation. This is true even for relatively minor characters such as Jane Fife who saved an important strain of wheat by running “from the house waving her apron and shooing the cow out of the yard” (FC, p.262). Had she not rescued the wheat, “Canada might never have become a great wheat-producing country” (FC, p.262).

Characters marked with British-ness exhibit significant actions, but they also are portrayed as living significant lives with lasting and crucial contributions to the nation. This is frequently recognized through descriptions of what these individuals did later in life or how their achievements were distinguished. Billy Barker had a town named in his honour (FC, p.128). Mackenzie was pardoned for his role in the rebellion and returned to live in Toronto (FC, p.28). Begbie became “chief justice” (FC, p.128), Tilley was “appointed lieutenant-governor” (FC, p.105), and Tupper became “prime minister of Canada” (FC, p.108). The implication is that the lives of these individuals mattered and are critical to the telling of Canadian history. This is further recognized by the portrayal of their deaths as momentous events in themselves. Tupper, Tilley, and Mackenzie are among those whose deaths are described in some detail. Certainly,

however, it is the glorified death of Macdonald which most clearly illustrates the salient link between the lives of 'British' characters and the Canadian nation. "On the evening of 6 June 1891, Sir John A. Macdonald died. With his death an era of Canadian history had come to a close" (FC, p.246). Macdonald's role in the construction of the nation is highlighted throughout the text. He is the busiest problem-solver in the textbook, and portrayed as the solution to "guid[ing] the new Dominion of Canada through the first shaky years of its life" (FC, p.58), almost as though he has some symbolic parental function. Macdonald comes to the rescue of the nation time and time again. When a "great economic depression set in" during the Alexander Mackenzie years, he proposed "a National Policy to solve the country's problems" (FC, p.197). As part of this policy, he negotiated deals to ensure the completion of his promised railway. When the railway project was in trouble, Macdonald again was the saviour.

At the crucial moment, Macdonald acted. He reminded Parliament that the railway had already proved its value in the Red River Rebellion ...For this reason, the railway did get one more government loan. It was enough to finish the line of steel. (FC, p.206)

His power to solve these problems is attributed to willingness to work hard, his determination to rise above poverty and immigrant status, and the natural skills and qualities which made him a good politician and gained him the support of the people (FC, p.57-8). Another way in which the text seems to explain Macdonald's tremendous power and success is through discussion of his dreams which represent him as a visionary able to look to the future for the good of the country (e.g., FC, p.68 and p.196). Above all perhaps, Macdonald's power is frequently explained in terms of the problems of wielding authority over others. Hurdles faced by Macdonald include convincing the colonies to join confederation, settling and enforcing law in the west, completing the railway, and quelling "Native" and "Métis" rebellions. Each is overcome through Macdonald's guidance and with the help of other great "British" men. In part through Macdonald, *Flashback Canada* unites Canadian-ness with British-ness in the telling of this Canadian nationalist history. He represents the 'true' Canadian - a loyal British subject supposedly endowed with superior moral and intellectual characteristics.

Male and female (but mostly male) characters marked as British, Scottish, or English appear as norms for rationality, authority, civilized behaviour, legitimate and powerful control, purposeful action, and success. The 'character' of these narrative characters is further imbued with such qualities as enterprising and determined perseverance, loyalty, a willingness to make personal sacrifice, benevolence, integrity, natural leadership ability, intelligence, family values, and Christian morals. Furthermore, these qualities attributed to British, Scottish, and English individuals and groups come together to represent the archtypical Canadian.

(ii) The 'unmarked' and Canadians

The proximity of British-ness to Canadian-ness can be further observed through the representation of certain 'unmarked' narrative characters or characters whose only ethnic, national, or racial marking presents them as Canadian. Embodying the same or similar 'character' as that of the British, these groups are not marked explicitly enough to allow me to place them into the preceding category of British-ness or any of the categories which are to follow. In this sense, many of them are 'unmarked' though a number are, in fact, located or named as Canadians. Nellie McClung, for example, is presented as "Canada's great social reformer" and indicated to have been "born in Ontario" (FC, p.333). Many others are portrayed as having come from somewhere in Canada including Samuel Lount who was described as "a blacksmith from Holland Landing" and Peter Matthews who was referred to as "a farmer from Pickering" (FC, p.27).

Characteristics ascribed to these individuals consistently bear close resemblance to those marked with British-ness. For example, many of these characters are elected - a marking which signifies 'biological' characteristics such as intelligence and moral characteristics such as concern or responsibility for others. Women are included among those represented as elected:

Agnes Macphail, was the first woman to be elected to the House of Commons in 1921. She was re-elected four times. In the same year, Nellie McClung was elected to the Alberta legislature. (FC, p.337)

John Powell (FC, p.3), J.S. Woodsworth (FC, p.319) and Joseph Howe (FC, p.36) are among others described as elected. Howe's elected-ness helps to justify his rather favourable portrayal in the text, despite his anti-confederationist stand. Because he is a 'legitimate' representative of the

people, Howe's actions are acceptable and, indeed, help to define the Canadian nation as one which permits alternative viewpoints and freedom of expression. Furthermore, Howe's efforts to bring about responsible government through peaceful means highlight the civilized nature of his character and the group for which he stands. The election of Howe and these other individual men and women is portrayed as critical to the construction of the character of the Canadian nation as a whole. This character of the nation is deemed to include responsible government, labour and social reform, and women's rights.

This category including 'unmarked' narrative characters and those marked as "Canadian" is also represented as possessing leadership ability. For some, this leadership comes in the form of opposition to constituted authority. Anthony Anderson (FC, p.3), Samuel Lount and Peter Matthews (FC, p.27) are each pictured as armed rebel leaders. For others, leadership comes in the form of counteraction to Confederation. Anti-confederationists from Nova Scotia were "led by Joseph Howe" (FC, p.114) and "C.F. Bennett led the fight against Confederation" in Newfoundland (FC, p.110). George Brown is referred to as a "respected leader" (FC, p.106) and leader of the "Reform party" (FC, p.54) while frequently being presented as John A. Macdonald's rival. But these characters are not always or merely represented as opposing authority or authoritative figures. Sheriff Jarvis (FC, p.5) and Colonel Garnet Wolseley (FC, p.161) are examples of military leaders clearly on the side of the established powers. Legitimate and authoritative leadership is also implied for Andrew Onderdonk (FC, p.204), Sandford Fleming (FC, p.206), and Charles Saunders (FC, p.262) each of whom is described as being "in charge".

The importance of family is also represented for this category of characters. Occasionally, this is done through what are ostensibly original letters describing concern for family members or expressing human feelings which demonstrate attachment to the family. Harry Goodfellow's letter indicating that he missed his family (FC, p.291-2) and Rufus Seaver's letter expressing relief that his wife and children were safe from the threat of rebellion (FC, p.46) are examples of this. Elsewhere, the tragic consequence of personal sacrifice aimed at the achievement of responsible government is demonstrated when *Flashback Canada* explains that following their executions,

“Peter Matthews left a widow and fifteen children, and Samuel Lount left a widow and seven children” (FC, p.228).

The willingness to make personal sacrifices is highlighted for several of the characters in this grouping. Self-denial and sacrifice is made very clear with George Brown who “sacrificed himself and his party to help” bring about Confederation (FC, p.106). His action to break political deadlock is described as “one of the most unselfish actions in Canadian history” and said to have “revealed his true greatness” (FC, p.61). He “was not looking for personal credit, but thinking of the good of his country” (FC, p.106). This also positions Brown as having legitimate membership in the Canadian nation by virtue of his loyal actions. In a similar vein, J.S. Woodsworth’s “tireless” efforts on behalf of social reform explain his rise “to a place of national prominence” (FC, p.320) as a justly-earned place in the Canadian nation.

Communicative ability as a reflection of intellectual authority is also represented among these ‘unmarked’ or Canadian characters. Nellie McClung is “chief spokesperson ... [of] a delegation of several hundred women” (FC, p.325) and explicitly claimed to have had “great ability as a speaker and a writer” (FC, p.333). J.S. Woodsworth’s writing skills are touted (along with a degree of benevolence) when it is explained that he “wrote two books” about the suffering of people as the All People’s Mission (FC, p.319). Additionally, the communicative aptitude of George Brown is noted when the text explains that during the debate of the Quebec Conference resolutions “one of the best speeches was given by George Brown who spoke for four hours” (FC, p.105).

Like characters marked as British, these characters are invariably portrayed as achieving success through their actions. Often this success is gained through perseverance. One example is the successful effort of Nellie McClung, Emily Stowe, and Emily Murphy in their “movement for women’s suffrage” (FC, p.332-340). Adelaide Hoodless too successfully “persisted’ with her efforts to “persuade the public schools to teach domestic science” (FC, p.332). That this characteristic of persistence went hand in hand with hard work is also evident. Hart Massey, the text declares, “was not afraid of hard work” (FC, p.286). Through Massey, enterprising success and business acumen signify superior intelligence. “He knew how to operate every machine his

factory produced” and built “his father’s small implement business into one of Canada’s largest industries” (FC, p.285) . The lasting contribution of Massey to the national project is expressed in terms of how his inventions “helped to revolutionize farming techniques at the time the West was opening for settlement” and also through the sharing of his wealth with “Canadian society”, notably his gift to Toronto of “the world famous concert hall” (FC, p.286).

The entire life of George Brown is deemed significant by the text when it claims that he “withdrew from politics and gave all his attention to the *Globe*”, was “appointed to the Senate”, and later had his life end “in tragedy” when he was shot and killed by one of his employees (FC, p.106). Brown is noted to have been the leader of a group of newspaper owners who had turned down workers’ demands for change (FC, p.303). However, while the text does illustrate some of the terrible conditions under which workers struggled, none of these are directly associated with Brown or his paper. Just as the failures and oppressive or immoral actions of characters explicitly named as British are minimized or ignored altogether, so too does any wrongdoing on Brown’s part go unacknowledged.

These ‘unmarked’ characters and characters marked as Canadian are represented (in part, through their elected-ness) as possessing intelligence, problem-solving ability, and responsibility for others. They are primarily peaceful, rational, and civilized individuals demonstrating authoritative leadership and high regard for family values. Their tendencies toward unselfishness, self-help, hard work, and persistence represent them as important and life-long contributors to the Canadian project. In other words, despite not being named as such, they are British or, minimally, a very close approximation. Though arguably not as complete or as perfect as the British, this group (as an heir to this perfection) is similarly representative of conceptions of the ideal Canadian.

b) Flawed but Compatible Canadians

While the Canadian and ‘unmarked’ characters may not exhibit the same range of qualities as those marked with British-ness, these qualities are of the same kind. There are other narrative characters, however, who exhibit many of the same qualities, but who display as well some clear faults or ‘moral blemishes’. These include those characters marked as Irish, French, and

American. These blemishes are not enough, though, to exclude these characters and the group they stand for from compatibility with the ideal Canadian. Indeed, despite their faults, these groups make substantial and honourable contributions to the nation, almost as though they have been morally redeemed through achieving Canadian-ness.

(i) The Irish

There are several characters clearly identified as Irish or being from Ireland. Thomas Scott is referred to as “an Irishman” (FC, p.158). D’Arcy McGee is identified as “Irish” (FC, p.107) and the text claims that Daniel O’Donogue “came to Canada from Ireland as a small boy” (FC, p.304). There are also numerous references to a special group of Irish people, the Fenians: “The Fenians were some of a large number of Irish who had settled in the United States to get away from British control” (FC, p.66). That the Fenians were not to be considered British is made very clear: “Many Fenians detested the British” (FC, p.66). One of these Fenians is personally identified in the text as Patrick James Whelan (FC, p.108).

These characters who stand for the category of Irish-ness, represent this category in two contrasting ways. Whelan and the Fenians are characterized primarily as violent. The Fenians are said to have “actually invaded” Canada (FC, p.66) and are portrayed as instilling both fear (FC, p.67) and terror (FC, p.107) into the lives of those living along the border. Whelan himself receives mention in the text solely because of his violent action, “the murder of McGee”, which is deemed to be motivated by “Fenian revenge” (FC, p.107). Thomas Scott is also presented as violent, as well as disruptive, intolerant, and disrespectful. The text claims that Scott showed “little respect for the Métis people and sneered at their lifestyle”, “struck his guards”, “called the Métis a pack of cowards” and “threatened to murder Riel” (FC, 158-9). But while both Whelan and Scott are identified as causing significant problems, it appears as though some effort is made to position them as not personally accountable for their actions. For example, the use of his own words suggests that alcohol is to blame for Whelan’s fatal actions: “Whiskey is the devil. If it were not for whiskey, I would not have shot McGee. I was drunk as the devil when I did it. There were three of us, but the others skedaddled home” (FC, p.107). Similarly, although the text notes that Scott “continued to stir up trouble” and was the cause of “a very serious incident”

more criticism is directed toward Riel's decision to have Scott's execution carried out than on Scott's actions (FC, p.159). The text seems to suggest that Scott's troublemaking didn't warrant the punishment he received. These representations come across as confessional narratives or ways to acknowledge historical wrongs, but at the same time distancing British-ness or Canadian-ness from those wrongs by confining guilt to a people declared to be Irish. The portrayal of Scott, Whelan, and the Fenians as 'bad apples' works to reinforce the distance between British-ness and Irish-ness while the representation of McGee and O'Donogue as 'good apples' demonstrates the potential of 'Irish' people to attain some sort of compatibility with British-ness (and by extension, Canadian-ness). Both McGee and O'Donogue are ascribed many of the same characteristics as those marked with British-ness. In fact, McGee is represented as possessing similar British loyalties as he "strongly criticized his fellow Irish who wanted to free Ireland and Canada from Britain" (FC, p.107). Like many of the British and Scottish, McGee is portrayed as having been elected and possessing great communicative ability. He is referred to as "the best speaker in the Canadian assembly" (FC, p.107) and mentioned along with Macdonald as one who "spoke with warmth and brilliant wit" (FC, p.99).

O'Donogue shares with British characters traits such as compassion for family members, a willingness to work hard and to learn, and the ability to lead:

To help support his widowed mother, Daniel became a printer's helper when he was eleven years old. He learned the trade and became a leading organizer of the printer's union in Canada. (FC, p.304)

Both he and McGee are presented as noteworthy builders of the Canadian nation. McGee, who "travelled around the colonies talking about the dream of Confederation", is portrayed as a determined and instructive "Father of Confederation" (FC, p.107). O'Donogue is credited with solving problems related to the rights of workers and is referred to as "The Father of Canadian Unionism" (FC, p.304).

The Irish then are at once integral and foreign to the Canadian nation. The Fenian Irish and those like them (e.g. Scott) actually provided justification for creating the nation as a way to combat the "Fenian threat" (FC, p.67) and to bring civilized order to the west. They are

characterized by violence, vengefulness, disrespectfulness, intolerance, troublemaking, and drunkenness, but in such a way that immorality is reconfigured as innocence. On the other hand, the compassionate, hard-working, eloquent, determined, and loyal Irish (e.g., McGee and O'Donogue) are presented as having made material contributions to the development of the Canadian nation. Signified here is the potentially congruous fit of Irish-ness with imagined ideals of Canadian-ness. Nevertheless, it is evident that as a less than perfect (read British) people, the Irish occupy a somewhat lower rung on the hierarchical ladder which defines this ideal Canadian citizen.

(ii) The French

Another distinct group identified in the text and representative of something less than perfect Canadian-ness is the French. This group is described as being “concerned about preserving their French language, their Roman Catholic religion, and their traditional way of life” (FC, p.33). This sense of tradition and the concern to maintain the status quo is evident in a letter written by “French-Canadian” Marie-Josée:

Four-fifths of the people of Lower Canada are French-Canadians like us. For six generations we have lived quietly farming this land. We are contented with our life. We do not see the need to change. Why can't the English just leave us in peace? (FC, p.32)

The French are marked as conservative, old-fashioned, or even stagnant in comparison to the English. “The French were afraid they would soon be swamped by the growing number of English-speaking people” and the progressive change brought by the English:

The English business people wanted to change Lower Canada into a busy industrial place. They wanted to build roads, canals, bridges, and banks. They wanted to encourage English people to move to the cities in Lower Canada ...[because] the English settlers would bring more business. (FC, p.34)

Placed in opposition to English foresight, innovation, and modernity, the French become representative of unpreparedness, unimaginativeness, and antiquation. When progressive change comes in the form of plans for Confederation, “French-speaking people” had to be persuaded “that they had nothing to worry about” and that “they would not lose their language, their religion, or their schools” (FC, p.107). The persuaders, the English, take the role of symbolic ♦

parents guiding the infant French in a process of maturation toward modernity (c.f., Francis, 1997, chapter 4).

The French are portrayed repeatedly as discontented, bitter, and insulted. Through the words of a contemporary (though fictional) French-Canadian, the text portrays the French as insulted by English rule of which they “complained bitterly” (FC, p.33). The execution of Louis Riel is deemed to have caused a “bitter” split “between English-speaking and French-speaking people”, yet this bitterness is represented as very one-sided:

On the day of the execution, crowds gathered quietly in English-speaking Canada to hear the news. In French-speaking Canada, however, the reaction was quite different... Hundreds of students in Montreal shouted “Glory to Riel!” Likenesses of Sir John A. Macdonald were burned openly in the streets. (FC, p.241)

Such a representation of this supposed bitter split reinforces the notion of a reserved and rational English population while propagating the view of an irrational and disorderly French population who are disrespectful of the nation’s most heroic and glorified leader. Another example of French ‘bitterness’ comes through discussions of Confederation. Unlike in Canada West, the text implies, “In Canada East, there were bitter critics of the plan for Confederation” (FC, p.106). When a “Confederation update” is discussed, the text explains that the Quebec government protested the Constitution deal as “an insult done to Quebecers by English Canada” (FC, p.144). French-Canadian resistance to Confederation and the new Constitution is described only briefly, however, in comparison to the successful implementation of these two key nation-building steps and the glorious ceremony surrounding them. This positions French concerns as somewhat insignificant to the Canadian project and thus places the French people on the margins of this national venture.

Connected to this representation of powerlessness in the face of British or English goals is fear. Marie-Josée wrote, “I fear French-Canadian blood may soon run in the streets of this unhappy land” (FC, p.32). Louis Joseph Papineau, “feared that Britain intended to turn his people into English men and women” (FC, p.34) and “many French-speaking Canadians feared they would be completely outnumbered in Confederation” (FC, p.106). A fear of being “swamped” by the English is another mentioned on several occasions (e.g., FC, p. 85). This fear

is represented as continuing into the next century. During the “Confederation update” the text reads, “Quebec fears its provincial powers will be weakened by the new Constitution” (FC, p.144).

Beyond these uniquely French representations, however, the text does portray French and English Canadians as having “many things in common ” (FC, p. 86). Examining the individual characters marked as “French” illustrates this. Along with the aforementioned Papineau and the family of Marie-Josée, others marked as French include: Louis Lafontaine, George Cartier, Wilfrid Laurier, and René Levesque. These characters are marked as French primarily through direct association with regions explicitly and frequently referred to as French. For Lafontaine and Levesque this occurs through their roles as representatives of Canada East and Quebec (FC, p.42 and p.141). For Cartier and Laurier, the marking comes through discussions of their background. George Cartier is “a descendant of the famous Cartier family of New France” (FC, p.106). The textbook explains that,

[Laurier] was born near the village of St. Lin in the Province of Quebec. He was a sixth generation Canadian. He could trace his ancestors back to a member of the Carigan-Salieres Regiment who had settled in Quebec in the seventeenth century. (FC, p.248)

This emphasized longevity serves not only to create a sense of natural belonging for these characters , but also works to justify the power they exhibit as nation-builders as some natural extension of their historical (pseudo-aboriginal) place in the nation. Wilfrid Laurier’s power, in particular, is represented through an emphasis on longevity: “the next fifteen years were to become known as the Golden Age of Laurier” (FC, p.248). His power is further explained as owing to personal characteristics such as his sense of “honesty, courage, and fair play” and his “charm, appearance, dignity, and eloquence” (FC, p.248-9). But all of these exceptional attributes are presented as if they arose from the “English-ness” he gained as a youth:

When Laurier was eleven, his father did a surprising thing. He sent Wilfrid to school in the English-speaking settlement at New Glasgow. There Laurier learned English and became fluently bilingual. He lived with a family of Scottish Protestants. Laurier learned a great deal about the ways and religion of English-speaking Protestants. He also learned to be tolerant of people different

from himself. In later years, as prime minister of a largely English-speaking Canada, this knowledge was extremely useful. (FC, p.248)

Since this background is described as “unusual” and “surprising” it asserts as normal the separation of peoples defined as English and French. Furthermore, there is a strong sense that this ‘injection’ of Scottish Protestant morality Laurier received in his youth somehow explains his prominence in Canadian history. “Laurier’s greatest gift to Canada was his ability to see both the English and French points of view” (FC, p.249) and this greatness seems to depend on his becoming more English, as if this accomplishment was the reason “he won the respect and admiration of the British” and a knighthood from Queen Victoria (FC, p.249).

Though not to the same extent as Laurier, Cartier too is represented with characteristics similar to those for ‘British’ individuals. For him this comes through comparison to John A. Macdonald: “Like John A. he was trained to be a lawyer, and like Macdonald, he became leader of the conservative party” (FC, p.106). As if Macdonald’s word is to represent the ultimate truth, the final comments on Cartier which attest to his fundamental place in the building of the Canadian nation are: “Macdonald said that if it had not been for Cartier, Confederation would never have passed in Canada East” (FC, p.107).

Even rebel leader, Papineau, is deemed to have been “an admirer of Britain” (FC, p.34) in his early life. Though his actions turned anti-British, they are portrayed as a last resort to force the changes necessary for responsible government, the kind of government which would come to define the Canadian nation. Since Papineau’s actions such as attacking “the governor and the English-speaking Chateau Clique” (FC, p.34) are directly linked to efforts to bring about reform, he is ultimately forgiven (just as Mackenzie was). After being pardoned, Papineau “returned to Quebec ...[and] soon retired” (FC, p.36). It is these great French characters (Laurier, Cartier, and Papineau) who the text deems worthy of extensive coverage and inclusion as nation builders. Those opposed to the nation in some way, Dorion and Levesque for example, receive far less attention.

The possession of elected-ness is another way in which the ‘great’ French individuals are portrayed as similar to the English or British. Lafontaine (FC, p.42) and Papineau (FC, p.34) were “elected to the assembly” and Laurier was elected to the federal government in Ottawa”

(FC, p.248). Dorion, however, is represented as finding fault with the processes of elections: “Dorion wanted a referendum ... [He] believed that on such an important issue it was not enough just to have the elected members of the Assembly vote” (FC, p.107). The problem he creates by requesting special treatment and attempting to contravene the system of responsible government so hard fought for, is resolved by Cartier who simply “refused” the request (an action reflective of both men’s relative power).

During the process of getting Confederation to pass in Canada East, Cartier actively demonstrates several other characteristics associated with British-ness, namely, overcoming distances, persuasion, and promise-making (FC, p.107). Laurier too is portrayed as a problem-solver. He is represented as a prime minister who solved problematic relations between Canada’s French and English (FC, p.249) and successfully dealt with the problem of filling the west with settlers by delegating the task to the capable Clifford Sifton (FC, p.253). Laurier, however, is one of the few characters presented as key to the Canadian nation who is marked by any kind of failure, but even then the text highlights his efforts to solve problems.

Prime Minister Laurier and the Liberals listened to the farmers’ problems. They tried to do something about them ... Western farmers were happy about Laurier’s plan. However, business people in eastern Canada [were not]... Laurier and his government were soundly defeated. (FC, p.350)

Characters marked as French are represented as less ‘perfect’ than those marked as British. While certain French characters seem to possess favorable moral and intellectual qualities such as honesty, determination, courage, eloquence, persuasive power, and problem-solving ability (e.g., Laurier, Cartier, and Papineau) others come across as more confrontational, discontent, or unwilling to participate in the ‘proper’ procedures of the Canadian nation (e.g., Dorion and Levesque). Indeed, the French in general are frequently presented in ways that portray them as overly conservative, lacking in foresight, and fearsome of the British. Like the Irish, then, there is a sense that this group of people named as “French” is comprised of both good and bad characters. It is the existence of the good which allows them the possibility to attain

compatibility with the Canadian ideal, particularly when they are presented as ‘naturally’ belonging in Canada and having made monumental contributions to the Canadian project.

(iii) The Americans

Another category of people referred to in the text is Americans. As a defined group, Americans are set apart from the British (and Canadians) in ways which emphasize the former’s less desirable traits. Early in the text, this is explained in terms of an impending threat that the Americans might take over all of North America.

When the North won the war in 1865, Canadians really began to worry...Would they attack Canada as a way of getting revenge on Britain? A number of American newspapers and politicians had been talking about the takeover of Canada. Many Americans believed in Manifest Destiny. That is they believed that it was natural that the United States would one day control all of North America. (FC, p.66)

This represents the Americans as vengeful, power-hungry, and greedy. It also portrays them as disrespectful of what are deemed to be established territories. Such intrusiveness into “British” territory is also evident in the following passage:

American settlers, railways, and trade were steadily pressing in on the Red River Settlement near what is now Winnipeg. It looked as if the colony might become so American that it would be joined to the United States. On the west coast of North America, the same thing was happening. The discovery of gold in British Columbia brought thousands of Americans into that colony.....If the colony of British Columbia and the empty plains were to be kept British, something would have to be done quickly. (FC, p.66)

Not only does this suggest that Americans were trespassing onto British land, but it implies that for something or someone to become American is to become decidedly different, or even inferior (implied through the sense of urgency in the passage), to that which is “kept British”. In such ways are the categories of “British-ness” and “American-ness” separated by *Flashback Canada*.

The “thousands of Americans” brought to British Columbia with the discovery of gold reappear later in the text. These gold miners are indicated to have been “one of the toughest and most lawless groups of people in America” and described as “a very unruly group of people. Most [of whom] were armed with pistols, knives, and other weapons” (FC, p.127-8). Tendencies toward disobedience, lawlessness, and fracticious behaviour are not limited to

American miners however. An 1873 “news bulletin” describes “American wolf hunters” as attacking a “band of Assiniboine” whom they “falsely accused” of stealing a horse:

The Americans came north looking for revenge. The “wolfers” burst into the Indian camp, killing thirty-six men, women, and children. It turned out that the missing horse had just wandered away. (FC, p.167)

Again, Americans are portrayed as having intruded into the space of others, this time acting in a violent and irrational manner. Later in this same passage, the American hunters are further represented as unscrupulous in their actions, trading firewater to the Native peoples and using a poisoned bait which “often” caused the “agonizing deaths” of Indian dogs (FC, p.167).

Elsewhere, Fort Whoop-Up is termed the centre of “outlaw activity” primarily involving the illegal whiskey trade. That such unlawful activity was being committed by Americans infringing on “Canadian territory” is made clear by the text: “The people who lived there were mostly American smugglers and traders. They flew the American flag over the fort, even though it was Canadian territory” (FC, p.168).

The relationship with “native groups” also provides a way for the text to create a distinction between inherently peaceful Canadians and naturally violent Americans. In a discussion of the movement of native groups to reserves, the text claims: “In Canada, unlike in the United States, this was achieved with almost no bloodshed and warfare” (FC, p.174). Elsewhere violence is associated not with criminals or outlaws, but with soldiers and settlers:

In the United States, Native groups had fought a losing battle against the settlers. Native lands had been taken, and Natives had been killed by American soldiers and settlers. Were the treaties [in Canada] a better solution perhaps? (FC, p.182)

When the text asks the reader to discuss the comment that “the Mounted Police made the Canadian West a different kind of place than the American West”(p.182), the implication is that the Canadian West was a better place to live because it was a place of law and order as opposed to unruly violence and disobedience. Indeed, America is represented as both a place of origin and refuge for violent and unruly people. It is emphasized that the Fenians (Irish-Americans) “invaded” and threatened Canada by way of America, and that rebel leaders such as Mackenzie (FC, p.26-7), Riel (FC, p.162, 227), and Dumont (FC, p.237) all sought sanctuary in the United

States at one point or another. The suggestion that Canada was a better place to live is also apparent through an emphasis on the portrayal of the Icelanders opting to live in Canada though they had originally intended to go to the US (FC, p.221).

This is not to say that the Americans were irreversibly trapped in their unruly, irreverent, and violent way of being. For example, once law and justice were brought to British Columbia by the British government, the aforementioned American gold miners chose British over American rule, implying their acceptance of and preference for the former: “Many of the miners came from the United States. But, when a petition was circulated in 1869, only 104 of 10000 people in the colony signed it to say they wanted to join the United States” (FC, p.129). Similarly, a sense is created that once Americans came to Canada, their potential for honest and hard work would manifest itself as successful contributions to the “nation” of Canada, as if being in Canada somehow brought out the most redeeming characteristics in Americans (c.f., Roman & Stanley, 1997, pp.215-217). For example, the “amazing” Jake Englehart “from Ohio” is credited with helping to increase the annual oil production in Ontario, building a refinery, and organizing the Imperial Oil Company (FC, p.287-8). Harry Nash, marked as American by his nickname “Montana Pete” became “one of the most important men in the camp” as a cook for the labourers building the CPR (FC, p.202). The individual most clearly marked as “an American” also makes the most significant contribution to the Canadian nation. William Van Horne is described through his actions and activities as exhibiting many of the traits associated with British-ness. To begin with, he is represented as unusually intelligent and capable of achieving success rapidly.

[Van Horne] began his railway career at fourteen working in an office. Within a year, he had mastered Morse code and became a telegraph operator. At twenty-one, he was a ticket agent; at twenty-four, a train dispatcher; [and] at twenty-five, a superintendent of the railway. (FC, p.198)

All of this success was apparently achieved through “ambition, hard-work, and ability” (FC, p.198). Van Horne also demonstrates perseverance in the face of overwhelming tasks. He called the railroad project “two hundred miles of engineering impossibility, but since he had “no such word as can’t in his vocabulary”, set to work overcoming “gigantic problems” such as hills, swamps, hard granite, deep lakes, and mosquitoes to see that the railway was completed (FC,

p.201). Van Horne's representation as a problem-solver also extended to issues of finance and politics. He used the "North-West rebellion" to "get another loan from the government" which, in turn, ensured completion of the railway (FC, p.229-30). He did this by demonstrating the characteristic of promise fulfillment. He "promised to have the troops in fort Qu'Appelle in ten days in return for another loan" and "kept his promise" by delivering the troops "in nine days" (FC, p.229).

Van Horne also represents characteristics which are uniquely ascribed to Americans. "He fired anyone who said something could not be done" (FC, p.198) an example of impulsive decision-making which resembles the irrational behaviour of the American wolf hunters. Furthermore, his boasts that he "would put down 800 km of track in the first season"(FC, p.198) border on cockiness, much like that of the American smugglers who had the fortitude to display an American flag on 'Canadian' territory (FC, p.168).

Another group of people identified as Americans in the text are certain unnamed members of the Family Compact. In this Family Compact,

A few were English, but most were members of United Empire Loyalist families who had lived in the colony for many years. The United Empire Loyalists were originally Americans who had come to British North America because they opposed the American Revolution against Britain. They were loyal to the British crown. (FC, p.11)

This particular group of Americans were capable of loyalty to Britain and also of having compatible relations with the English and/or British. This compatibility seems to be based on the existence of positive traits or characteristics within what is termed American. Furthermore, it seems apparent that these positives could be used to help build the Canadian nation. For example,

In building the new nation, the Fathers of Confederation ... selected what they thought were the best features of government of both [Britain and America]... From the American system of government, the Canadians chose the idea of a federal union. (FC, p.116-118)

However, the Canadians improved upon it by making a strong central government which they hoped would "avoid the mistakes and weaknesses of the United States system" that led to "the bloody Civil War" (FC, p.119). The compatibility of Americans to the Canadian project would

also seem to be the reason that “the Canadian government decided it was also a good idea to attract American farmers” (FC, p.258). “They had experience. They were used to farming the dry, wide plains. They knew how to grow crops where there was limited rainfall” (FC, p.258). Not only was their experience and knowledge valued, but also their wealth and ability to achieve success rapidly: “Settlers who came to Canada from the American West had a fair amount of cash, machinery, and experience. They often bought large farms and quickly became successful” (FC, p. 259). The significance of this is that the Americans are represented as wealthy or of a higher class of people than many of the other “new” Canadians. Their compatibility with the English and British therefore reinforces the notion that British or English Canadians were of a higher ‘stock’ than others. Critical to the construction of the nation, it would seem, was populating the country with people of this higher stratum of society.

c) Desirable New Canadian Citizens

In part because of their common representation as desirable or compatible immigrant groups who fit themselves (or were fitted) into the Canadian nation, I have grouped together the ethnically or nationally located identities referred to as Icelanders, Ukrainians, the Finnish, and the Mennonites. Each are not nearly so pervasively represented in *Flashback Canada* as other groups such as the British, French, Americans, or Irish; nor are they or their accomplishments glorified to quite the same extent. To be sure, they are frequently presented in contained sections of the textbook as though the purpose of their presence is simply to assist with the conceptualization of Canada as a distinctly multicultural, egalitarian, and tolerant nation. Nevertheless, each of these groups exhibit many (but not all) of the same characteristics identified for British (or British-like) characters, not the least of which is the lack of naming in explicitly racial terms. Somewhat more distanced from British-ness than other previously discussed characters, these new Canadians appear to represent the outer fringes of Canadian compatibility, as their presence at once works to help define Canadian-ness in multicultural terms.

(i) The Icelanders

Though all four of these groups are portrayed favourably, it is the Icelanders who are represented as the most desirable immigrant population. The text establishes the longevity of this

group in Canada by explaining that they were “one of the first groups of people to take up homesteads” and that “an Icelandic community still exists there today” (FC, p.221). This contrived longevity affirms that Icelanders properly or naturally belong in Canada, particularly when it is explained that “the Canadian government invited them to stay in Canada” (FC, p.221). That is, they are not interlopers or unwanted guests of the nation. Rather, they were enticed to stay with promises of Canadian citizenship, land, and the right to maintain their language and customs (FC, p.221). Certainly the latter are in keeping with the notion of Canada as a multicultural and tolerant nation. Additionally, that this group of people “agreed” to stay implies that they had some power to decide. Power is further evident in the representation of Sigtryggur Jonasson who is identified as “their leader” and “the Father of Icelandic settlement in Canada” and who made the decision on where they would finally settle (FC, p.221). To a large extent, it would seem, the Icelanders had control of their own destiny.

The Icelanders are further represented as having a great deal of determination and perseverance. In their first winter, they overcame hardships such as poor shelter, starvation, and the death of “many settlers, young and old” from scurvy (FC, p.221). The second year too was filled with hardship: “A smallpox epidemic struck the colony. Many more of the Icelanders died. As often happened in the early epidemics, the neighbouring Native peoples also suffered” (FC, p.221-2). Curiously, it is never unambiguously stated that the Icelanders were responsible for the Native’s suffering by bringing the diseases which began the epidemics. Furthermore, the hardships faced by the Natives as a result of these epidemics go without explanation, as if trivial or insignificant in the telling of this history. Rather, the focus is placed on the Icelandic community and that it “fortunately” survived such adversity (FC, p.222). Elsewhere in the text (FC, p.183), it is noted somewhat vaguely that “Europeans” brought the diseases which decimated the Native population. But even here, responsibility is redirected toward the Native people themselves for being without “natural resistance” (i.e., they were biologically weaker) and “Native medicines” to combat the diseases (i.e., they were intellectually/technologically inferior). Conversely, of course, this represents the Icelanders (and other Europeans) as biologically and intellectually superior to the Natives. Simultaneously, it removes guilt from the Icelanders by

de-emphasizing their responsibility for the epidemics and this, in turn, works to leave their moral standing intact.

Both Icelandic determination and high regard for education are represented in the following statement: “Even in the midst of these trying conditions, many settlers taught their children to read and write” and in the character of Jon Gudmundson who wrote a newspaper “in his own handwriting and read it aloud to groups as he travelled from house to house” (FC, p.222). Signified here as well are the characteristics of self-help, agency, and intelligence. The text also states that “many Icelandic women made special contributions to the history of Canada” and identifies Margret Benedictsson as one of these women for her role in making Manitoba “the first province in Canada to grant its women citizens the vote” (FC, p.222).

Clearly, the Icelanders are represented as desirable and valuable contributors to the Canadian nation. This would appear to be based on the moral and intellectual attributes assigned to them by the text: determination, perseverance, self-help, agency, and intelligence as reflected by decision-making ability, leadership qualities, and educational status; and loyalty to Canada as demonstrated through notable contributions to Canadian history.

(ii) The Ukrainians

There are three characters in the narrative sections of the text who are marked as “Ukrainian”. Wasyl Hryholczuk “came to Canada from the Ukraine” (FC, p.202) and Joseph Oleskow and Wasyl Melnyk are marked as such under the heading “Case Study: The Ukrainians” (FC, p.267-271).

In an explanation for why 170 000 people left the Ukraine for Canada, the text paints Canada as embodying freedom, democracy, and as a place where one can lead a good life:

There were few opportunities for education and self-advancement. The people were given no voice in the running of the country. The Ukrainians longed for freedom and a better life for their children. For many Ukrainians, Canada promised a new life. (FC, p.267)

This explanation also implies that the Ukrainians held education in high esteem and had concern about the welfare of their children. That Ukrainians possessed more than a desire for education and were, in fact, ‘educable’ is evident through the representation of “one of their most educated

Citizens, Dr. Joseph Oleskow” (FC, p.267). He visited Canada and wrote a pamphlet describing the country and offering advice for those who might want to “venture to Canada” (FC, p.267). The text represents those Ukrainians who embarked on the journey as possessing the abilities to endure hardship and work hard. It does this by describing in some detail the difficulties in “crossing to Canada”(FC, p.268) and “starting to farm on the prairies” (FC, p.269). They “were packed together in horrible conditions” on boats and then had to endure “several days of railroad travel” with bare board seats and no eating facilities (FC, p.268). Even when described as “tired and half starving” they are not portrayed as complaining about the conditions but rather, represented as having “hope in their hearts” (p.268). In his way, the Ukrainians are portrayed as striving self-helpers willing to work for the right to be Canadian.

This seemingly natural and optimistic inclination to persevere is concomitant with a work ethic described in the account of the Melnyk family. The Melnyk family is also used to display a sense of responsibility among the men to provide for their family: “Wasył’s father and uncles then left the family and went to earn money to buy doors and windows for the house” (FC, p.269). This, in turn, leads to an illustration of particularly human trait of loneliness: “They found jobs working on the railway, but it was lonely for the family with the men away” (FC, p.269).

That Ukrainians worked hard is also made explicit through the use of a 1902 document which stated in part: “Hardworking are these peasants, rising before sunrise and labouring until dark. The women labour as hard as the men in the fields. Only the babies are immune from work...” (FC, p.271). However, because no effort is made to explain the historical context in which the piece was written, terms such as “peasants” come to represent the Ukrainians, even presently, as a distinctively lower order of people. This seems to be supported by the representation of Wasył Hryholczuk as an “unskilled labourer” with “little money” and “thankful for the chance to make a few extra dollars building the railroad” (FC, p.202). Nevertheless, the modest achievements of Hryholczuk, who “was thrifty and saved almost every penny he earned”(FC, p.202), and the Melnyk family, who “made a proud beginning homesteading in Canada” (FC, p.269), seem to imply that Ukrainians had the potential to rise above their lower status. That is, with their inclination for hard work, perseverance, and thriftiness along with their

concern for family, education, and democratic ideals, the Ukrainians could possibly enter into the imagined fabric of the Canadian nation.

(iii) The Finnish

Only one personally named character, Lars Peterson, is identified as “Finnish” (FC, p.202). He is represented as skilled, experienced, and willing to travel great distances to work: “He had worked on every major railway construction gang across America. He was one of the best “spikers” in the business” (FC, p.202). The text illustrates his exceptionality and physical power by explaining that he was chosen to a team which then broke all records by laying 10.3 km of track in ten hours (FC, p.202). Also represented here is the inclination to work hard, the tendency toward self-help, and the ability to transcend the impossible or difficult.

It is also made clear that Peterson would remain in Canada and that those like him (i.e., Finnish) had been and would continue to be part of the nation: “Lars planned to retire some day and live in southern Manitoba. There were already a number of Finnish people living on farms there” (FC, p.202). This helps to establish the legitimate presence of “Finnish” people in the nation of Canada. Additionally, it is stated in the text that Peterson had worked across America, but decided to live in Canada. This suggests either that Canada was more willing to accept him or that Canada was a more appealing place to live, but also reflects the power which lies in the ability to decide one’s own fate.

(iv) The Mennonites

No individual member of this group is personally named implying an absence among them of particularly noteworthy or honourable people. However, this “group of settlers” is identified as a distinct people and ascribed particular characteristics, many of which are similar to those of the British group.

The Mennonites were generally a peace-loving, hard-working people. Within two or three years, they had turned the prairie into outstanding farms...The Mennonites were the first to prove the open prairie could be farmed successfully. (FC, p.222-3)

The impression left is that this ‘kind’ of people were inherently peaceful and through their tendency for hard-work could achieve exceptional (i.e., pioneering) success relatively quickly.

Such success too depended on their experience and knowledge: “They were already experienced in farming the prairies of Russia. They knew that the prairie soil would be good for growing grain. It was like the rich farmland they had left” (FC, p.222). They are thus experienced and knowledgeable problem-solvers who seem naturally suited for the Canadian prairies.

Like British characters, the Mennonites also exhibit the characteristic of loyalty. However, whereas British loyalty extends to the nation and empire, the Mennonites’ loyalty is to their religion: “Their faith demanded that they should never go to war...[so] they left their homeland when the Russian government ordered them to serve in the army” (FC, p.222). The Christian faith of the Mennonites makes them compatible with what is unquestionably presented as an exclusively Christian nation. Furthermore, the presentation of this group as being accepted into Canada helps to define the Canadian nation as a good and tolerant multicultural community.

d) ‘Seeing’ Whiteness

National and ethnic identifiers in *Flashback Canada* create distinct populations of people who are characterized and hierarchically evaluated by particular moral and intellectual traits. In other words, nationalities and ethnicities work as boundaries of separation on which racializations get acted out. It should also be clear, however, that the racialized identities I have discussed to this point coalesce together to form a larger identity - the Canadian. Individuals and groups marked as British, English, and Scottish are represented by *Flashback Canada* as models of an imagined ideal Canadian, while characters left ‘unmarked’ or referred to simply as Canadian are close approximations of this ideal. Slightly flawed, but nevertheless compatible individuals and groups marked by Irish, French, and American ethnic or national identities are represented as having the potential to achieve honourable inclusion in this conception of the imagined Canadian. Furthermore, their representation in this way depicts that which is Canadian as possessing the capacity for moral redemption. Meanwhile, European immigrant groups including those identified ethnically or nationally as Icelanders, Ukrainians, Finnish, and Mennonites are portrayed as desirable new Canadians similarly compatible with the notion of an ideal Canadian, though lacking the same degree of completeness or esteem as the British models of this ideal. Thus, there is a hierarchy of Canadian-ness in which various ethnically and nationally identified groups are located

according to the degree to which they approximate a supposed superiority of British-ness. Canadian-ness is constructed out of the common characteristics represented among the various ethnic and national groups, but is also created from the existence of differences and variations which help to define Canadian-ness as multi-ethnic or multi-national (indeed, multicultural).

I would now like to argue that whiteness is represented in this hierarchical arrangement as well. More to the point, British-ness stands at once for perfect whiteness and perfect Canadian-ness. The ethnic and national identities which are positioned as legitimate, true, or potential Canadians by virtue of their proximity to British-ness are simultaneously positioned as representative of whiteness. I am not arguing that a monolithic whiteness is signified through these various racialized identities. Rather, different kinds, categories, or degrees of whiteness (i.e., white ethnicities/nationalities) are established by the text through patterns of redundant marking and (as I shall discuss later) the separation of these various categories of whiteness from racialized categories of 'non-whiteness' or 'otherness'.

At this point, I feel it necessary to return to an observation that I made during my discussion of the methodology, specifically, that not a single named narrative character in *Flashback Canada* is described or categorized explicitly as white. There are, however, three occasions in which variations of the term 'white' are used to refer to a group of people (as opposed to individual characters). All three appear in the same chapter, "Treaties with Native Peoples", and all are ostensibly primary sources. One, a reference to "Whiteman", is part of "A Cree Legend" (FC, p.191). The other two, references to "white men" (FC, p.184-5) and "whites" (FC, p.193), are quotations from historical figures of the past, David Laird and Pemmican, respectively. This is important. The text doesn't use the term, these historical figures did - the text is positioned as an 'objective' recorder of their comments. What this does is to assert that 'white' as a term or concept is outdated or a relic of the past, its ties with racisms problematic of a bygone era. 'Whiteness' (and racisms for that matter), is (are) confined to the past, any lasting significance to the construction of the nation underplayed or denied.

Nevertheless, these three references to 'white' people are significant markers in this study. They provide the only direct link from the racialized concept of 'whiteness' to characters never

explicitly identified as white. In a speech delivered to “Native chiefs” David Laird is quoted as saying, “the Queen ... wishes you to allow her white children to come and live on your land” (FC, p.184) and later, “The Queen’s officers will permit no white man or Métis to build or cut timber on your reserves” (FC, p.185). ‘White’ men and children are therefore genetically or heritably associated with the Queen (i.e., Britain). In this way, British men and children are at once represented as white and concurrently categorized as something other than Natives. Métis too are defined in this passage as a people separately identifiable from whites. Since the text makes no effort to explain the usage of ‘white’ in this way, the representations stand as ‘truth’ or ‘natural’ and whiteness becomes represented, in part, as that which may be British, but not Native or Métis.

In “A Cree Legend”, a reference is made to the “Whiteman” who took over a log on which an “Indian” was seated (FC, p.191). Though “Whiteman” is used in the legend, the questions posed by the text have avoided the term and replaced it with “Europeans” (FC, p.192). The implication is that “Whiteman” and “Europeans” are interchangeable or equal terms with the latter possibly being more acceptable for present-day use. The definition of whiteness is thus expanded to include that which is European. Conversely, this means that identities arising from non-European geographical regions (e.g. China) represent something other than whiteness. Therefore, through these subtle usages of primary source documents, that which is representative of British-ness or European-ness becomes a signifier of whiteness while “Métis”, “Native”, and “Chinese” identities join the explicitly racialized identity of “Blacks” in a broader category of ‘non-whiteness’ or ‘otherness’.⁶

Obviously, these subtle uses of primary source documents are not the sole basis on which I make my claim that this textbook whiteness is represented as fundamentally different from and superior to otherness. To the contrary, I contend that whiteness primarily ‘shows’ itself as superior through a range of similar moral and intellectual characteristics ascribed by the textbook

⁶ I use the headings ‘non-whiteness’ and ‘otherness’ somewhat reluctantly. They problematically imply that people who are not racialized as white have an identity which can be defined only in relation to what they are not. In this way, they reinforce whiteness as the normative basis for social constructions of identity. Yet, in the context of trying to see “the specificity of whiteness”, it seems necessary to fall back on ‘non-white’ and ‘other’ as organizational categories (Dyer, 1997, p.11).

to narrative individuals and groups representing various British (or British-like) and European ethnicities or nationalities. In other words, whiteness appears through representations of the imagined ideal Canadian.

In my discussion of the representation of British-ness, I argued that British groups and individuals were portrayed as true, natural, and supreme forms of Canadians. I observed that these characters exhibited morally sound qualities such as honour, loyalty, personal sacrifice, determination, perseverance, striving, diligence, the ability to transcend, hard-work, self-help, honesty, enterprise, energy, swiftness, Christian virtue, benevolence, peacefulness, and civilized nature. Intellectual superiority was demonstrated by these characters through far seeing wisdom, leadership, decision-making ability, communicative ability, technical superiority, frequent and expedient success, rationality or reasonableness, and problem-solving ability. They seldom, if ever, exhibited moral or intellectual failure. Furthermore, these characters marked with British-ness were frequently invested with legitimate authority, power, and responsibility for delivering law and order. To lesser extents, other British-like and European groups approximated these same characteristics. Let me now illustrate how some of these qualities and capacities of the imagined Canadian are also representative of whiteness.

Numerous characters representative of the ideal Canadian exhibit self-denial or personal sacrifice. Dyer (1997) has argued that these are Christian virtues which act as signifiers of whiteness because Christianity, though not of its essence white, has been “the religion and religious export of Europe” and historically “thought and felt in distinctly white ways” (p.17). Whiteness is thus signified by those “Canadian” characters explicitly marked as Christian and others whose Christian virtuousness is in the form of striving to overcome monumental obstacles. Dyer (1997) contends that striving to achieve success and possessing “the ability to transcend and to go on striving in the face of the impossibility of transcendence” constitutes something of “a white ideal” (p.17). This has particular relevance when the obstacles are associated with images of cold, snow, daunting terrain, and remoteness (as they frequently are for British and European characters in *Flashback Canada*). Dyer (1997) argues that the virtues of enterprise, discipline, and energy necessary to overcome these obstacles contributed to the formation of a Canadian

“white national character” among “white settler people” by extending the myth of a supposed noble, white, and pure people of the highest caste (i.e., Aryans or Caucasians) who founded Europe after coming through the northern Caucasus mountains (p.20-21).

Related to representations of determination and the ability to overcome obstacles are frequent illustrations of perseverance and self-help which Wellman (1997) argues reinforce whiteness as that which remains independent from outside support (e.g., social assistance). The “Canadian” characters in *Flashback Canada* achieve success through their own hard work and are seldom, if ever, portrayed as failing. An implication of such representation is that any failures (moral or otherwise) can be attributed to racialized others, in part, because of their perceived inability to work hard, persevere, or help their own cause (c.f., Wellman, 1997, p.318).

Whiteness, signified by Canadian-ness in this textbook, thus occupies high moral ground, a privileged position facilitated by the removal of guilt and failure. Those military leaders who lost battles only because of dysfunctional equipment or the suspect actions of the opposition, for example, reassert the conjectured non-failing moral and intellectual supremacy of whiteness.

Another way in which failure or guilt is removed from whiteness (i.e., whiteness is morally purified) is through “confessional narratives” (Aanarud, 1997). One such confessional narrative acknowledges the existence of discrimination in the history of Canadian immigration policy. Significantly, the words ‘race’ and ‘racism’ are never stated (nor do they appear in any historical narrative in the textbook), thus effectively denying their salience to the historical development of the Canadian nation. Instead, *Flashback Canada* states that,

[Clifford] Sifton believed that the British were the most desirable settlers for Canada ...[and]...wanted people like the Ukrainians, Poles, and Germans ... The policy of the Canadian government showed signs of discrimination too. Orientals, Blacks, Jews, Italians, and city-dwellers were not encouraged to come to Canada. (FC, p.254-260)

These confession-like declarations are as close as the text ever comes to identifying the perpetrators of the “discrimination” or admitting the existence of racisms. Assigning responsibility for this problem to the “policy of the Canadian government”, however, evades the historical (and present-day) reality of white oppression and privilege. The policy is made to be the

problem, but no specific individual or group is apparently responsible for its creation or employment. To the contrary, the discriminatory policy is re-phrased a “successful policy” and Clifford Sifton is fully congratulated for his efforts in promoting it (FC, p.261). Thus even the policy itself, despite showing “signs of discrimination”, is ultimately exonerated. More than a simple absence or denial, this ‘confession’ would seem to represent a process of rationalization which, as Aanerud (1997) puts it, moves “whiteness from guilt to innocence” (p.48-9). Canadian government officials (notably Clifford Sifton) genuinely believed (according to the text) that certain people “would not make successful prairie farmers” (FC, p.260). Presumably these officials were looking out for the best interests of the Canadian economy and were not discriminating solely (or at all) on the basis of race. The consequence of this representation is that the Canadian nation and its government officials are removed from any responsibility for the real effects of the policy. This innocence is reinforced when Sifton’s beliefs about farming ability are left unexplained and unchallenged. They appear to stand as the ‘truth’. That is, there is nothing in the narratives of *Flashback Canada* to suggest that “Orientals, Blacks, Jews, Italians, and city-dwellers” could have made, or did make, successful farmers. Furthermore, the negative consequences of this “selective immigration policy” for these excluded groups are never engaged with. Nor does the text examine the possibility that the nation was shaped along racial lines because of the way this policy privileged select groups of people. Rather than analyzing the decision to target settlers from only Britain, America, and Europe, the text reinforces the ‘naturalness’ of the choice. In the activities section of the same chapter, students are asked to develop immigration advertising campaign posters to encourage settlement in the Canadian West. Their first requirement is to “divide into three groups -- the first to work in Britain, the second in Europe, and the third in the United States” (FC, p.272). This effectively naturalizes ethnic or national difference in a hierarchy of suitability to life in Canada.

The above example is also representative of the tendency within this text to admit limited flaws in the Canadian past without implicating central (i.e., white, male, upper-class) individuals (e.g., Sifton or Laurier). These “small inoculation[s] of acknowledged evil” (Pajaczkowska & Young, 1992, p.217) protect the morality of central characters in the narratives of this Canadian

history from being undermined. In this way, whiteness (as represented by Canadian-ness) is distanced or made innocent with respect to historical and contemporary white dominance and oppression (c.f., Frankenberg, 1997, p.22-3).

Rather than being undermined, the morality of these central “Canadian” characters is upheld through redundant portrayals illustrating such redeeming qualities as honesty and integrity (e.g., they fulfilled promises), familial piety (e.g., they had families and were concerned about them), and benevolence (e.g., they solved or attempted to solve the problems of less advantaged people). The latter points also reinforce the representation of “Canadians” as human. Dyer (1997) contends that this representation as “just human” empowers whites with the privilege to “speak for the commonality of humanity” (Dyer, 1997, p.2). This privileged position is evident among those fighting for responsible government (e.g., Mackenzie, Papineau, Howe). They represent whiteness as that which is “capable of bringing order, decency, and hope to those on the margins of society” (Giroux, 1997b, p.308). Woodsworth’s books about the conditions of the poor, Laurier’s concern about the plight of farmers in the west, and Gudmonson’s desires to educate the struggling Icelandic community all illustrate this kind of whiteness.

One of the most visible characteristics of “Canadians” in the narratives of *Flashback Canada* is leadership ability. Numerous characters from the ‘perfect’ British to the less-than-perfect Irish or the desirable Icelanders are imbued with this ability. According to Dyer (1997), “white people” have been historically viewed as effecting human progress largely because of “their temperamental qualities of leadership: will power, far-sightedness, energy” (p.31). These qualities of leadership too are frequently evident among “Canadian” characters and seem to justify their many glorious accomplishments and success. Whiteness, therefore, is represented through those “Canadian” characters who are portrayed as holding and operating out of successful and powerful positions of leadership.

Often the powerful leadership or the successful and glorious accomplishments of “Canadian” characters are represented as intelligence owed in part to educational background. Frankenburg (1993) argues that when education is presented as an integral component of a character’s accomplishments, whiteness emerges as the fulfilled expectations of upper-class white

men who make “good use of good training” (p.83). But it also manifests itself as an extension of historical racist beliefs in the superior intellectual abilities of the ‘white race’ (see Gould, 1996).

If not explained entirely by educational background, the powerful and prestigious positions of leadership occupied by many “Canadian” characters is naturalized or legitimized through honourable and/or military titles. Among “Canadian” characters there are Colonels, Generals, Captains, Governors, Premiers, Prime Ministers, Bishops, Doctors, and Fathers of Confederation to name but a few. Above all, there is the title “Sir”. *Flashback Canada* recognizes only those characters representing the ideal “Canadian” to have been bestowed with the honour of knighthood. In fact, the only non-British character honoured in this way is Wilfrid Laurier. Such representations serve as ‘proof’ of the superior and noble nature of individuals who ultimately represent whiteness.

As leaders guiding the progressive development of the Canadian nation through humane, benevolent, and peaceful means, many of these characters represent whiteness by standing as “model[s] of authority, rationality, and civilized behaviour”(Giroux, 1997b, p.308). Occasionally, when greater force is warranted, whiteness is represented as “tough authority” or the cultural standard for discipline and control (Giroux, 1997b, p.305). Macdonald, Macleod, and Douglas among others take this role. In these instances, whiteness is represented as a mix of morally uplifting benevolence and notions of discipline and control rooted partly in punitive action (Giroux, 1997b, p.305).

I want to be clear that just as a hierarchy of Canadian-ness is represented through racialized groups differentiated on the basis of ethnicity and nationality, so too is the corresponding representation of whiteness an hierarchical arrangement. The exemplars of the ideal Canadian citizen (i.e., the British, Scottish, and English) are not representatives of a singular whiteness. Rather, they represent a putative best or supreme kind of whiteness. Other ethnicities or nationalities identified in the text as approximations of the Canadian ideal do not embody the same ‘perfect’ whiteness as those characters explicitly recognized as British. The same range of characteristics is not witnessed and some of the characters appear to have minor faults or imperfections. These faults do not, however, exclude them from the Canadian nation or

prominent places within it. Moreover, they are compatible with the 'British' standard and, as we shall see, represented with moral and intellectual qualities superior to those people racialized as 'non-white'. That is, they approximate the 'white Canadian ideal' established through the representation of British-ness.

As Dyer (1997) indicates, there are "gradations of whiteness: some people are whiter than others" (p.12). Slight imperfections in the actions or 'character' of some of these individuals serves to position their 'group' of people as a somewhat less superior form of whiteness, though one which remains compatible with the conception of an ideal Canadian. The "variations in white people; that is, the ways in which some white people fail to attain [perfect] whiteness" (Dyer, 1997, p.35) are evident in the representations of ethnic/national groups such as the Americans, the French, and the Irish. That there is indeed a struggle to attain whiteness among the Irish is evident in the juxtapositioning of the bad-apples with the good. McGee and O'Donogue represent the potential of 'Irish' people to achieve something near to 'perfect' whiteness (i.e., British-ness) while Whelan and Scott represent the insecure hold this racialized group has on whiteness, a point that has been illustrated historically by Roediger (1994, chapter 11), Allen (1994), and Ignatiev (1995) among others. It is not my point to argue the extent to which Irish people or any of these other 'white ethnicities' have been historically considered white. Nor do I wish to present them as fixed as such. Rather, I am claiming that the historical narratives in *Flashback Canada* position these British and European ethnicities and nationalities favourably according to perceptible white supremacist patterns.

Whiteness is represented through Canadian-ness or conceptions of what entails the ideal Canadian, and this relies heavily on racialized conceptions of British-ness. Other racialized groups demarcated on the basis of ethnic or national identity also represent whiteness, or more specifically, various kinds of whiteness. This argument is supported through the positioning of the characters in these groups as legitimate, true, or potential Canadians who possess a range of similar and compatible moral and intellectual characteristics which are decidedly superior to those of characters marked in various ways as racialized others.

To further show that the above ethnically and nationally marked groups represent whiteness through their Canadian-ness, I now wish to describe the representation of groups whom *Flashback Canada* explicitly marks in racialized terms as something ‘other than’ white.

2. *Imagining the Other*

I will argue in this section of the thesis that individuals and groups marked as Métis, Chinese, Black, and Native are represented as different from and decidedly inferior to those individuals and groups who simultaneously represent (by virtue of their British-ness or proximity to British-ness) ideal or compatible conceptions of the Canadian and various degrees or kinds of whiteness. The ‘non-whiteness’ or ‘otherness’ of Métis, Chinese, Black, and Native individuals and groups is represented, in part, through the absence or scarcity of those moral and intellectual characteristics which define Canadian-ness. Additionally, non-whiteness is seen among these groups through representations of moral and intellectual characteristics which stand in opposition to those defining whiteness and Canadian-ness.

a) The Métis

The text situates Métis as a distinct group of people: “The Métis were people of mixed heritage ... Their ways were not entirely Native, nor were they European” (FC, p. 237). At one point, this group of people is even deemed to be a “Métis nation”(FC, p.149). As for the narrative characters themselves, Gabriel Dumont is referred to as a “Métis buffalo hunter” (FC, p.237) and Jerry Potts as “an experienced Métis guide” (FC, p.171). Louis Riel is identified as “a twenty-five-year-old Métis man” (FC, p.155) and has the “Native” side of his heritage made prominent through the statement that he “placed his moccasined foot on the surveyor’s chain” (FC, p.156). André Nault, however, is only indirectly identified as a Métis when the text states that “surveyors appeared on the farms of the Métis in the Red River Settlement” (FC, p.155) and then discusses what happened when these surveyors “stepped onto André Nault’s land” (FC, p.156). Additionally, a character who does not appear in the narratives, Maxim Marion, is nevertheless identified in a photo and caption as “a Métis guide” (FC, p.153). The category of “Métis” thus gets explicitly established. It is reinforced through discussions of family members in which explicit reference is frequently made to the racial origins of these characters. Riel, for

example, was said to be “the oldest of eleven children. His mother was the daughter of the first non-Native woman to settle in the North-West. His father was an important Métis leader” (FC, p.156). Here, the ‘race’ of his parents is deemed more significant to the telling of this story than their individual accomplishments or, even, their names. This implies that the story of the first non-Native woman to settle in the North-West is, at best, trivial. Passing over this story without any further elaboration is problematic for a text that devotes so much space to the ‘great men’ of history. Similarly, the above reference implies that being an “important Métis leader” (as opposed to an ‘important leader’) means being important among Métis only, and therefore amounts to being irrelevant to the telling of Canadian history. Underscoring the racial categories of parents left personally unnamed also occurs with Jerry Potts who is “the son of an Indian woman and a Scottish trader” (FC, p.171). This representation is significant too because it marks Potts not as part “Native” and part “non-Native” or “European”, but explicitly as part “Scottish”. This may be a partial explanation for the slightly more favourable (i.e., more ‘Canadian-like’) representation of Potts in the narratives of this text (i.e., that he somehow represents a different or higher level of “Métis” more closely akin to whiteness). This I will discuss below as I examine the characteristics that seem to be ascribed to this group marked as “Métis”.

To begin with, only one of the “Métis” characters is represented as having any particular faith or religion. The text explains that from his “non-Native” mother, “Louis [Riel] gained a deep faith” and that from his “Métis” father, “he inherited a pride in the Métis people” (FC, p.156). This reference suggests some kind of natural genetic or cultural link between his mother’s ‘non-Native-ness’ and spirituality, implying that it would be impossible to inherit such a deep faith from his “Métis” father and that Native peoples are, therefore, without or incapable of having faith. Riel’s faith is noted several times such as when he is quoted as saying, “I thank God ... I die at peace with God” (FC, p.240). Like his mixed heritage, however, the text sends mixed messages with respect to Riel’s Christian faith by presenting him as lacking in the proper commitment or devotion: “Though he trained to become a priest, he did not complete his studies” (FC, p.156). Furthermore, while he is portrayed on several occasions as praying, this is

often shown to be fanatical. For example, during one of the battles, “It was said that all day Riel stood praying for success. His arms were stretched out to form a cross” (FC, p.231).

The faults associated with Métis spirituality are also extended to Métis leadership ability. For example, “Gabriel Dumont was a well-respected hunter and military leader. However, he was not the educated, fiery representative the Métis needed” (FC, p.227). There is a certain artificial quality about Riel’s leadership which can be seen when it is claimed in the text that the Métis “turned for leadership to ... Riel” (FC, p.155) and later that Dumont had to “persuade Riel to return to Canada and fight again for the Métis cause” (FC, p.227). Riel seems to be less a natural leader and more the only choice available to the Métis. Unpredictability and violence are two characteristics which explain the faults in his leadership ability. At one point, the text questions Riel’s decision to allow the execution of Thomas Scott “to be carried out so quickly” and attributes it to his desire “to show the Canadian government that he was in charge” (FC, p.159). This, of course, insinuates that he really wasn’t in charge, at least not as a legitimate authority. This feeling that Riel was not a legitimate leader is reinforced when the text states that Riel “was elected by the Manitoba people” but immediately follows it with the claim that Riel left Canada when “some people threatened to shoot him if he appeared in the House of Commons” (FC, p.227).

Elsewhere, it is explained that “when Riel first returned to the Northwest, he seemed to have no thought of an armed rebellion. He wanted to try peaceful ways first” (FC, p.227). However, he subsequently made a call “to take up arms”, a call which “lost him the support of the settlers ...[and] ... the Roman Catholic Church” (FC, p.228). Not only does this illustrate his unpredictability and tendency for violence, but it demonstrates a precarious relationship with Christian leaders. When the text then explains that “only the French-speaking Métis and some natives continued to support him” (p.228), the suggestion is clearly that such support is insignificant, but also that support from these groups for violent action is somehow natural or given. Note, however, that it is French-speaking Métis, not English-speaking Métis like Potts, who are implicated in this natural tendency for violence along with the Native people.

Riel is presented as 'faulty' in other areas as well. He apparently lacked perseverance or determination. Indeed, he "gave himself up" (FC, p.232) to General Middleton and twice "fled" to the United States (FC, p.227 and 162). Aimlessness and lack of persistence are characteristics evident in discussions of his education and background: "Though he was "a bright boy and a good student ... [he] did not complete his studies" and after working as "a store clerk" in the United States, he eventually "drifted back to his Métis homeland" (FC, p.156). This reference also casts doubt on his intelligence, a doubt made more prominent by the explanation that he "twice had been in institutions for the mentally ill" (FC, p.239). There are, in fact, few indications anywhere in the text that Métis characters were or could be purposeful, determined, or unusually intelligent. One of Gabriel Dumont's plans was described as "clever" (FC, p.232), but an ultimate failure. Jerry Potts, the Métis of Scottish decent, comes closest to exhibiting intelligence with the statement that he "knew all the prairie landmarks" (FC, p.175).

With Riel's flawed character, one must wonder what it was that encouraged the Métis to persuade him to become their leader. It did, after all, make his Métis followers look naive, gullible, or foolish for following such an imperfect man. The text offers Riel's linguistic ability as the reason. He "could speak well in both English and French. His speaking ability and his interest in his people made him a defender of the Métis cause" (FC, p.156). This reinforces the assumption that language difference was the problem as opposed to any (deliberate or otherwise) racial oppression. The anomalous Riel is the only Métis marked as having such communicative ability. Gabriel Dumont is cast merely as a puerile storyteller: "It is said that he would sit at his cabin door and tell neighbourhood children tales of the rebellion" (FC, p.237) while Jerry Potts, whose work with the Mounties involved interpretation, is nevertheless, represented as "a person of few words" (FC, p.175). The text appears to be indicating that communicative ability was not a trait normally associated with Métis, and therefore, because Riel possessed this ability (particularly the ability to communicate in English) he became the only logical choice for a leader. Resistance to his leadership is only superficially acknowledged. That "only the French-speaking Métis" continued to support him when he made the call to take up arms implies, of course, that other Métis did not. However, lack of any discussion of 'internal' resistance, has the effect of

portraying all French-speaking Métis as naively following the pied-piper to their own demise. They become marked as easily misled and lacking the ability to make rational choices. Métis thus become implicated in their own oppression in what borders on a 'blaming the victim' script.

Despite his flaws, Riel is represented as solving problems. Nevertheless, in almost every case an even greater problem results or follows. For example, he comes to the aid of André Nault and solves the problem of surveyors trespassing on his land. However, Riel is then positioned as the cause of the "trouble" or "uprising" at Red River (FC, p.157). Riel's surrender at Batoche and subsequent execution are also represented as having caused significant problems for John A. Macdonald and for French-English relations in Canada (FC, p.241). "Hard feelings between the Ontario Protestants and the Quebec Catholics lasted a long time after Riel's execution" (FC, p.241) and "even though Riel was dead, he continued to influence Canadian politics ... Conservatives began to lose seats" (FC, p.245). The latter example demonstrates that the emphasis is not so much on the story of Louis Riel or the Métis as it is on the story of John A. Macdonald and the "British" in building the "Canadian" nation.

Other Métis characters are represented ambiguously with respect to their ability to solve problems or exercise power. André Nault, for example, is portrayed as largely powerless (on his own) to prevent surveyors from stepping onto his land. Language, as opposed to any ill-intentions on the part of the surveyors, is again presented as the root of the problem: "The French-speaking Nault tried to stop them, but the English-speaking surveyors did not understand him" (FC, p.156). Gabriel Dumont is represented as having the power to lead his followers to military success, but such success is often couched in terms of lucky positioning or unfair tactics. He defeated the Mounties at Duck Lake, but the text explains that the Métis could see the Mounties as they advanced along the trail and that this made the Mounties easy targets (FC, p.228). Similarly, his later success at Fish Creek is described as an "ambush" during which "Dumont trapped the army in a coulee" (FC, p.230). Dumont is also shown to solve problems, but only temporarily. His victory at Fish Creek "slowed Middleton down" and "gave him more time to gather a larger force" for the "Battle of Batoche" (FC, p.231). At Batoche, Dumont devised a plan to dig rifle pits to fend off Middleton's troops. This is described as a "clever

scheme” which worked until the Métis ran out of ammunition three days later (FC, p.232). Thus, through Dumont, lack of foresight becomes a characteristic associated with the Métis. The only Métis character who fully resolves problems is the part “Scottish” Jerry Potts. By finding water and buffalo, he is able to solve problems of thirst and hunger (FC, p.175). But these are problems solved for the Mounties. In fact, all of Potts’ actions are presented in terms of their benefit to the Mounties. Potts is not involved with the Métis cause, but rather works toward the Canadian cause of “opening the west” and is rewarded with a burial of “full Mountie honours” (FC, p.175). Through the representation of Potts, an hierarchical difference between French and Scottish Métis is witnessed.

Riel’s power is explained in the narratives largely in terms of the problems associated with defending “the Métis cause” (FC, p.227) in opposition to, and as though separate from, the ‘Canadian cause’ advanced by more powerful and moralistic ‘British-like’ leaders such as Macdonald. Riel exhibits an odd mix of both strength and weakness, strength with respect to the Métis cause, but weakness when positioned relative to the ‘Canadian cause.’ For example, he demonstrates the power to draw up a petition demanding various Métis rights, but “Ottawa did nothing” (FC, p.227) in response. When he exercises the power to set up his own government and arm his followers, the text terms it a “risky move” since the Canadian government was supported by the NWMP and the railroad (FC, p.227-228). Riel demonstrates personal strength and concern for the Métis when he refuses to accept the “excuse of insanity” since it “would be a disgrace” for his followers, and he carries this strength through to his execution when he “showed no signs of weakness” (FC, p.239-240). Nevertheless, the text clearly shows that the power to make the final decision on the execution rested with Macdonald and that the dilemma centered on “losing support in Quebec” more than on the Métis cause *per se* (FC, p.241). With Riel’s death came the end of the Métis barrier to the “opening of the west” (FC, p.149).

Many Métis fled to the wilderness ... [and] the proud Métis Nation was broken up. Not until the twentieth century were Métis organizations formed again to improve conditions for their people. (FC, p.241)

Conveniently, the people of “the Métis Nation” disappear as if the reasons they needed improved conditions are unrelated to the 1885 rebellion and/or insignificant to the telling of Canadian history. The summary of the “long-lasting results of the 1885 rebellion” (FC, p.241) and, indeed, the representation of the rebellion itself, fundamentally serve to set the stage for discussions on the rise to power of the Liberals and Wilfrid Laurier and the expansion of the nation through settling of the west. The story being told is that of the national project to which the Métis were apparently merely an obstacle.

b) The Chinese

A category of people termed “Chinese” is discussed in one chapter under the heading “the role of Chinese workers” (FC, p.204). No “Chinese” worker is individually or personally named in this or any other historical narrative section of the textbook. The text does identify Yip Sai Kai as “a Chinese immigrant” (FC, p.215) in a caption below a photograph located in the activities section of this same chapter. However, within the historical narratives, “Chinese” people are reduced to a collective and anonymous ‘they’ (c.f. Stanley, 1995, p.47) .

As a collective, the Chinese are portrayed as willing to work hard, but always in the context of settling for less than what could be considered normal. “They were willing to work hard for half the wages that other workers expected” (FC, p.204) and “many took low paying jobs that most people found disagreeable [working] ... as servants, in canning factories, and in laundries” (FC, p.205). These representations ‘naturalize’ the Chinese as unassertive or submissive people thankful to cling to the lower rungs of the social order. That ‘they’ had such modest aspirations is also made clear in the overly-general claim by the text that the “one major goal” of “most of the Chinese workers” was “to return someday to China and buy a small plot of land” (FC, p.204). Evident here as well is the notion that the Chinese were intentional interlopers occupying Canadian space only temporarily to serve the interests of their ‘home’ country. The text does go on to say that “Chinese people have contributed to Canada’s growth” and that “many Chinese Canadians have become important members of the community” (FC, p.205). Yet, these claims ring hollow without any individual or specific examples to substantiate them. Moreover, without any representative voices from Chinese people themselves (e.g., first hand accounts,

quotations), this group of people is effectively excluded from the telling of their own story. The exclusion of any Chinese perspective contributes to a process of 'othering' - without the power to speak for themselves, the Chinese must be spoken for as the 'other'. Whiteness manifests itself here as the power to speak for others and is inextricably wound with a notion of Canada as something to which "Chinese" could not be considered 'naturally' part of. There is a distinctive 'us' versus 'them' separation in the narrative which places the possession of "our history" in the hands of Canadians who are not Chinese:

Canadians must not forget the part the Chinese railway workers played in *our history*. With picks and shovels and with their hands, they helped to build the British Columbia section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. (FC, p.205 emphasis added)

Note also that it is "with picks and shovels and with their hands" but not with their intellect, courage, perseverance, or morals that "they" contributed to "our" history.

That this is a telling of Canadian history from a perspective which grants whiteness the privileged position of normal is also evident in the form the narrative takes as a confession.

Flashback Canada goes to great length to acknowledge the mistreatment of Chinese workers. It comes across, however, as a regretful, but unavoidable evil necessary for the completion of a national railway.

Unfortunately, the Chinese were often badly treated in British Columbia. But without them, British Columbia would not have had a railway. It was said that they took jobs away from other workers. But Onderdonk could never find enough workers who were willing to do the backbreaking railway work for such low wages. (FC, p.204)

The 'bad treatment' of the Chinese is almost justified as critical to ensure the successful completion of the national project. Never is it termed a form of racism, nor is anyone in particular apparently responsible though anonymous "railroad officials and citizens of British Columbia" are said to have "treated the Chinese harshly" (FC, p.204). Indeed, the real blame seems to fall on the Chinese themselves for being different:

Some people objected to the Chinese because they appeared different. Their clothing, language, queue hair-style (which Canadians called “pigtails”), customs, and skin colour set them apart. Railroad officials and citizens of British Columbia often treated the Chinese harshly. It is not a proud chapter in Canadian history. (FC, p.204-5)

To be sure, it was not these differences, but rather the decision by a white majority to strategically use them which set the Chinese apart. Furthermore, the “some people” in the above passage would appear to be equated to “Canadians” found in the same sentence. Thus, the textbook itself sets the Chinese apart from Canadians. By refusing to term this what it most certainly was (a form of racism) and by obscuring the active role of whites in its production, *Flashback Canada* removes the guilt from whiteness and returns it to innocence. It does this while simultaneously positioning Chinese as not Canadian.

This denial of white responsibility for racisms is evident through the discussion of “Chinese workers”. Though the text admits that “on occasion, it seemed that Chinese workers were given the most dangerous jobs” that led to many deaths (FC, p.205), it names no one in particular who assigned the jobs in this way. The text does not explain why these Chinese workers “*had to* leave their wives and children behind in China” and does not explain why “there were no doctors to help them” when “many became sick from scurvy” (FC, p.204, emphasis added). The text fails to discuss any of the individual deaths of Chinese workers. To those who would like to argue that there is insufficient space in a textbook to provide more details and perspectives from diverse populations, I would suggest that it is worth noting that *Flashback Canada* does explain elsewhere that “the last remaining camel in British Columbia died on a farm in 1905” (FC, p.132). The implication is that the value of these people to the historical development of the Canadian nation was less than that of an animal.

There is, in fact, a sense in these narratives that the Chinese were something less than humans, or were minimally imperfect humans. For example, while numerous ‘white’ groups are represented as having typically human feelings of loneliness, anxiety, or concern with respect to family members, none of these emotions are illustrated for the Chinese workers separated from their wives and children (FC, p.205). As de-humanized sojourners unnaturally occupying

Canadian space and positioned as anonymous and trivial others naturally inclined to be submissive and suited for manual and low-class labour, the group referred to as “Chinese” incurs a moral weighting clearly inferior to those who are representative of both whiteness and Canadian-ness.

c) **The Blacks**

The textbook twice refers to a category of people termed “Black”. In both instances, it is largely a biographical and decontextualized inclusion. In one, the reference to Anne Cools as “Canada’s first Black female senator” appears under “1984” in a timeline and not in any narrative section of the text. The choice to include this relatively modern historical figure in a textbook which ostensibly deals with a period up to 1920 (FC, p.vi) hints at the perceived insignificance of people from this group to that earlier period (since she is one of only two “Blacks” represented in the text). More importantly, it obscures the roles of racisms (and sexism among other forms of oppression) that prevented a woman racialized as Black from becoming a senator in Canada until 1984.

The second instance constitutes a historical narrative in itself, but is nevertheless separated from the main narrative of the chapter. The inclusion of the boxed insert entitled “Black settlers and the Underground Railroad” (FC, p.65) may, as the text suggests these inserts do (FC, back cover), highlight a key point of interest. However, it does this only by disconnecting this group of people from the era “that constructed them and which they, in turn, collectively constructed” and by failing to address the purposes, causes, and consequences of the system of slavery (Swartz, 1992, p.343). Put differently, the text has ignored the significance of racisms to this historical era. The system of slavery is presented as if a natural part of the evolution of history and “Blacks” as its natural slaves since, even in freedom, they are defined as “escaped slaves from the US” (FC, p.65). The text names only the “victims” of slavery, but not the beneficiaries. In fact, not only are those responsible for the system of slavery left unnamed, but the text takes care to illustrate that slavery was a problem in the US and opposed by the British Empire and Canada. “Slavery had been abolished in the British Empire in 1834. Anti-slavery legislation had been introduced in Upper Canada as early as 1793” (FC, p.65). Highlighting slavery’s abolishment obfuscates its existence in Canada and its real, oppressive effects. This paints Canada as “a desirable refuge”

(Knight, 1997, p.269) from the indignities and injustice suffered by enslaved Blacks in the United States and as principled and incorruptible compared to its southern neighbour. Evident here is the construction of “Canada as the non-racist antithesis of the United States” (Roman & Stanley, 1997, p.213). The inclusion of Mary Ann Shadd and her work seems to serve the purpose of illustrating that Canada West was a base from which the unjust system of slavery could be challenged. She is explicitly identified as a “Black settler” and “woman of colour” (FC, p.65) and represented as one who “advised Blacks who came to Canada from the US” and “spoke out against slavery” (FC, p.65). Yet, the text makes no mention of whether or not she did this particularly well or if anybody listened. Nor does the text reveal if or how she was elected or chosen to take this role. That is, there is no indication made of how successful she was in either helping Blacks who came to Canada or fighting slavery, or of the extent to which she was a legitimate voice of a group of people. So, while she is portrayed as one who defines problems and worked toward their resolution, neither she nor her work is presented as somehow contributing to the resolution of these problems. What is implied then, is that it is not Shadd or her work which is significant, but rather the place from which she was able to conduct her work, Canada West. It would appear that Shadd is included in the narratives of this text less to discuss her contributions to history and more to reinforce the notion of morality within the geographical space of Canada. This is made even more clear by the representation of Shadd as a solitary sojourner. Her stay in Canada is portrayed as temporary. “She moved to Canada West in 1851 ... [but] ... after the civil war, ... moved back to the United States” (FC, p.65). Her significance as an historical figure apparently ends here since no mention is made of her life beyond this. The text does claim that “other black settlers remained” in Canada, however, even pointing out that one of “the most important settlements was ... near present-day Chatham” (FC, p.65). Yet, this importance is never discussed nor are the “other Black settlers” evidently even worth naming. Similarly, while the text claims that “people of colour have a long history in British North America” (FC, p.65), none of this history is apparently worthy or significant enough for *Flashback Canada* to include it in this edition. That the text states that people of this group existed and even provides images which would most likely be interpreted as images of “Black”

people (FC, p.259, p.282, and front cover) seems to warrant greater explanation of their stories. Otherwise, the implication is that the history of this particular group is thought to be insignificant, trivial, or unnecessary in a telling of Canada's history, further implying that this racialized group is not representative of true or important Canadians. Indeed, since the only active character marked as Black eventually departs Canada, the presence of Blacks in Canada presents itself as something unnatural or abnormal.

There is another important consideration worth mentioning. The reduction of the racialized population of "blacks" or "people of colour" to a solitary figure (Mary Ann Shadd) in the historical narratives of *Flashback Canada* reflects what Carby has identified as the "essential black female subject" who must carry the burden of representing "the long-suffering or triumphantly noble aspect(s)" of black histories. Carby further argues that "the elevation of the black female subject" in this way "is frequently the means by which [whites] ... cleanse their souls and rid themselves of the guilt of living in a society that is still rigidly segregated" (p.192). Here again, whiteness can be viewed as guilt reconfigured into innocence.

d) The Natives

There are numerous characters clearly marked as "Native." Most often this marking occurs through the claim that the character is a "chief" of a particular "Native group" such as "Chief Crowfoot and his Blackfoot" or "Rainy Chief and the North Bloods" (FC, p.183). Some other examples of "Natives" marked in this way include Little Soldier (FC, p.167), Many Spotted Horses (FC, p.184-5), and Eagle Ribs (FC, p.185). The very fact that the names used by the text to refer to these "Native" people are 'English' names also says something about the point of view of the story and the power embedded in the processes of writing and publishing it.

All of these narrative characters marked as "Native" or "Indian" are portrayed in sections of the text which are in one way or another isolated. Most appear in a chapter entitled "Treaties with Native Peoples" (FC, p.178). Sitting Bull is presented in a separate section of a chapter titled "Relationships with Native Groups" (FC, p.173-4) and Little Soldier makes his only appearance in a highlighted "news bulletin" (FC, p.167). Both Big Bear and Poundmaker are represented in a separate biographical section of highlighted text, although they are also presented

throughout narratives pertaining to the North-west rebellion (FC, p.228-239). Nevertheless, this is indicative of a tendency to present “Natives” only as obstacles to the progress of western settlement. There is almost nothing to suggest that aboriginal peoples existed across the land and had desires, goals, and expectations of their own. In this respect, “Native” peoples and their voices are separated from the ‘main’ narrative as though this group is less integral to the telling of Canadian history.

The above reference to the participation of Big Bear and Poundmaker in the North-West rebellion points to a theme which runs through the representation of these “Native” characters - violence. This can be observed through the ways in which Native characters are portrayed as leaders. Poundmaker and Big Bear lead their “people” and “followers” only in the context of battle or war. For example, “Natives under Chief Poundmaker headed for Battleford” (FC, p.228) where they would fight in “the Battle of Cut Knife Hill” (FC, p.234). Elsewhere, Wandering Spirit “led a band of Natives against the settlement at Frog Lake” where they killed a government worker, two priests, and five others (FC, p.228). Since little effort is made to explain why this particular attack occurred, it portrays Natives as bloodthirsty savages. In fact, the words of Big Bear are used to confirm this portrayal: “My young men are wild. I can no longer control them.” (FC, p.228). Frequently, Crowfoot is identified as possessing “leadership abilities” (FC, p.178). He is described as “the leading chief of the Blackfoot” and as one who “became the most outstanding man of his people -- a poet, a speechmaker, and a leader (FC, p.173). In this way, Crowfoot’s ability to lead appears restricted to “his people”. But the claim is also made that Crowfoot “used all his influence as a speaker and leader to keep the Blackfoot out of the North-West rebellion” (FC, p.179) as if the natural tendency would be for the Blackfoot to fight. Again the image of the ‘savage Indian’ shines through despite the inclusion of ‘noble savages’ such as Crowfoot.

Crowfoot is the only Native character portrayed as either a significant problem-solver or peacemaker: “Crowfoot was a peacemaker and a diplomat ...[who] ... worked for peace between Natives and non-Natives’ (FC, p.178-9). He also “adopted Cree Chief Poundmaker as his own son” in an attempt to end “a long tradition of conflict between the Blackfoot and the Cree” (FC,

p.178). This shows violence to be part of the historical nature of these Native groups and positions Natives as the common denominator in violence, whether it be among Natives or with non-Natives. Even the problems that Crowfoot solves are problems related to violence. He is credited with averting a war “against both the American soldiers and the Canadian Mounties” by reminding other Blackfoot that the Mounties “were friends” and by refusing to “smoke Sitting Bull’s tobacco” (FC, p.174). Crowfoot is also represented as being instrumental in overcoming the problem of opposition to the treaty. He speaks first to give his support to the treaty and then later “comes forward and asks to be the first to sign the treaty” (FC, p.185-6). Not only are these problems related to violence or the possibility of violence, but they are nearly always problems resolved *for* the Canadian Mounties and Canadian government. This perhaps explains this noble portrayal of Crowfoot. Nevertheless, even he is indicated to be the source of a problematic and potentially violent situation. “The path of the railroad caused unrest among the native peoples. The most serious incident arose with Crowfoot and his Blackfoot people” (FC, p.200) The text paints Crowfoot and the Blackfoot as naturally irrational and hot-headed when the claim is made that they “needed a chance to talk before they took up arms” (FC, p.200). The Blackfoot are further portrayed as inherently unruly in the following statement: “It was possible that the aging chief [Crowfoot] would not be able to control some of his angriest people” (FC, p.200). Ultimately it is Father Lacombe and not Crowfoot who solves this particular problem by advising the Blackfoot not to go to war “against the railroad and the government” (FC, p.200). The implications are that Father Lacombe represents civilized rationality and that Crowfoot, despite the possession of some noble characteristics, remains a savage.

While Crowfoot is portrayed as solving problems related to violence, most Native characters are represented as the cause or source of violent problems. Poundmaker and Big Bear are represented as sources of the rebellion. They are described as causing problems by becoming “discontented and rebellious” (FC, p.188). They “refused to give up their way of life and move quietly onto the reserves [and] became increasingly desperate as food grew more scarce” (FC, p.228). Poundmaker is also represented as causing a problem by being a source of fear among settlers. “Battleford was surrounded by Poundmaker and his people” and the “frightened citizens

took shelter” (FC, p.230-234). This problem is one which Colonel Otter is sent to address. “Imagine the surprise and relief felt by the people of Battleford when they heard ... the approaching military” (p.234). That Poundmaker is the problem is made even more evident in the statement that Poundmaker caused “serious trouble” for Otter’s troops in the ensuing battle at Cut Knife Hill (FC, p.235). This narrative is presented entirely as the problems faced by Otter and his men who had to contend with “freezing temperatures which made sleeping on the ground a torture”, food “full of maggots”, and mosquitoes which drove the men “crazy” (FC, p.234). Significantly, the text tells little of the experiences of the opposition forces under Chief Poundmaker. Placed adjacent to the details of Otter’s experiences, this textually-imposed silence represents Poundmaker’s experience as either unknowable or insignificant to Canadian history. It might also imply that Poundmaker and his followers had no problems since, by their ‘wild’ nature, they were well-suited to the ‘savage’ conditions which plagued Otter and his troops. Conversely of course, this representation has the added effect of painting Otter and his men as civilized since they were made to appear ‘unnaturally’ placed among the wild elements of the country. Ultimately, the battle is termed “a humiliating defeat’ for Otter as opposed to a victory for Poundmaker (FC, p.236). The representation of Big Bear is similar with images of nature and hunting adding weight to his portrayal as a ‘natural savage’. He is presented as a problem for “avoid[ing] capture by heading north into the woods and lake country” (FC, p.236). In this case, General Strange is sent “to track down Big Bear” (FC, p.230). Thus, Big Bear becomes the hunted (the natural problem) and Strange the hunter (the civilized solution). This “hunt” is expressed entirely from the perspective of Strange and the problems he faced. “Through dense bush and swamps where the mosquitoes drove troops and horses mad, the chase continued” (FC, p.236).

The text does make some effort to include the perspectives of both Poundmaker and Big Bear by tagging a few comments onto the end of the narrative section. However, in the case of Big Bear, these comments come from unnamed sources and thus appear suspect or dubious. “Some witnesses testified that Big Bear cried out against the killings at Frog Lake” (FC, p.239). For Poundmaker, the comments are his own claims of innocence. “Poundmaker insisted at his

trial that he had not fired first at Cut Knife Hill...He pointed out that he actually saved people's lives" (FC, p.239). His opinion seems less credible against the events of the battle which are written as if 'historical fact.' This technique of juxtaposing 'what the text says' with 'what others say' serves as a vehicle for the inclusion of 'other' perspectives, but acts as a separation strategy that reinforces supposed facts, truth, and the knowable from possible fabrications, the questionable, and the unknowable. Invariably, it is Natives or other 'others' who are forced to occupy the latter position.

Another problem-causer is Sitting Bull who "tested" the friendship between Macleod and Crowfoot by "inviting Crowfoot to join the Sioux in war against both the American soldiers and the Canadian Mounties" to protest "against the settlers and prospectors who had taken over their hunting areas" (FC, p.173-4). Perspective is key here as well. It is the potential war and protest which are framed as problems. Any problematic actions of the settlers, prospectors, or the Canadian Mounties are left unexplained. Since "some of the Blackfoot called for war" (FC, p.174), a Native perspective of perceived problems is called for. Without one, Natives are portrayed as unreasonably willing to wage war, and non-Natives as innocent and blameless in a near-conflict with a supposedly savage people.

As a defined group of people, Natives in the text have their views, stories, and concerns presented time and time again as insignificant to the history of the Canadian nation. For example, in a discussion of the problematic way in which land in Upper Canada was granted to "members of the Family Compact or their friends and favourites", the following statement is put forth: "Much of this land had once been the home of the Native peoples. In 1836, Sir Francis Bond Head had convinced some of these Native peoples to move to reservations in the Georgian Bay area" (FC, p.13). These "Native peoples" are not actors in their own right. Rather, they are portrayed as scenery in a play, easily shifted and moved to suit the telling of a particular Canadian story. Since "some" were convinced to move, it is clear that others did not. However, those who remained in Upper Canada are represented as insignificant because they never appear in the narratives that follow. Although Head's actions are termed a "cause of discontent" (FC, p.13), this discontent is examined only in terms of how the land was divided among Family Compact

members. The problem from the viewpoint of the “Native peoples” is not explored. Since, these are narratives concerning the genesis of the Canadian nation, Native concerns and definitions of the problems associated with this genesis are apparently trivial or misplaced.

Another example which shows the trivialization of Natives and Native concerns in the context of telling Canadian history is represented in the following passage:

In 1670, King Charles of England gave the governor and the Company of Gentlemen Adventurers the rights to thousands of square kilometres of land... The Hudson’s Bay Company named this land Rupert’s Land. Legally, Rupert’s land belonged to them. For 150 years or more no one, except the Native peoples, cared very much about Rupert’s Land. Then, at the time of Confederation, Canadians began thinking about settling the West. (FC, p.133)

That the Native peoples cared about the land is insignificant. Of significance is what Canadians in the Confederation thought. This starkly illustrates the exclusion of Native peoples from the definition of Canadian. The passage is also problematic on several other fronts. First, by presenting King Charles as unquestionably capable of giving away this land, it emphasizes the ‘naturalness’ of this supposed English ownership. This natural ownership is reinforced and artificially legitimated by the emphasis on the early date at which the transfer occurred (i.e., it represents this ownership as existing for centuries) and by making claims about the legality of the transfer. What was legal from the British standpoint might very well not have been “legal” from the viewpoint of Native peoples. These were, after all, British laws drawn up and enacted by British citizens. Indeed, the concept of “legality” appears here to be code for legitimizing the “British-ness” of the geographical and historical space of Canada, particularly since the text makes no mention of the lands being previously occupied by Native peoples.

Native characters are often portrayed as largely powerless, easily pacified, or incapable of putting up any sustained resistance against a greater power or obstacle. This is true even for the most “noble” of Native characters, Crowfoot, who is portrayed as easily persuaded by Father Lacombe not to go to war against the railroad or the government and, subsequently, pacified by Van Horne’s gift of a lifetime rail pass. “Crowfoot was pleased with his gift and wore it for the rest of his life on a chain around his neck” (FC, p.200). He is also described as the “leader of the Blackfoot during very distressing times ... Many of his people were sick and starving” (FC,

p.179). There is no indication that he was at all able to help his people successfully rise above these or other troubles. Likewise, Poundmaker and Big Bear do not persevere, but rather give up. Poundmaker “voluntarily surrendered” to Middleton while Big Bear “surrendered to the North-West Mounted Police” (FC, p.236). Other Native chiefs are represented as relenting and agreeing to sign treaties which they opposed. Among them, Button Chief also demonstrates actions of complaining and pleading, which, along with protesting, are actions seen periodically among Native characters. Button Chief, for example, “complains that settlers and police are cutting down large amounts of firewood ... and asks for more money” (FC, p.185). However, his arguments are presented as no match for those of David Laird, who claims that “the Blackfoot should pay the Queen for sending the whiskey traders away and bringing in the Mounties.” The treaties are signed and nothing more is made of any opposition to them excepting the evasive claim that the arguments of the Native chiefs opposed to the treaties “were expressed privately at their council meetings” (FC, p.185). To be fair, the text does include the oppositional arguments of Pemmican in the “activities” section of the chapter (p.193). Nevertheless, this again is an example of a separating strategy which removes Native peoples’ perspective from historical context as if less intrinsically salient in the shaping of that context.

In addition to an apparent lack of resilience, Native characters are also portrayed as lacking in family cohesiveness. Only two Native characters are represented as having any family. For both, the family is made to appear disjointed or abnormal through violence or death. In a description of Wandering Spirit’s violent attack on a settlement, he is named as “Big Bear’s son” (FC, p.228). The only other reference to family within the narrative sections of the text is that Crowfoot “became a Blackfoot when his widowed mother married a Blackfoot man” (FC, p.178), although a caption below a photograph states that ‘one of Crowfoot’s daughters died in a tuberculosis epidemic’ (FC, p.188). The significance of this portrayal of Natives as either without family or with a family that is characterized only by death or violence lies in past tendencies to point to troubled family life or an absence of family values as causes of racism. It doesn’t need to be explicitly stated in this text. It is clear that there is something abnormal about Native family life, particularly when viewed next to the portrayal of numerous white families. Again, falling

back on a 'blaming the victim' syndrome, the text represents whiteness as innocence since no indication is made that whites contributed to the problems faced by Native families.

Native peoples are also represented as naive or misunderstood. For example, the text asks whether the Blackfoot people understood the treaties "in the same way that the Canadian government did" (FC, p.186) and answers for the reader,

Most Native people say no. They say their people did not believe that they were giving up the land forever ... When the Native peoples signed the treaties, they thought they were sharing the land with other people in the same way they shared it with the animals ... They thought they were making a friendship agreement. (FC, p.186-7)

It is explained that most of the Native groups signed treaties by the late 1870s, but were reluctant to immediately move to the reserves because "they did not want to leave the life they had lived as buffalo hunters" (FC, p.187). This illustrates a common portrayal of Natives as unwilling to embrace change. This conservative lack of foresight is also evident in the representation of individual Native characters whose limited power seems to be explained as rising from concerns about their people and way of life. Poundmaker, for example, was "genuinely concerned about the welfare of his people. He did not want to see the destruction of their way of life" (FC, p.236) Big Bear too was "concerned about his people" (FC, p.228) and "the destruction of his people's way of life" (FC, p.238). This portrays Natives as unable to see beyond their own racialized boundaries. British characters, on the other hand, as powerful and privileged characters do see beyond. That is, they are never portrayed with restricted concerns of 'a British way of life' or 'a white way of life', but rather have the foresight to view a national project that accepts and tolerates certain carefully positioned degrees of difference.

Crowfoot's representation as one concerned with "helping his people adapt to a new way of life" (FC, p.179) portrays him as somewhat more willing to make the attempt to conform to non-Native notions of progressive development. Through (or because of) this acceptance, Crowfoot gets a more positive portrayal. What this suggests, therefore, is that the racialized category of "Native" itself contains sub-divisions whereby 'good' and 'bad Indians' are situated.

Having said this, none of the native characters is represented as possessing any exceptional intelligence, training, education (of any sort), or ability that helps to explain their rise to leadership

positions (i.e., the process by which they became chiefs) or historical prominence (i.e., their inclusion in the textbook). Indeed, very little information is provided about the background of Native characters. Similarly, the later lives or deaths of Native characters are either not explained or hastily breezed over. The text mentions only that Poundmaker and Big Bear both “died within a few months of their release” from prison and that “Poundmaker’s bones were moved to the Cut Knife reserve” (FC, p.239). There is nothing in the text concerning the later life or death of Crowfoot or any other Native character. With no beginnings and endings, “Native” characters are almost frozen in space and time, like a backdrop in a movie that is fundamentally neither about them nor their concerns or desires. They appear present only to enliven the plot for the real stars of the film, those pervasive and glorified characters who doggedly and heroically build, by the film’s climactic end, the fair, just, and moral nation.

V. Summary and Conclusions

Racializations do not work to produce simple binaries standing on either side of permanently constructed and impervious boundaries. Rather, they operate with a complexity that can involve many different levels of signification. They organize populations into hierarchies, but these hierarchies are not mere two-dimensional static structures. The hierarchical arrangements produced through racializations cascade along multiple dimensions, may change over time, and work with any number of signifiers.

In *Flashback Canada*, processes of racialization articulate in complex ways with signifiers of ethnicity and nationality. I wish to use the term 'micro-racialization' to refer to the processes of racialization by which ethnic or national identities in *Flashback Canada* are separated and made distinct through the representation of particular moral and intellectual characteristics as the essence of that 'kind' of people. This results, for example, in the formation of Icelandic, Ukrainian, American, Irish, and British 'sets' (indeed, 'races') of people. Even internal to these identities, additional micro-racializations function to create different categories of each racialized kind (e.g., Fenian Irish). I use the term micro-racialization to distinguish between the racialization of these compartmentalized ethnic or national identities and a more panoramic form of 'macro-racialization' through which numerous racialized groups coalesce into simultaneous representations of Canadian-ness and whiteness. Via this process of macro-racialization, Canada and Canadian become racialized identities. The essence of what is imagined as a Canadian is constitutive of those very moral and intellectual qualities which signify whiteness. Thus, neither whiteness nor Canadian-ness is a single essentialized entity. In point of fact, both are complex hierarchical representations interwoven with one another, but which are made to appear quite distinct from others portrayed as non-Canadian and non-white.

Similar processes of micro- and macro-racialization also work in *Flashback Canada* to imagine groups of people as non-Canadian and non-white 'others'. People represented in this way include those racialized as Métis, Black, Chinese, and Native. Again, even within these racialized identities, there is evidence of further micro-racializations. Take, as examples, the apparent differences between Scottish and French Métis or between the 'good Indian' (e.g.,

Crowfoot) and the 'bad Indian' (e.g., Wandering Spirit). The larger process of othering occurring here differentiates Blacks, Chinese, Métis, and Native from that which is 'Canadian' and from that which is 'white'. This process of othering is, I would like to argue, a form of macro-racialization. Ostensibly lacking in certain appropriate, suitable, or desirable qualities while simultaneously possessing particular traits presumed to be indicative of inappropriate, unsuitable, or undesirable temperament, these individually racialized groups are represented by *Flashback Canada* as a collectively racialized 'other'.

These socially constructed identities are not unassailable divisions hermetically sealed off from one another. Rather, in a continuum of gradual change from superior whiteness to inferior otherness, there is a blurred though recognizable location at which whiteness ends and otherness begins. At this same juncture, Canadian-ness becomes non-Canadian-ness. The representation of Métis characters, in particular, illustrates the complexity of this place of departure from racial superiority to inferiority. The Métis are portrayed as exhibiting and possessing some of the same moral and intellectual characteristics as 'white' characters, but in faulty, defective, or flawed ways. The point of separation between whiteness and otherness can be brought into focus by examining the historical narratives of this textbook for redundancies pertaining to the ways in which individuals and groups are represented in terms of power, problem-resolution, and performance, and by taking into consideration the representation of racisms and the salience of diverse perspectives. Those moral and intellectual attributes which serve to both define the essence of particular groups and to differentiate these groups from a collective 'other', permit whiteness to be viewed as an assembly of racialized identities which stand for the Canadian nation (c.f., Miles, 1993). Moreover, these social divisions are not merely documented by the textbook, but invented and reinvented by it. *Flashback Canada* imagines and delineates boundaries between and among groups representative of whiteness and otherness and presents these as social realities.

To answer the question which has guided this project, then, *Flashback Canada* racializes Canada and Canadians as white. This is not a singular or pure whiteness, however. To the contrary, it is an hierarchy of white ethnicities which are positioned to varying degrees as

constitutive of the nation. “British” individuals are at once represented as the best and most natural form of Canadians and representative of the most supreme form of whiteness. Whiteness is represented through British characters as the supreme form of morality. These characters exhibit honour, privilege, loyalty, personal sacrifice, determination, perseverance, diligence, the ability to transcend, hard work, self-help, honesty, enterprise, energy, Christian virtue, benevolence, peacefulness, and civilized nature. No less supreme are their intellectual capabilities as evident through their superior intelligence, far seeing wisdom, inclination for leadership roles, communicative ability, technical superiority, frequent and expeditious success, and problem-solving ability. Moreover, presented as legitimate authorities invested with the responsibility of creating a nation in their own likeness, characters marked with British-ness demonstrate both intellectual and moral superiority through roles as educators and deliverers of law, discipline, and order.

Other ethnically and nationally named groups exhibit many of these same characteristics, though not to the same degree of ‘perfection’. Groups racialized on the basis of their Irish, French, and American ethnicities or nationalities, are presented as occasionally faulty versions of the ideal Canadian. Those racialized as Icelanders, Ukrainians, Finns, and Mennonites come across as incomplete or immature versions of the imagined Canadian. Clearly, however, all of these British, British-like, and European narrative characters are racialized as white and represented as Canadian or, minimally, as having the potential to become Canadian. This does not appear to be the case with groups racialized as Métis, Black, Chinese, and Native. The moral and intellectual characteristics ascribed to the individuals who stand for each of these racialized groups reinforce their racialized ‘otherness’. Moreover, the decidedly inferior moral worth of the traits assigned to racialized others propagate whiteness as the supreme ‘race’. In this respect, little has changed from turn of the century textbooks. *Flashback Canada*, a “successful” history textbook presently being used in Ontario continues to foster the indoctrination of white supremacist ideology. Clearly, part of this indoctrination process is the denial of white responsibility for historic oppressions. The historical significance of racisms and the benefits derived from them by groups racialized as white are altogether ignored in this textbook. This ensures that, among the

various 'kinds' of whiteness represented in *Flashback Canada*, there remains one which signifies pure and supreme morality. This supremacy almost appears to justify the imagining and reification of 'the Canadian citizen' as one constructed from a hierarchy of ethnic and national identities racialized as white and "homogeneous with regard to their sense of entitlement and national belongingness" (Roman & Stanley, 1997, p.209).

The racializations (both micro- and macro-) which I have found to be represented in *Flashback Canada* are not, in any way, natural. Rather, they are *naturalized* by the textbook through repetition, but also by their presentation as unproblematic. Perhaps this can be best illustrated with an example. Christianity is not naturally 'white' any more than such qualities as loyalty, determination, or far-seeing wisdom. Many people racialized as Black, Native, and Chinese have historically embraced Christianity as well as other forms of spirituality and many, of course, continue to do so. However, there is little or no evidence of this in *Flashback Canada*. Instead, Christianity is represented as an attribute and even a discriminating component of whiteness. Christian faith, like a number of other characteristics, is reserved in the historical narratives of this textbook for particular (white) groups through patterns of separation and redundancy. Conversely, none of the Black, Native, or Chinese narrative characters are portrayed as Christian. The only Métis identified as Christian, Louis Riel, is portrayed as a defective Christian at best. Moreover, spirituality of any sort (e.g., Confucianism, Buddhism, or Native spiritualism) is seldom ever mentioned let alone associated with these 'other' characters. Thus, through silence about the faith(s) of 'others' and through the redundant association of Christianity with whiteness, the naturalized (not natural) reality presented by *Flashback Canada* is that otherness lacks spirituality or faith while the essence of whiteness equals that of Christianity.

The significance of this study lies in the unveiling of such representational inequities. *Flashback Canada* (Cruyton & Wilson, 1994) is the third and most recent edition of a popular textbook and, furthermore, is the product of decades of multicultural initiatives. Yet, in this study it has been revealed that *Flashback Canada* produces and perpetuates unfair representations of various social divisions of the population. Through linguistic means, this history textbook creates races by demarcating narrative characters on the basis of national and ethnic identities and

representing these identities with varying degrees of moral and intellectual worth. In other words, it imagines or contrives an hierarchy of racial superiority. Focusing on the racializations contained within the narratives of this textbook has exposed the inner workings of this social process of race formation and hierarchical positioning and advanced the struggle for justice in society by moving beyond simplistic positive/negative forms of analysis to tackle the complex syntactical and semantic dynamics of representation.

Moreover, this study of racializations has contributed to understanding how discursive forms may be conducive to identity formation among school children. There is ample evidence in the historical narratives of this one representative textbook to suggest that a persuasive and privileged view of racialized identities is being presented to school children. Identification of this potential for a pedagogical device to produce damaging effects on children's learning is, in and of itself, a worthy accomplishment because it has illuminated an educational location at which initiatives may be taken by anti-racist educators to disrupt continued white supremacist thought and practice.

Furthermore, the racialized hierarchical arrangements in evidence in *Flashback Canada* attest to the normalized and naturalized white supremacist authority and legitimacy which pervades the nation and its institutions. After all, the representations contained within this history textbook are themselves material consequences of subliminal and hegemonic white supremacist structures. By deconstructing what can appear to be authoritative and legitimate norms, this study has disclosed effects of white supremacist racisms and worked to furnish some understanding of the unconscious social and psychic components of white supremacist thought and action.

What I have not done here, however, is to make any attempt to ascertain the effects of the dynamic use of the textbook nor have I made any effort to examine the extra-discursive elements that play a part in children's construction of meaning. Thus, my interpretations and findings are measures of the potential of *Flashback Canada* to influence or persuade children to adopt a particularly white supremacist viewpoint on Canadian history and citizenship. A logical and

necessary extension of this study would be one which looked at the effects on young readers of the determinate conditions presented in *Flashback Canada* and other Canadian history textbooks.

This study is also limited by an absence of any examination of the political economy and historical circumstances surrounding the production of the textbook. Textbooks such as *Flashback Canada* take their appearance from a complex interaction of societal factors. To more fully understand the representations contained within *Flashback Canada*, one needs to investigate the politics of textbook publishing and authorization as well as the socially and historically influenced roles of the authors themselves. Here one might also look at how lived whiteness and imagined conceptions of whiteness construct *Flashback Canada* and how the existence of a wider grammar of Canadianism contributes to the construction and appearance of various components of educational curricula. Determining how textbooks come to take their final form is certainly a different kind of study from the one which I have undertaken, but it too would help to understand the representations contained in *Flashback Canada* by revealing something of their multiple origins. I have touched on one aspect of the origin of these representations, that is, the remarkable similarity between and among history textbooks used over the course of the past century. Certainly this is an area in need of further investigation to determine the extent to which white supremacist narratives are, for example, a consequence of any over-reliance by textbook authors on the work of their predecessors or common sets of sources with limited perspectives. Related to this is the need to analyze the use of primary and secondary sources used in textbooks to support claims about groups of people or to reinforce the authenticity of historical narratives. The sporadic provision of citations for materials used in the development of *Flashback Canada* problematically contributes to the representation of historical narratives as normal and unchanging truths, not as selective interpretations based on sources which are inevitably reflective of particular perspectives.

It seems to me that this study is situated as one of three general kinds of studies which should be required of school textbooks. One involves the political economy surrounding the production of the textbooks in question. The second entails analyzing the textbooks themselves, and the third necessitates studying the various effects of the textbooks on those who read them.

This study is an example of the second and is limited by the exclusion of examples of the first and third. Of course, there are other limitations, many of which I have already discussed in chapter three. The selection of a single textbook for analysis has limited the generalizations I can make with respect to other state-sanctioned textbooks. Additionally, my findings and interpretations are influenced by numerous contextual factors such as my own motivation, desires, background knowledge, and experiences. Another limiting factor in this study has been my decision to focus on the narratives which purport to tell a story of Canada's past. While I did take into consideration narrative elements such as conflict (problems), action (performance), and conclusions (problem resolution), these were interpreted in ways which helped me understand the roles of various characters within the historical narratives. There are at least two problems with this approach of focusing on narrative character representations. First, other narrative elements have largely been overlooked. For example, I have made no attempt to analyze how narrative devices such as curiosity and suspense are woven with racializations to privilege or evoke certain desires and motivations among the readers. Second, choosing the historical narratives as the focus of the study has relegated the extra-narrative elements of the textbook to positions which considerably downplay their roles in constructing meanings. I have not altogether ignored other integral elements of history textbooks such as images, activity sections, questions, unit and chapter titles, timelines, lists, the index, and the overall organizational structure of the textbook (e.g., unit and chapter titles, order, and layout), but clearly there is a need for these to be fully scrutinized in order to more completely comprehend the representation of groups or individuals in the textbook.

Nevertheless, by demonstrating numerous linguistic means through which racialized groups are arranged according to an hierarchy of racial superiority, and by providing evidence detailing how white power and privilege is rendered the normal or natural state of existence in the Canadian nation, I have shown that white supremacy, far from being merely the work of extremist groups, is constructed, sustained, and naturalized by a typical and representative textbook used to educate children in Ontario's public schools.

The obvious question which follows then is what do we do with history textbooks like *Flashback Canada*? I suggest that the books must be replaced or rewritten. The new textbooks must attempt to tell histories without hierarchically categorizing groups of people as racialized essences. One way to assist in obtaining this goal is to have the textbooks discuss racisms as integral components of the histories being narrated. This requires the inclusion of knowledge about how particular racisms harmed (and continue to harm) specific groups of people, but also knowledge about how particular racisms benefited or privileged (and continue to benefit and privilege) certain groups of people. This would present possibilities for describing the less than honorable actions and characteristics of members of those groups heretofore represented exclusively as 'great and honorable'. It would also help to explain some of the disadvantages and obstacles overcome by members of groups to this point largely represented as hapless victims or morally and intellectually flawed sub-humans. It should be noted here that teaching about racisms does involve a certain degree of risk. Historical narratives which graphically discuss human suffering in terms of systematic enslavement, internment, and mass murder can have very real and painful psychological effects on the children asked to read them (Robertson, 1997). Consequently, teachers have a responsibility to anticipate and prepare for these potential difficulties of anguish and hurt. As Robertson (1997) puts it, the aim of teachers should be "to help students begin to identify the varying conditions present in paradigms of destruction, and to produce vigilance in learners about the ongoing implications and effects of catastrophic suffering in the world today" (p.463).

Replacing or rewriting the textbooks does not mean attempting to capture an elusive historical 'truth'. Rather, it means critically examining that which is deemed significant to the telling of histories and ensuring that the selections made do not create racialized hierarchies based on intellectual and moral worth. Again, an example may help to illustrate this point. It is true that Macdonald, Tupper, Laurier, and others were knighted. The inclusion of this historical 'fact' is not in and of itself problematic. The problem is related to the decision to choose knighthood as integral to telling this story of Canadian history and combining it with repetitive characteristics or decisions which emphasize and reinforce the redeeming characteristics or morally and

intellectually favourable attributes of particular groups, but not others. When little or no explanation is offered as to why members of other groups were not similarly bestowed with knighthoods or equally honorable titles, the attributes associated with knighthood appear to naturally belong with the groups represented by this collection of 'Sirs'. There can be little argument that Macdonald and others like him (e.g., the British) did good things, were justly rewarded for their honorable actions, and did play central roles in the building of the Canadian nation. However, they did not play the only important roles and, for that matter, were not exclusively great, just, and honorable in the process. Textbooks need to recognize the racisms which allowed these individuals and groups to carry out the Canadian project and must also recognize that in the process of building the Canadian nation, these same people were responsible for destroying other nations and possibilities for other types of communities. Consequently, it needs to be further recognized, in legitimate and fairly-represented ways, that not everyone has been necessarily pleased with the outcomes.

The goal of these new (or revised) textbooks should be to privilege multiple perspectives of the histories which, in various ways, relate to the Canadian nation. This might entail including more diverse perspectives within the narratives of the textbooks, but it also might involve using different and more varied sets of primary and secondary sources, encouraging authorship from diverse segments of the population, or even radically altering the organizational styles of textbooks so that it is not "Canadian history" *per se* that gets told, but a more global and inclusive set of histories of which Canadian nationalism represents one aspect among many.

Truly educational history textbooks must be invested with multiple and collective sources of knowledge and experience. However, as I discussed in chapter one of this thesis, it is impractical to expect problematic textbooks such as *Flashback Canada* to be immediately replaced or rewritten. Additionally, even if this were a possibility, there is no single or correct way for textbook content to be represented. Thus, simply replacing or rewriting the textbooks is inadequate. What also needs to occur are critical and liberating approaches by students and teachers to using the textbooks. This means that teachers and students should be given the tools that will enable them to ask of the textbooks many of the same questions that I have posed in this

study. In other words, anti-racist theory and practice should be made an integral component of the classroom. Students and teachers must take pro-active and critical approaches toward understanding how institutionalized and unequal relations of power and privilege (e.g., racisms) are created, sustained, and promoted. That which is apparently obvious or taken for granted must continually be problematized and reconstructed. This, of course, includes the historical narratives located in Canadian history textbooks, but also involves all other pedagogical devices, strategies, and forms of representation which may influence students in Canadian classrooms. Ongoing and critical interrogation of representative forms and the racializations embedded within them is indispensable in the struggle for social justice for *all* students.

VI. References

- Allen, T.W. (1994). The invention of the white race. Volume One: Racial oppression and social control. London: Verso Press.
- Altheide, D.L. (1987). Ethnographic content analysis. Qualitative Sociology, 10 (1), 65-77.
- Anchan, J.P. & Holychuk, L. (1996). Dealing with racial and cultural diversity in the curriculum. In I. Alladin (Ed.), Racism in Canadian schools (pp. 93-106). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
- Anderson, B. (1991). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. (Rev. ed.). London: Verso.
- Annarud, R. (1997). Fictions of whiteness: Speaking the names of whiteness in U.S. literature. In R. Frankenburg (Ed.), Displacing whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism (pp. 35-59). London: Duke University Press.
- Baker, G.C. (1983). Organizing for instruction. In Planning and organizing for multicultural instruction (pp. 78-101). Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Bocock, R. (1996). The cultural formations of modern society. In S. Hall et al. (Eds.), Modernity: An introduction to modern societies (pp. 149-183). Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.
- Brown, G.W. & Careless, J.M.S. (1954). Canada and the world. Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons.
- Carby, H. (1992). The multicultural wars. In G. Dent (Ed.), Black Popular Culture: A project by Michelle Wallace (pp. 187-199). Seattle: Bay Press.
- Chafe, J.W. & Lower, A.R.M. (1948). Canada: A nation. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Company.
- Clark, P.I. (1996). Take it away youth: Visions of Canadian identity in British Columbia social studies textbooks, 1925-1989. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia.
- Council on Interracial Books for Children. (1977). Stereotypes, distortions and omissions in U.S. history textbooks. New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children.
- Cornell, S. & Hartmann, D. (1998). Ethnicity and race: Making identities in a changing world. London: Pine Forge Press.

- Corrigan, P. (1987). Race/Ethnicity/Gender/Culture: Embodying differences educationally. An argument. In J. Young (Ed.), Breaking the mosaic (pp. 20-30). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Cronon, W. (1992). A place for stories: Nature, history, and narrative. The Journal of American History, March, 1347-1376.
- Cruyton, J.B. & Wilson, W.D. (1994). Flashback Canada. (3rd ed.). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Daniels, J. (1997). White lies: Race, class, gender, and sexuality in white supremacist discourse. New York: Routledge.
- Dean, E., Hartman, P., & Katzen, M. (1983). Aims and methods of textbook analysis. In History in black and white: An analysis of South African school history textbooks (pp. 37-44). Paris: UNESCO.
- Dei, G.J.S. (1996a). Anti-racism education: Theory and practice. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.
- Dei, G.J.S. (1996b). Critical perspectives in antiracism: An introduction. The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 33(3), 247-267.
- Dhand, H. (1988). Bias in social studies textbooks: New research findings. The History and Social Science Teacher, 24 (1), pp.23-27.
- Donald, J. & Rattansi, A. (1992). 'Race', culture and difference. London: Sage Publications.
- Dyer, R. (1988). White. Screen: The last special issue on race?, 29 (4), 44-65.
- Dyer, R. (1997). White. New York: Routledge.
- Eco, U. (1976). Introduction: Toward a logic of culture. In A theory of semiotics (pp. 3-31). London: Indiana University Press.
- Evans, A.S. & Martinello, I.L. (1978). Canada's century. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures and Truth/power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), Power/Knowledge (pp. 78-133). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Francis, D. (1997). National dreams: Myth, memory, and Canadian history. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Frankenburg, R. (1992). Growing up white: The social geography of race. In R. Frankenburg (Ed.), White women, race matters: the social construction of whiteness (pp. 43-70). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Frankenburg, R. (1997). Introduction: Local whitenesses, localizing whiteness. In R. Frankenburg (Ed.), Displacing whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism (pp. 1-33). London: Duke University Press.
- Garland, A. (1961). Canada, our country: Part two. Toronto: Macmillan Company.
- Garvey, J. & Ignatiev, N. (1997). Toward a new abolitionism: *A Race Traitor* manifesto. In M. Hill (Ed.), Whiteness: A critical reader (pp. 346-349). New York: New York University Press.
- Glazer, N. & Ueda, R. (1983). Ethnic groups in history textbooks. Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Gilroy, P. (1992). The end of anti-racism. In J. Donald and A. Rattansi (Eds.), 'Race', culture and difference (pp. 49-61). London: Sage.
- Giroux, H.A. (1997a). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling (pp. 234-253). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Giroux, H.A. (1997b). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. Harvard Educational Review, 67 (2), 285-320.
- Goldberg, D.T. (1990). The social formation of racist discourse. In D.T. Goldberg (Ed.), The anatomy of racism (pp. 295-318). Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- Goldberg, D.T. (1993). Racist culture. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Goldberg, D.T. (1994). Introduction: Multicultural Conditions. In D.T. Goldberg (Ed.), Multiculturalism: A critical reader (pp. 1-41). Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Gould, S.J. (1996). The mismeasure of man. (Rev. ed.). New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Government of Ontario. Ministry of Education. (1998). Circular 14. <http://onteris.oise.utoronto.ca/c14e>.
- Greene, M. (1993). The passions of pluralism: Multiculturalism and the expanding community. In T. Perry & J.W. Fraser (Eds.), Freedom's plow: Teaching in the multicultural classroom (pp. 185-196). New York: Routledge.
- Grant, C.A. & Sleeter, C.E. (1989). Turning on Learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability. Toronto: Merrill Publishing.
- Hall, S. (1980). Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance. In Sociological theories: Race and colonialism (pp. 303-345). Paris: UNESCO.

Hall, S. (1992). New ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), Race, culture and difference (pp. 252-259). London: Sage Publications.

Hatcher, R. & Troyna, B. (1993). Racialization and children. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), Race, identity, and representation in education (pp. 109-124). New York: Routledge.

Herstein, H.H., Hughes, L.J. & Kirbyson, R.C. (1970). Challenge and survival: The history of Canada. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd.

hooks, b. (1990). Representing whiteness: Seeing wings of desire. In Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics (pp. 165-171). Boston, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1992). Representations of whiteness in the black imagination. In Black looks: Race and representation (pp. 165-178). Boston, MA: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. London: Routledge.

Ignatiev, N. (1995). How the Irish became white. New York: Routledge.

Ignatiev, N. (1997). Treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity. An interview with Noel Ignatiev of *Race Traitor* magazine. In R. Delgado & J. Stefaniec (Eds.), Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror (pp. 607-612). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Irving, H.M. (1986). An analysis of Ontario's junior division social studies textbooks in relation to multiculturalism. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Jay, G. (1994). Knowledge, power, and the struggle for representation. College English, 56 (1), 9-29.

Kirbyson, R.C., Blair, C.M., Dreyer, P., McCutcheon, K. & Skeoch, A. (1983) Discovering Canada: Shaping and identity. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall Canada, Inc.

Knight, C. (1997). Black parents speak: Education in mid-nineteenth century Canada West. Ontario History, 89 (4), 269-284.

Kohler Riessman, C. (1993). Narrative analysis. London: Sage Publications.

Lerner, R., Nagai, A.K., & Rothman, S. (1995). Molding the good citizen: The politics of high school history texts. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. London: Sage Publications.

Lupul, M.R. (1976). The portrayal of Canada's 'other' peoples in senior high school history and social studies textbooks in Alberta, 1905 to the present. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 22 (1), 1-33.

Lynch, J. (1986). Curriculum planning, implementation and evaluation. In Multicultural education (pp. 79-103). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Maher, F.A. & Tetreault, M.K.T. (1997). Learning in the dark: How assumptions of whiteness shape classroom knowledge. Harvard Educational Review, 67 (2), 321-349.

Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. (1974). The shocking truth about Indians in textbooks. Winnipeg: Manitoba Indian Brotherhood.

McCarthy, C. (1994). Multicultural discourses and curriculum reform: A critical perspective. Educational Theory, 44 (1), 81-98.

McDiarmid, G. & Pratt, D. (1971). Teaching prejudice: A content analysis of social studies textbooks authorized for use in Ontario. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

McLaren, P.L. (1997). Unthinking whiteness, rethinking democracy: Or farewell to the blonde beast; Towards a revolutionary multiculturalism. Educational Foundations, 11 (2), pp. 5-39.

Morrison, T. (1992). Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination. New York: Vintage Books.

Miles, R. (1989). Racism. London: Routledge.

Miles, R. (1993). Nationalism and racism: Antithesis and articulation. In Racism after 'race relations' (pp. 53-79). London: Routledge.

Ng, R. (1993). Racism, sexism, and nation building in Canada. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), Race, identity and representation in education (pp. 50-59). New York: Routledge.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. New York: Longman.

Pajaczkowska, C. & Young, L. (1992). Racism, representation, psychoanalysis. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), 'Race', culture and difference (pp. 198-219). London: Sage.

Rattansi, A. (1992). Changing the subject? Racism, culture and education. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), 'Race', culture and difference (pp. 28-33). London: Sage Publications.

Rizvi, F. (1993). Children and the grammar of popular racism. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), Race, identity, and representation in education (pp. 126-138). New York: Routledge.

- Robertson, J.P. (1997). Teaching about worlds of hurt through encounters with literature: Reflections on pedagogy. Language Arts, 74 (6), pp. 457-466.
- Roediger, D. (1994). Towards the abolition of whiteness. London: Verso Press.
- Roediger, D. (1998). Black on white: Black writers on what it means to be white. New York: Schocken Books.
- Roman, L.G. (1993). White is a color! White defensiveness, postmodernism, and anti-racist pedagogy. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), Race, identity, and representation in education (pp. 71-88). New York: Routledge.
- Roman, L.G. & Stanley, T.J. (1997). Empires, Emigrés, and aliens: Young people's negotiations of official and popular racism in Canada. In L.G. Roman & J. Eyre (Eds.), Dangerous Territories: Struggles for equality and difference in education (pp. 205-231). New York: Routledge.
- Said, E. (1978). Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (1993). Overlapping territories, intertwined histories. In Culture and imperialism (pp. 3-61). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Simon, R. (1988). Being ethnic/doing ethnicity: A response to Corrigan. In J. Young (Ed.), Breaking the mosaic (pp.31-43). Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Sleeter, C. (1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), Race, identity, and representation in education (pp. 157-171). New York: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current textbooks. In M.W. Apple & L.K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), The politics of the textbook (pp. 78-110). London: Routledge.
- Snead, J. (1986). Preface. In Figures of division: William Faulkner's major novels (pp. ix-xv). New York: Methuen.
- Snead, J. (1994). White screens, black images: Hollywood from the dark side. C. MacCabe & C. West (Eds.), New York: Routledge.
- Stamp, R.M. (1982). The schools of Ontario. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Stanley, T.J. (1995). White supremacy and the rhetoric of educational indoctrination: A Canadian case study. In J. Barman (Ed.), Children, teachers, and schools in the history of British Columbia (pp. 39-56). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises.
- Stanley, T.J. (1996). Cultural pluralism and critical multiculturalism. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ottawa. Subsequently published in French as Stanley, T.J. (1998). Pluralism culturel et multiculturalisme critique. Dans A. Giroux (dir.), Repenser l'éducation.

Repères et perspectives philosophiques (pp. 169-185). Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Stanley, T.J. (1998). The struggle for history: Historical narratives and anti-racist pedagogy. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 19 (1), 41-52.

Swartz, E. (1992). Emancipatory narratives: Rewriting the master script in the school curriculum. Journal of Negro Education, 61 (3), 341-355.

Thomas, B. (1987). Anti-racist education: A response to Manicom. In J. Young (Ed.), Breaking the mosaic (pp. 104-107). Toronto: Garamond Press.

Thompson, A. (1997). For: Anti-Racist education. Curriculum Inquiry, 27 (1), pp.7-44.

Thwaites, T., Davis, L., & Mules, W. (1994). Tools for cultural studies: An introduction. South Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia PTY Ltd.

Troyna, B. (1987). Racial inequality in education. London: Tavistock.

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1992). Racism in children's lives: A study of mainly-white primary schools. London: Routledge.

Wallace, W.S. (1928). A first book of Canadian history. Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd.

Wallace, W.S. (1944). A history of the Canadian people. Toronto: Copp Clark Company Ltd.

Wellman, D. (1997). Minstrel shows, affirmative action talk, and angry white men: Marking racial otherness in the 1990s. In R. Frankenburg (Ed.), Displacing whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism (pp. 311-331). London: Duke University Press.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1992). Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Willows, D.G. & Richmond, S. (1970). Canada: Colony to Centennial. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company Limited.