Building Bridges, Breaking Barriers: Canada in the 21st Century

Construire des ponts, Franchir les obstacles : Le Canada au 21ème siècle

Conference Proceedings

13th Annual Graduate Conference of the Young Scholars' Forum of the Association for Canadian Studies in German Speaking Countries

13ème Conférence étudiant(e)s diplomé(e)s du Réseau des jeunes chercheur(e)s de L'association d'Études canadiennes dans les Pays de langue allemande

Editors: Marc Chalier, Claudia Grill, Alexandra Hauke & Jessica Janssen

Table of Contents

Introduction
1

Betsy Leimbigler (FU Berlin)
Multiculturalism and its Interpretations through the Canadian Commission for UNESCO
3

Annika Groth (University of Siegen)
« Le chiac, c'est comme le plus beau French kiss de langues » : une analyse des débats des internautes sur Facebook
17

Alicia Krömer (University of Vienna)
Public Memory and the Ongoing Reconciliation Process in a Post-TRC Canada
41

Patrizia Zanella (Université de Fribourg)
The Controversy Around Joseph Boyden's Identity: A Missed Opportunity at Reconciliation
62

Melanie Braith (University of Konstanz)
"Bih'kee-yan": Richard Wagamese's Keeper'n Me and the Imaginative Renewal of Relationships
86

Introduction

Alexandra Hauke & Jessica Janssen

The Young Scholar's Forum is a network for early career researchers and advanced students in the field of Canadian Studies. It is designed as a platform that strengthens existing networks between young Canadianists and gives young scholars around the world an opportunity to easily access these networks, start new ones, and to cooperate with other scholars working in similar fields or on similar projects.

The Forum annually hosts a post-graduate conference and a panel at the annual conference of the German Association for Canadian Studies (GKS) to promote scholarly exchange on site, and publishes a newsletter including information about current events and conferences, new book releases, scholarships and grants, job postings, and much more in the field of Canadian Studies.

The 13th Annual Conference, entitled "Building Bridges, Breaking Barriers: Canada in the 21st Century," took place at the University of Vienna from June 24-26, 2016. This interdisciplinary and bilingual event sought to reflect on Canada's ongoing status as a space of encounters and multiculturalism, but also of separatism and (neo)colonial policies. The organizing team aimed at exploring and discussing Canada's cross-cultural and transnational dimensions; the realities of its histories, geographies, cultures and politics, and, above all, its people and identities that have shaped and transformed it into its current state as a multicultural dominion *a mari usque ad mare* ("from sea to sea"). For these purposes, the conference brought together 19 postgraduate speakers from Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Canada, and the Czech Republic, whose unique backgrounds and presentations spoke to the diversity of the conference theme and the multitude of perspectives that make up Canadian Studies within and beyond Canada.

Keynote speaker Prof. Dr. Martin Löschnigg (Graz) and writer Michael Crummey (Newfoundland) framed the conference with an opening talk and a poetic reading respectively in ways that transcended geographical, social, cultural, and political borders and drew attention to the impact Canadian writing has on current affairs on both sides of the Atlantic. We are grateful to all conference speakers whose ideas continue to reflect the multifaceted nature of Canadian literatures and cultures—as will become obvious from this volume.

At this point, we would like to thank the members of the Canadian Studies Centre at the University of Vienna, who have allowed us to publish this edition within the frame of the "Vienna Working Papers in Canadian Studies," a publication series that aims at creating a space where work in progress can be shared that has previously been presented at an event organized or supported by the Centre. We also want to give special thanks to the contributors of these conference proceedings: Melanie Braith (Konstanz), Annika Groth (Siegen), Alicia Krömer (Vienna), Betsy Leimbigler (Berlin), and Patrizia Zanella (Fribourg), whose sharp explorations of Indigenous literatures, Aboriginal histories and politics, multiculturalism, and language debates across Canada through the common theme of cross-cultural relationships highlight the importance of interdisciplinary research as it opens up spaces for discussion across cultures, fields, and media by looking into the complexities, contradictions, and peculiarities of Canada and Canadian Studies.

In the first paper, Betsy Leimbigler looks at multiculturalism policy in Canada and is interested in how this concept is interpreted today in relation to the work of the UNESCO and the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCU).

Annika Groth's paper deals with Chiac in New Brunswick, a vernacular Acadian French language that, due to Canada's colonial history, is marked by influences of Canadian English.

Alicia Krömer offers a short summary of the history of Indigenous Residential Schools in Canada and the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) in order to discuss the impact of public memory in a process of reconciliation.

Patrizia Zanella's contribution, a case study of novelist Joseph Boyden, is a direct response to the controversies of cultural appropriation and (false) Indigenous identity that resulted in heated debates across Canada over the last few years.

In the last paper, Melanie Braith writes about relationality in Indigenous ontologies and focuses on what she calls "imaginative territorealization" in Richard Wagamese's novel *Keeper'n Me*.

We hope this volume will provide ample space for further discussions and allow readers to engage in and learn about a variety of themes, texts, and cultures, whose diversity testifies to the inevitably multicultural spirit of Canada and Canadian Studies— breaking barriers and building bridges towards the future.

Multiculturalism and its Interpretations through the Canadian Commission for UNESCO

Betsy Leimbigler (FU Berlin)

Canadian multiculturalism policy has been scrutinized, critiqued, compared to other countries, and held up as a model to follow for other nations worldwide by various politicians and experts. The intricacies of multiculturalism policy in Canada have much to do with the nation's historical and geographical specificities. Canada as a nation is not without its challenges, of course - this is understood throughout the paper. In an ever-evolving nation containing diverse societies, I am interested in better understanding how the concept of multiculturalism is interpreted today in Canada – and to explore the significant links between this policy and the programs that have been created and supported through UNESCO (United Nations Education, Science, and Culture Organization), and the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCU). In order to answer this question of how multiculturalism is interpreted, we must first unpack the notion of multiculturalism, understand its history in Canada, and then observe the parallels between the UNESCO Associated School's innovative curricula and the central tenets of multiculturalism policy. For the purposes of this research and to focus more on how multiculturalism is interpreted today in Canada, this article will try to answer these questions: What is a multiculturalism policy? How does CCU interpret multiculturalism, and what is its relationship to the concept of interculturalism? What does this look like in Canada today?

The theoretical concept of multiculturalism can be better understood when looking at its application through policy. This paper has two goals: first, it aims to explain the adoption of multiculturalism policy in Canada in 1971 and the trends towards interculturalism. Secondly, it aims to give an interpretation of what multiculturalism looks like today by looking through the lens of the UNESCO Associated Schools in Canada, which equip students with the UNESCO concepts of Global Citizenship Education (GCED) and Education for Sustainable Development (ESD). The term "multiculturalism" is not necessarily used to describe the activities and learning objectives of students in these schools. However, the aims of bridging cultures, learning to live together and learning

about indigenous histories, to name a few, are in line with what multiculturalism policy aims to achieve, and this represents a modern-day, 21st century interpretation of multiculturalism in Canada.

The concept of multiculturalism has played a central role in public discourse in Canada over decades, and the meaning of multiculturalism has shifted over the past few decades in Canada. This article highlights how the concept of multiculturalism is linked with concepts taught in UNESCO associated schools, which create inclusive school curriculums and represent the future of how we may interpret the notion of multiculturalism in Canada. In short, Canadian multiculturalism policy must be understood at both the theoretical and the policy level in order to make sense of it. We must unpack the concept of multiculturalism in Canada and understand how it came about; only then are we able to trace the development of the concept of interculturalism and differentiate this concept from that of "multiculturalism" – and better understand how the concept of "intercultural communication" is used at the forefront of discussions on diversity in Canada. The case study of the Winnipeg Schools Project, an interfaith learning initiative in grade 5 school children, demonstrates one of the ways in which multiculturalism policy has evolved from its origins of linguistic diversity, and encompasses deeper understandings of cultures and faiths. If we define multiculturalism as a policy that encourages mutual respect and equality among citizens, then certainly, these initiatives for youth are in line with multicultural life. A current interpretation of multiculturalism encompasses so much more than its earlier notion of just linguistic diversity, but rather encompasses an understanding of different cultures and faiths.

I posit that the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCU) has been an instrumental leader in supporting intercultural learning, and as such, we may argue that CCU is an important institutional contributor to upholding Canadian multiculturalism policy. I therefore show the relationship between these programs and the official multiculturalism policy, and the contextualization of multiculturalism in Canada - which includes a major focus on both indigenous heritage and culture, as well as a special focus on Quebec.

Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism does not have one set definition, as the concept can mean different things to different groups. In a broad sense, a multiculturalism policy is seen as one that has a focus on different ethnocultural groups. One way in which multiculturalism is described today includes the idea that it is a "form of public discourse in Canadian social life" (Connelly et al. 1). Multiculturalism cannot exist in a vacuum, and it is inextricably linked to political and economic emancipation (Banting et al.). Therefore, when we discuss multiculturalism, we are discussing "culture" and "identity" in conjunction with economic opportunities and political representation.

In Canada, multiculturalism is enshrined in the constitution and is an official policy. While the official statement by Pierre Elliott Trudeau on multiculturalism took place in 1971, official interest in multiculturalism policy in Canada began in the 1960s, in order to reconcile two linguistic groups: English and French Canadians (Yalden). However, in consulting with Canadians across the country, it was quickly seen that although there could be two official languages in Canada, there could be no "official culture", and thus multiculturalism policy was adopted. Decades later, the Bouchard-Taylor report on cultural and religious accommodation popularized the notion of "interculturalism" upon the report's release in 2008 (Tremblay). This report commented on the importance of cultural diversity in Quebec and Canada, and on how the key to an inclusive, collective identity was through this concept of "interculturalism", where cultural exchange between groups occurs. The difference between multiculturalism and interculturalism is highlighted in the following quotation: "What distinguishes them is the emphasis interculturalism places on the need to perpetuate the social bond and the symbolic references underlying it, as compared with multiculturalism that gives priority to the preservation and promotion of ethnocultural diversity" (Tremblay 4). The Bouchard-Taylor report explains "integrative pluralism" in Quebec; a notion of respecting diversity in a pluralistic, French-speaking culture (Bouchard 118). In creating this report, Bouchard and Taylor heard from people in Quebec expressing their sentiments about multiculturalism, and note that the majority of consultation participants supported

interculturalism and rejected the notion of multiculturalism, which was attributed to a lack of interest in continuing to focus on the "two founding cultures" of Canada.[1]

In Pierre Trudeau's declaration on October 8th 1971, he stated that "there are two official languages, there is no official culture" (Trudeau). In the Canadian context, when discussing multiculturalism policy, we generally are talking about how multiculturalism is written into the constitution and how the word also features in the charter of rights and freedoms. In more general terms, Banting et al. comment on multiculturalism policy as such: "Unfortunately, there is no consensus in the literature on how to define the term "multiculturalism policies" (51). However, they provide a new definition, highlighting that multiculturalism policy is a focus on ethnocultural groups, and that sometimes multiculturalism extends into a broader range of diversities such as sexual orientation, gender and disability.

It is indeed quite difficult to define multiculturalism, since it has been an evolving concept and it has many different interpretations based on which particular ethnic group is at the core of the discussion. Banting et al. recently wrote on the relationship between multiculturalism policies and the welfare state in response to criticisms of multiculturalism policies that may contribute to a possible erosion of the welfare state. To debunk this, they deconstruct the concept of multiculturalism into a historical overview that categorizes different ethnocultural groups into indigenous groups, immigrant groups, and national minorities. Banting et al. contend that is important to distinguish between these groups and provide a working definition to avoid blurring the lines as to what exactly a multiculturalism policy is.

Different approaches to multicultural policy depend upon the group in question. When it comes to indigenous peoples, a multicultural approach to indigeneity includes the following points: Affirmative action, recognition of land rights, recognition of self-

[1] Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Book IV: the cultural contribution of the other ethnic groups (1969). The commissioners state in their report that they view the term "race" as simply denoting a group of people. The report highlights the two founding "races" of Canada; the English and the French.

government, upholding historic treaties, guarantees of representation in government and recognition of cultural rights such as language, hunting and fishing (Banting et al. 61). There are several notably different points than a multicultural approach to a different group. For example, a multicultural approach to national minorities, such as the Quebecois in Canada, is necessarily different. This approach would include territorial autonomy, public funding of minority language universities and schools, and according international personality such as allowing the sub-state to sit on international boards, and official language status (Banting et al. 60). Finally, a multicultural approach to immigrants focuses on 'the adoption of multiculturalism in the school curriculum, funding ethnic cultural group activities, affirmative action and exemption from dress codes" (Banting et al. 56-57). Banting et al. therefore break down multiculturalism into these three groups. They reach the aforementioned conclusion that multiculturalism cannot exist in a vacuum, and is inextricably linked to political and economic emancipation. They also distinguish between multicultural policy and rhetoric/discourse. For example, multicultural rhetoric can be employed by politicians who wish to pass a certain bill in any given country, whereas in the case of Canada, multiculturalism policy is enshrined in the constitution and is an official policy.

One last definition of multiculturalism which relates to how we may interpret it in the 21st century is provided by Kymlicka in a 2012 report, where it is defined as "first and foremost about developing new models of democratic citizenship, grounded in human rights ideals, to replace earlier uncivil and undemocratic relations of hierarchy and exclusion" (Kymlicka, "Multiculturalism Success" 8). These new models of democratic citizenship draw strong parallels to the global citizenship education (GCED) taught to young children in UNESCO affiliated schools.

Interculturalism

Throughout the discussions on multiculturalism in this paper, I have so far focused on definitions, rather than on critiques. There exists a large amount of criticism of multiculturalism, many of which comes from European nations. Challenges have been

highlighted in response to fears of ethnic enclaves, the undermining the welfare state, and radicalization; thus associating the concept of multiculturalism with these issues. In the time during which the concept of multiculturalism began to become more politicized and contested, the Bouchard-Taylor report was released in 2008. This commission was tasked with interviewing Quebecers on reasonable accommodation for religion and culture, and discussed collective identity and cultural exchange at length: "An inclusive collective identity is both respectful of cultural diversity and built upon it. It grows out of cultural interaction and exchange" (Tremblay 6). The commission highlighted the concept of interculturalism, which was explained to be different from multiculturalism: "What distinguishes them is the emphasis interculturalism places on the need to perpetuate the social bond and the symbolic references underlying it, as compared with multiculturalism that gives priority to the preservation and promotion of ethnocultural diversity" (Tremblay 4).

Interculturalism focuses on the individual, while multiculturalism focuses on broader concepts. Multiculturalism can be concentrated into three things: it is a concept, it is the diverse societal makeup in Canada, and it is also a program. "On the one hand, we can ask about multiculturalism at the level of the state: what would it mean for the constitution, institutions and laws of the state to be multicultural? I will call this the question of the nature of the 'multicultural state'" (Kymlicka, "Multicultural States" 2). Thus, the state enacts a multiculturalism policy. What about the citizens of that nation? "On the other hand, we can ask about interculturalism at the level of the individual citizen: what sorts of knowledge, beliefs, virtues, habits and dispositions would an intercultural citizen possess? I will call this the question of the 'intercultural citizen'" (Kymlicka, "Multicultural States" 2).

Kymlicka sees this dynamic between multiculturalism and interculturalism as a self-reinforcing process, as intercultural citizens will work to reinforce multicultural policy. Operating under the assumption that multiculturalism can refer more to the abstract, state policy level, while citizens perform "intercultural" actions, this provides us with a framework through which to look at how the programs of the CCU equip young citizens for intercultural citizenship.

UNESCO-Associated Schools

As discussed in the previous section, the histories of the concepts of multiculturalism and interculturalism emerged from two different scenarios in Canadian history. Interculturalism generally encompasses a concept that is associated with a stronger emphasis on sharing and interacting between cultures, focused on the French-Canadian culture in which these interactions take place. Multiculturalism may be seen as more static with increasingly less focus, in the Canadian context, on the "Founding Cultures" in question – as described by the Official Languages Commission in 1969, seen to be a rather problematic construct in today's discourse. In the language of the UNESCO Associated schools, the concept of "intercultural" learning is used. Intercultural dialogue also encompasses interfaith dialogue, which is a crucial component of young people's education towards mutual respect and understanding of different beliefs and religions. I argue that to reconcile state, community and cultural divides, it is important for young people especially to turn to understanding multiculturalism and intercultural learning. I would like to focus specifically on UNESCO Associated Schools that teach global citizenship and education for sustainable development. The UNESCO-associated schools in Canada have at the core of their curricula to support UNESCO values: "international understanding, peace, intercultural dialogue, sustainable development and quality education in practice" (The UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network, 2016).

UNESCO was founded after the Second World War, with one of the major objectives to build peace in the minds of men (and women). UNESCO has different chapters throughout the world, or commissions, which link UNESCO's mandates and contextualize these to each nation. As such, the Canadian Commission for UNESCO focuses on education, culture and science in terms of indigenous learning, preservation of French language and culture, and education through eighty UNESCO associated schools.

> Founded in 1953, the UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network (ASPnet), commonly referred to as UNESCO Associated Schools, is a global network of 10,000 educational institutions in 181 countries. These schools work in support of international understanding, peace, intercultural dialogue, sustainable development and quality education in practice. (The UNESCO Associated Schools Project)

The ASP network in Canada serves to educate young Canadians on a wide range of social issues, which include UNESCO values, local and global issues, peace, sustainability and inclusive societies. It works to

> promote UNESCO values inside and outside school, and work to share them with others. The Network empowers learners to take on active roles locally and globally to resolve global challenges and contribute proactively to a more just, peaceful, inclusive, secure and sustainable world. (The UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network)

In Canada, the Associated Schools Network has 70 schools in seven provinces. Canadian schools that join the UNESCO Associated Schools Network make a commitment to support UNESCO's ideals through four pillars of learning and four themes of study. These four themes include: "Intercultural learning, Peace and human rights, Education for sustainable development and ASPnet and UN priorities" (UNESCO "Education").

ESD

Education for Sustainability Development (ESD) goes beyond education on climate change or the concept of sustainability confined to the natural sciences. "ESD aims at promoting teaching which respects indigenous and traditional knowledge and encourages the use of indigenous languages in education. Indigenous worldviews and perspectives on sustainability should be integrated into education programmes at all levels whenever relevant" (UNESCO, "Cultural Diversity"). Under this definition of ESD, there is a focus on local knowledges and languages. This is incorporated into the learning of students at UNESCO-associated schools, with the aim of instilling knowledge on the preservation of cultures. Cultural diversity exerts strong influence on ESD in that: "ESD requires intercultural understanding if people are to live together peacefully, tolerating and accepting differences amongst cultural and ethnic groups" (UNESCO, "Cultural Diversity").

ESD is therefore by no means limited to sustainability in terms of energy. The tenets of teaching ESD also include gender equality and peaceful societies. Thus, ESD is much more than education about climate change; rather, it encompasses all areas of education

that deal with sustainability. The focus on indigenous knowledge and preservation of culture is a strong link to the multiculturalism ideal of democratic governance and human rights ideals.

In terms of Global Citizenship Education (GCED), one of the latest developments by UNESCO's Associated Schools Network is a handbook on violent extremism for teachers on how to approach the topic. This handbook was developed through UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education initiative with the aim of focusing on classrooms and schools to combat violent extremism. This guidebook is meant to help teachers create inclusive classrooms that use respectful dialogue and critical thinking, "to promote a culture of peace, tolerance, intercultural and interreligious dialogue that involve youth and discourage their participation in acts of violence, terrorism, xenophobia, and all forms of discrimination" (UNESCO, "Teacher's Guide" 14).

UNESCO associated schools strive to integrate the concepts of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), as well as Global Citizenship Education (GCED) (ASPnet strategy 2014-2021). The idea behind this is for young students to learn how the world is interconnected, and to learn how small, local actions can have a wide-reaching impact. "ESD aims at promoting teaching which respects indigenous and traditional knowledge and encourages the use of indigenous languages in education. Indigenous worldviews and perspectives on sustainability should be integrated into education programmes at all levels whenever relevant" (Cultural Diversity, UNESCO, 2016). This is particularly relevant for Canada and many other nations, where many indigenous groups face higher rates of marginalization (Amnesty Canada, 2014). Along with this, Global Citizenship Education (GCED) equips students with critical thinking skills, and encourages teachers to also foster a classroom environment focusing on respectful dialogue and inclusion.

One of the models that has arisen from the UNESCO Associated Schools Project is the Winnipeg Schools Project, an initiative where fifth-grade children spend time visiting and learning about different faiths as part of the UNESCO affiliated schools program in Canada (Associated Schools Network in Canada). Teaching young children about the

diverse world in which they live is seen as key to building lasting connections and understanding between different groups.

These focuses on school curriculum are one way to move towards bridging cultural divides in Canada and attaining the multicultural ideal. With indigenous peoples in Canada still facing a much higher risk of marginalization than any other group, changing the discourse around indigeneity and teaching young children about respect and history is one of the most powerful ways in which communities can begin a process of reconciliation. Furthermore, having inclusive spaces for students to discuss their backgrounds and cultures is an essential component of reconciling state and community.

ESD and GCED are just a few examples of why looking at the global institution of UNESCO, at the Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCU) and this schools network is an excellent way to better understand the role that this organization plays in interpreting a Canadian constitutional policy. CCU focuses on intercultural dialogue, that being the link to multiculturalism policy. CCU has also remained relevant and in touch with schools and teachers, and can be seen as an organization that is at the forefront of the kinds of discussions that are important for understanding Canadian multicultural society.

The Canadian government has pledged to invest nearly CAD 1.9 billion (~USD 1.4 billion) in the nation's arts and culture budget over the next five years to promote Canadian creativity both at home and abroad (Canadian Budget Table 5.1). The Canada Council for the Arts, under which the Canadian Commission for UNESCO operates, will be on the receiving end of this funding increase and so it is expected that we see an increase in the number of programs supported by the Canadian Commission for UNESCO.

While the word "multiculturalism" may not be directly present, the concept of multiculturalism permeates the CCU's mission and it is through these programs that we see multiculturalism policy at work. At the same time, it is not possible to understand what multiculturalism engenders without fully understanding the history of multiculturalism policy in Canada and the notion of interculturalism. The goal of this article was to give a more clear understanding of the ways in multiculturalism can be

differentiated: we can differentiate which groups we are talking about when we discuss this in the Canadian context: indigenous groups, national minorities, and immigrant groups. We can differentiate what multiculturalism is: a theory of liberalism and how states can function, the reality of what we see in Canada when people's heritages are from many different countries, or tangible programs that seek to educate young people on becoming global citizens. In the case of CCU's programs and the concept of global citizenship education, the focus is put on intercultural communication and dialogue. This is a shift towards discourse and dialogue, including the program guidebook for teachers on how to prevent radicalization – just as one example. In short, one tangible way in which multiculturalism policy is interpreted in the 21st century in Canada involves how young children are taught about diversity, indigenous cultures and languages, local and global issues.

Multiculturalism policy can be effectively implemented through programs that actively engage with young people to raise their awareness not only of the world around them but also of the histories of indigenous groups – hence, the importance of Education for Sustainable Development. While the term "multiculturalism" doesn't come up as often through the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, the terms "intercultural dialogue" and "peacebuilding" are the ones that are used when it comes to CCU's interpretation of the broad concept of multiculturalism.

Research points to the younger generation of citizens to take up multicultural attitudes: "a child's racial attitudes can change but education must start early…early childhood programs are the perfect place to start multicultural education" (Ogletree & Larke 2). It is essential that continuing work on multiculturalism policy takes into account the impact – while difficult to measure objectively – that programs such as ESD and GCED have on young Canadians.

Conclusion

The main goal of this paper, first and foremost, was to bridge political concepts with policies and programs. By situating multiculturalism in a historical context, from its inception as a term used to describe linguistic differences, we can better see its evolution towards intercultural communication. The three goals that this article attempted to achieve include the following. First, giving an overview of multiculturalism in Canada, based off of the history of the inception of the policy. Second, in looking at the history of the policy and the development of interculturalism, we are better able to discern how this came about as a response to multiculturalism. Third, a modern-day interpretation connects the theoretical concept of a "multiculturalism policy" with the Canada Council for the Arts/Canadian Commission for UNESCO (CCU) and the programs it has supported, to give a tangible example of one of the ways in which we can see Canadian multiculturalism interpreted today.

Where there is a lack of multiculturalism, there is a correlation between national identity and xenophobia (Kymlicka "Multiculturalism Success"). Analyzing the role of UNESCO, and the Canadian Commission for UNESCO's (CCU) schools network, provides excellent insight to better understand the role that these organizations play in upholding a Canadian constitutional policy. These organizations play a strong role in educating young people in Canada and worldwide. This focus on intercultural and interfaith dialogue in schools represents a clear example of how young people's education is the key to bridging cultural divides. Of course, what has worked in the context of one nation does not mean that the exact model may be used in another, but it is noteworthy to observe the ways in which culture and multiculturalism are interpreted through the Canadian Commission for UNESCO with a focus on youth, interfaith dialogue, intercultural communication, and concepts like ESD and GCED. Thus, 21st century interpretations of multiculturalism in Canada go beyond merely existing as separate cultures, but rather focus on sharing and common ground between different cultures, with a strong focus on young peoples' education.

List of Works Cited

A Teacher's Guide on the Prevention of Violent Extremism. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France. 2016.

Amnesty International. "Violence against indigenous women and girls in Canada: A Summary of Amnesty International's Concerns and Call to Action". 2014. https://www.amnesty.ca/sites/amnesty/files/iwfa_submission_amnesty_international_february_2014_-_final.pdf Accessed 10 September 2016.

ASPnet Strategy 2014-2021. "Global Network of Schools addressing Global Challenges: Building Global Citizenship and promoting Sustainable Development". 2014. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002310/231049E.pdf Accessed 3 June 2016.

Associated Schools Network in Canada. (n.d.) In Canadian Commission for UNESCO. http://unesco.ca/home-accueil/aspnet-reseau%20new Accessed 3 June 2016.

Banting, Keith, and Will Kymlicka. "Introduction: Multiculturalism and the Welfare state: Setting the Context." *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*, edited by Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka,Oxford UP, 2009, pp. 1-45.

Banting, Keith, Johnston, Richard, Kymlicka, Will & Soroka, Stuart. "Do multiculturalism policies erode the welfare state? An Empirical Analysis." *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*, edited by Keith Banting and Will Kymlicka, Oxford UP, 2009, pp. 49-91.

Bouchard, Gérard and Charles Taylor. *Building the Future: A Time for Reconciliation. Report. La commission de consultation sur les pratiques d'accomodement reliees aux differences culturelles*. Government of Quebec. 2008.

Canadian Budget. Chapter 5: An Inclusive and Fair Canada. Table 5.1: New Investments in Canadian Arts and Culture millions of dollars (cash). 2017.

Canadian Commission for UNESCO. Report on Activities, 2014-15. http://unesco.ca/home-accueil Accessed 3 June 2016.

Canadian Multiculturalism: An Inclusive Citizenship. In Government of Canada, 2012. http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/citizenship.asp Accessed 3 June 2016.

Cultural Diversity. In UNESCO, Education, 2016. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-sustainable-development/cultural-diversity/ Accessed 3 March 2017.

The UNESCO Associated Schools Project. In UNESCO, Education, 2016. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/networks/global-networks/aspnet. Accessed 3 June 2016.

Tremblay, Luc. The Bouchard-Taylor Report on Cultural and Religious Accommodation: Multiculturalism by Any Other Name? European University Institute, LAW working papers. Series/Report no.: EUI LAW; 2009/18.

Yalden, Maxwell. "Multiculturalism-An Anniversary Celebration." *Canadian Ethnic Studies Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 2011): 5-15.

Connelly, Michael, JoAnn Phillion and Ming Fang. "An Exploration of Narrative Inquiry into Multiculturalism in Education: Reflecting on Two Decades of Research in an Inner-City Canadian Community School." *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol. 33, no. 4 (Winter, 2003), pp. 363-84.

Kymlicka, Will. "Multicultural states and intercultural citizens: Theory and Research in Education." *Sage*, vol. 1, no. 2 (2003): 147-69.

---. *Multiculturalism: success, failure and the future*. Migration Policy Institute Europe. Translatlantic Council on Migration. 2012.

Ogletree, Quinita and Patricia Larke. "Implementing Multicultural Practices in Early Childhood Education." *National Forum of Multicultural Issues*, vol. 7, no. 1 (2010).

Trudeau, Pierre. Speech delivered on October 8, 1971, to the House of Commons, Ottawa, Canada. 1971.

UNESCO. Cultural Diversity. http://en.unesco.org/themes/education-sustainable-development/cultural-diversity Accessed 10 June 2016.

UNESCO. Education. ASPnet and UN Priorities. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/networks/global-networks/aspnet/study-areas/aspnet-and-un-priorities/ Accessed 3 March 2017.

« Le chiac, c'est comme le plus beau French kiss de langues » : une analyse des débats des internautes sur Facebook

Annika Groth (University of Siegen)

1. Introduction

> [Le chiac], c'est comme le plus beau french kiss de langues qu'il m'ait été donné de rencontrer (I25, 30 Juillet 2013).

Le français québécois a souvent été au centre des recherches sur les variétés diatopiques du français au Canada. Mais le Québec n'y est pas la seule région francophone : outre l'anglais, on parle encore aujourd'hui dans les provinces maritimes de l'ancienne Acadie le français acadien. La région est marquée de l'emprunte coloniale de l'Angleterre et de la France. Elle en garde en héritage les langues anglaise et française et leurs variations (*cf.* Boudreau et Perrot 57), dont le français acadien, qui a survécu jusqu'à aujourd'hui. C'est principalement à la région du Nouveau-Brunswick que nous nous intéressons. Nous y observons en effet un exemple remarquable de ces influences langagières mutuelles entre l'anglais et le français : le *chiac*, variété[2] parlée au Sud-Est de la région. Le chiac présente un développement sociolinguistique étonnant, avant tout dans les médias (*cf.* Cormier 24). Ainsi, ce ne sont pas seulement les chercheurs qui s'intéressent au phénomène du chiac, mais aussi les non-linguistes. Parmi ceux-ci, certains considèrent le chiac comme marqueur d'identité, quitte à lui donner le titre de « plus beau french kiss de langues » (I25, 30. Juillet 2013) ; alors que d'autres y voient davantage une menace pour le français acadien. Dans ce qui suit, nous analyserons certaines réflexions de non-experts ayant été diffusées dans un groupe Facebook pour savoir comment ces derniers définissent et qualifient le chiac, quel statut ils lui donnent, quel est son rôle identitaire et quelles sont les problématiques provenant de la confrontation entre le chiac et les deux pôles normatifs du français et de l'anglais.

[2] Il y a des difficultés qui se posent par la notion d'une ‚variété'. Nous parlons ici des variétés diatopiques, terme qui désigne toute variation régionale d'une langue. Sur les questions approfondies, *cf*. Gadet 2009.

1.1 La situation sociolinguistique du Nouveau-Brunswick et de Moncton

Le Nouveau-Brunswick, seule province officiellement bilingue du Canada depuis 1969 (*cf.* Boudreau et Dubois, *Mondialisation* 71), comprend aussi bien des régions majoritairement francophones ou anglophones que des régions où habitent des locuteurs des deux langues. Toutefois, l'anglais, parlé par 64,9% de la population du Nouveau-Brunswick, reste la langue dominante dans cette province (*cf.* Statistique Canada). La région du Grand-Moncton, l'une des régions dites 'mixtes' située au Sud-Est du Nouveau-Brunswick, a longtemps été présentée comme un « modèle de bilinguisme harmonieux » (*cf.* Cormier 16), alors que les locuteurs du français se sont linguistiquement adaptés à la majorité anglophone. Ce faisant, ils ont abandonné l'usage de leur langue dans quelques domaines de la vie quotidienne (*ibid.*). Ainsi, nous pourrions également parler d'une situation de diglossie[3] typique étant donné qu'elle « est souvent dissimulée, dans le discours dominant, sous le masque du bilinguisme » (*cf.* Daoust et Maurais 19). C'est dans ces régions hétérogènes que l'on trouve, en plus de l'anglais et du français, la présence de variétés comme le chiac.

1.2 Le chiac entre français et anglais

Le chiac est généralement présenté comme un parler « franglais » ou « anglais-français » (*cf.* Perrot, *Aspects fondamentaux*). Néanmoins, il a été défini par certains linguistes comme étant « le vernaculaire de la ville de Moncton[4] » (King 137, traduction A.G.), se caractérisant par des emprunts à l'anglais ainsi que par des archaïsmes et des régionalismes du français acadien. L'étymologie du terme chiac n'est pas claire. L'explication la plus courante, souvent relayée dans le savoir populaire, propose que ce terme serait dérivé de celui de la ville de Shédiac, une commune située à une vingtaine de

[3] La définition de diglossie selon Fishman (1967) peut être vue comme un élargissement de la théorie de Ferguson (1959), qui la caractérise comme un état dans lequel deux variétés coexistent sur un territoire et qui ont des fonctions distinctes : l'une est vue comme supérieure, alors que l'autre occupe une fonction sociale inférieure. Fishman ajoute que la diglossie peut également exister entre plus de deux codes et que ces derniers peuvent appartenir à différentes familles linguistiques (Fishman 29*sqq*.).

[4] « Variety of Acadian French spoken in the urban area of Moncton ».

kilomètres de Moncton (*cf.* Péronnet, *Substrat gallo-roman* 6, Cormier 22). C'est à travers ce contact intense entre le français acadien et l'anglais que s'est formé le chiac. Il est particulièrement victime à Moncton de l'influence de deux phénomènes l'affaiblissant. D'un côté, l'anglais devient de plus en plus important, présent et accessible, ce qui provoque une anglicisation du français. De l'autre, l'on peut observer une standardisation du français dans les médias, les institutions et les échanges formels ; orientation certaine que l'on retrouve partout dans le monde à cause du prestige que l'on attribue aux langues standardisées (*cf.* Péronnet, *Changement linguistique* 53). Ces tendances peuvent très bien être déduites dans les débats des non-linguistes sur Internet parce qu'ils sont d'actualité et représentent les attitudes des internautes et ainsi, ils sont aptes à être objet de notre analyse.

2. Méthodologie

Cormier (173) a pu constater que le discours des internautes dans le forum *Acadie Urbaine* fait preuve d'un nombre élevé de positions (parfois) contraires aux réflexions scientifiques. Notre analyse s'inscrit dans les recherches sociolinguistiques de Cormier et cherche à repérer, puis à analyser les nouvelles réflexions des non-experts au sujet du chiac, et ce en soumettant à notre étude un corpus de contributions tirées du groupe Facebook *L'incubateur de l'esprit critique acadien.* Ces contributions ont été sélectionnées à l'aide de la fonction de recherche dans le groupe mentionné. Les termes de recherche ont été *chiac*, mais aussi les orthographes plutôt inhabituelles *shiak* et *chiaque.* Ainsi, toutes les contributions traitant du chiac ayant été publiées entre 2012, année de la fondation du groupe, et 2015 font partie de notre corpus. Les noms des internautes ont été anonymisés de manière à ce que chaque internaute soit désigné par un chiffre, tandis qu'une lettre indique la discussion dont nous avons tiré la contribution. Les fautes de langue n'ont pas été corrigées afin de conserver l'expressivité de certaines contributions.

Les différents commentaires ont été regroupés selon les sujets suivants : définition, désignation, statut et rôle identitaire du chiac, relation à l'anglais et au français.

2.1 Définition du chiac

La région du Grand Moncton est considérée par les internautes comme étant majoritairement anglophone, bien qu'elle soit le centre de la francophonie du Nouveau-Brunswick (*cf.* Dubois 140) :

> **D4** (30. Avril 2014) : [...] Dans la région de Moncton il n'existe qu'une poignée de gens […] qui comprennent assez bien le français pour écouter la TV ou bien un film en français. Si tu penses que j'exagère alors demande à n'importe quel natif de la région si il comprend une émission en français à la TV.

Les internautes reconnaissent le chiac comme phénomène linguistique dans la région de Moncton et témoignent des divergences avec le français de France ainsi que de la difficulté pour les locuteurs du chiac d'utiliser ce français de référence :

> **I6** (28. Juillet 2013) : [...] C'est pourquoi tout francophone „non-chiacophile" qui envisage de venir s'établir à Moncton, devrait être mis au courant : le chiac est une réalité de tous les jours. Continuer à éduquer ses enfants en français ‚standard', lorsque l'on vit dans la région, demande beaucoup, beaucoup de travail.

Nous pourrions alors parler ici de *prestige latent*[5] du chiac en ce sens que l'utilisation du parler de Moncton est un choix lié à la valeur d'identité et à la culture populaire de la région. Les non-linguistes remarquent également qu'il y a des variétés du chiac dépendant du quartier de Moncton:

> **I8** (30. Juillet 2013) : Le chiac est en partie régional - il y a des variantes de chiac, entre Moncton et Shédiac par exemple - mais surtout il est parlé par les jeunes un peu partout dans l'Acadie des Maritimes, et il correspond surtout à un moyen de communication populaire et familier [...]. Et le chiac évolue et change, comme toute langue.

[5] Le terme prestige latent (*covert prestige*) s'inscrit dans la théorie de Labov (1963) qui distingue entre le prestige apparent (*overt prestige*), les caractéristiques linguistiques des classes sociales dominantes auxquelles on associe le statut, le succès etc., et le prestige latent, portant d'autres valeurs comme la solidarité, l'intimité etc., et qui est attaché aux groupes sociaux dominés (*cf*. Trudgill).

> **F21** (26. Mars 2014) : Région de Cap-Pelé (mon enfance) : If que j'allais à Shediac à la place.... . J'ai peu comprendre dans le temps que l'influence venait de la région anglophone de Port Elgin [...].

I8 voit dans le chiac une langue actuellement parlée par les jeunes[6] et ainsi un langage populaire. Mais il y a d'autres membres du groupe qui constatent qu'ils ont déjà parlé le chiac dans les années 1960 :

> **M5** (27. Août 2013) ; j'étudiais au collège st-Jospeh à Memramcook en 64 pis le monde parlait chiac.

Le chiac pourrait alors ne pas être un phénomène seulement propre aux jeunes d'aujourd'hui, même si quelques non-linguistes sont d'avis que ce franglais est typique des jeunes grandissant dans une société mondialisée avec une importance croissante de l'anglais dans tous les domaines de la vie quotidienne. En outre, les internautes ont déjà entendu le chiac dans des institutions officielles de Moncton et non pas seulement comme moyen de communication populaire, comme I8 le définit. Cependant, il semble être lié à un groupe social en particulier :

> **M4** (28. Août 2013) : Le chiac c'est spécial et j'ai l'impression que c'est peut-être aussi le langage d'une certaine classe de gens […].

Ici, les chiacophones sont considérés comme un groupe à part entière et l'on reconnait déjà sa valeur identitaire, ce que nous analyserons dans ce qui suit.

I8 évoque aussi le changement et l'évolution du chiac. Il semble surtout que la part de l'anglais y varie. Les non-experts discutent alors aussi de la structure du parler. Les emprunts à l'anglais font dire aux internautes que le chiac pourrait être une langue mixte, voire une variété de l'anglais :

[6] Selon Lamizet (97), il n'existe pas de parler jeunes, car « ce n'est pas par le langage que les jeunes se définissent et reconnaissent, mais bien par leur situation par rapport aux autres générations. ». Young (43*sq*), par contre, constate que le chiac est principalement parlé par des adolescents qui se trouvent dans une phase de leur vie durant laquelle ils développent une volonté de se détacher de la dépendanace de leurs parents et que cette démarcation se réalise également par la langue. En outre, ces adolescents de Moncton sont confrontés à plusieurs variétés langagières au quotidien, ce qui favorise l'utilisation du chiac, qui peut être vu comme une fusion du français acadien, du français standard et de l'anglais. Ce phénomène peut être comparé aux parlers jeunes des banlieues parisiennes, qui sont également perçus comme sociolectes marquant consciemment la différence avec les autres variétés existantes et ainsi qu'avec les autres groupes sociaux (*cf*. Zouhour Messili et Hmaid Ben Aziza 2).

> **I5** (28. Juillet 2013) : [...] je dois apprendrre le chiac. Pas facile d'apprendre à parler deux langues en même temps !
>
> **N48** (27. Septembre 2012) : [...] Est-ce vraiment du chiac quand c'est environ 95% des mots de la phrase qui est en anglais ?

La question de N48 provoque une vraie discussion sur la morphosyntaxe du chiac. Certains membres du groupe se réfèrent aux linguistes (*cf.* Boudreau et Perrot 67*sq.*) et disent qu'il s'agit d'une syntaxe française avec des emprunts à l'anglais, d'autres sont convaincus que la base du chiac est l'anglais :

> **I5** (4. Août 2013) : [...] Le chiac est un français truffé de mots anglais et d'anglicismes énoncés dans une syntaxe anglaise. Et c'est pour ça que le chiac illustre un certain degré d'assimilation.

L'on s'aperçoit aussi que la définition du chiac donnée par un même auteur peut changer d'un message à l'autre. I5 a d'abord défini le chiac comme « deux langues en même temps », puis il le caractérise comme un français ayant des emprunts lexicaux et syntaxiques à l'anglais (*cf.* Roy 74). B1 explique qu'il y a une différence entre la réalité linguistique et l'illusion de parler français :

> **B1** (14. Mai 2014) : [...] la syntaxe calquée sur la structure anglaise est très courante et plus difficile à rectifier puisqu'on a l'impression de parler français [...].

Ce commentaire montre que les locuteurs du chiac ont souvent l'impression de parler français tandis que leur manière de parler inclut en réalité un grand nombre d'éléments faisant partie de l'anglais. Boudreau et Dubois (*cf. j'ai ma own p'tite langue*, 153*sqq*), par contre, ont relevé que les locuteurs du chiac croient leur chiac plus anglicisé qu'il ne l'est effectivement. Les non-linguistes constatent que la part d'anglais peut varier selon la personne et le contexte :

> **N4** (27. Septembre 2012) : C'est tout un choc culturel lorsqu'on arrive de la péninsule que d'être exposé au chiac mais on s'y habitue. J'ai l'impression que la quantité d'anglais dans le chiac peut varier de 50% à 95% tout dépendant de la phrase et de la personne.

Ces commentaires renvoient prioritairement à la fusion de l'anglais et du français. Mais les membres du groupe ont tous des difficultés à définir le chiac comme franglais ou à le mettre sur le même pied que d'autres variétés, comme celles du Québec :

M41 (27. Août 2013) : [...] Dans ce contexte, j'ai de la difficulté à associer la simple utilisation du franglais au Chiac. Il me semble qu'il y a une couleur autre en ce qui concerne le Chiac [...].

Selon les internautes, ce sont surtout des archaïsmes qui le distinguent d'un simple franglais :

> **L45** (7. Novembre 2012) : [...] Ce qui est beau avec le chiac acadien c'est qu'il y a aussi des beaux vieux mots français (qui eux ont souvent été perdus au Québec) [...].

La fonction des archaïsmes est très rarement indiquée lorsque les internautes essayent de définir le chiac. Ce sont plutôt des tentatives de classification du chiac entre le pôle anglais et le pôle français qui déclenchent des discussions entre les non-experts. L'on peut remarquer ici que quelques internautes partagent les mêmes arguments que l'on trouve également dans des travaux scientifiques et, parfois, ils renvoient aussi aux experts, tandis que d'autres argumentent plutôt de façon intuitive. Quelques membres du groupe utilisent aussi une terminologie linguistique pour feindre des connaissances fondamentales du chiac. Il n'y a malgré tout pas de consensus sur la définition du chiac. Nous pouvons pourtant constater qu'il est perçu de différentes manières, ce qui peut aussi être dû à l'influence des médias où existent des positions contraires concernant le chiac : parfois il est vu comme héritage culturel, parfois comme menace pour le français. Ce dernier commentaire résume bien les différentes conceptions des non-experts, mais aussi des linguistes (*cf.* Cormier 19) :

> **N48** (27. Septembre 2012) : […]. [C]e n'est pas d'avoir une réponse ou un résultat concret qui est important... On est pas obligé d'avoir un consensus sur le sujet. On discute simplement du moyen de communication utilisé : "Qu'est-ce qu'est le chiac?" Je vois que l'opinion qu'on s'en fait diffère vraiment d'une personne à l'autre. C'est correct comme ça.

Dans ce contexte, il est aussi intéressant de savoir quel statut les internautes donnent au chiac et comment ils le désignent.

2.2 Désignation

Dans le groupe, le chiac est désigné comme tel la plupart du temps. Cormier (83) a pu constater que le terme franglais est rarement utilisé pour désigner ce parler ; dans le groupe, nous le remarquons seulement lorsque les non-experts apportent une définition linguistique du chiac. En plus du substantif, ils utilisent le terme chiac comme adjectif :

> **I8** (31. Juillet 2013) : De toute façon, certains Français peuvent bien nous faire chier avec le chiac, quand on entend le franglais utilisé dans des émissions comme télématin, le verlan et les langues tronquées utilisées en France pour des SMS, le nombre de mots d'anglais qui émaille le français de France actuel, on se demande qui sont les plus chiacqueux...[7]

> **I14** (30. Juillet 2013) : [...] Actuellement en acadie, d'après ce que j'ai compris, à force de dévaloriser le chiac, les chiacophones se tournent vers la langue dominante... l'anglais. C'est le même processus qu'en France il y a 130 ans. Que faire alors? Valoriser le chiac ou non?

Ainsi, le terme n'est pas seulement utilisé en tant que substantif, les dérivés chiacqueux et chiacophones désignant aussi ses locuteurs. Le chiac étant aujourd'hui fréquemment utilisé et diffusé dans les médias locaux, Moncton devient célèbre pour en être le centre, tant et si bien qu'elle est parfois désignée dans le langage familier comme 'la ville du chiac' :

> **M41** (29. Août 2013) : Oui, les osties et les tabernaks du nord ne sont pas utilisés dans la chiacatown.

Finalement, nous constatons que le terme chiac est connu non seulement à Moncton, mais aussi dans d'autres provinces et pays. Il est utilisé par les internautes pour englober une langue protéiforme et pour la différencier du joual[8], par exemple, mais aussi pour désigner une certaine communauté et pour caractériser son histoire et son identité.

[7] En France, nous trouvons également beaucoup d'anglicismes lexicaux, qui sont plus visibles que les anglicismes sémantiques – très courants au Canada (*cf.* Pöll *Francophonies périphériques*, 128). Ainsi, ce sont surtout des anglicismes du 1er type qui expliquent la perception des « langues tronquées en France » de l'internaute I8. Les Québécois, par contre, prennent conscience de l'anglicisation du français et y interviennent tandis qu'ils observent « la réaction relativement passive » (Pöll *Francophonie périphériques*, 111) de la France face aux anglicismes, ce qui est perçu négativement. L'on peut donc transférer cette attitude également à l'égard des locuteurs du chiac et à leur grande part d'emprunts lexicaux à l'anglais.

[8] Le terme 'joual' désigne la variété québécoise du français apparue à la suite de l'urbanisation et de l'industrialisation qui se caractérise, donc, par le grand nombre d'emprunts à l'anglais. L'étymon du mot ‚joual' est la prononciation dialectale de cheval (*cf.* Pöll *Francophonie périphériques,* 112).

Souvent, le terme est employé pour éviter de devoir utiliser une terminologie linguistique qui donnerait un certain statut au chiac, soit une langue, un dialecte ou un patois9. En outre, en le nommant, ses locuteurs légitiment « une réalité linguistique occultée » (Canut 2). Dans ce qui suit, nous verrons quel statut préfèrent les internautes.

2.3 Le statut du chiac

Les membres du groupe sont conscients du statut indéfinissable du chiac et de la certaine liberté que chacun peut avoir de le définir comme il le souhaite. Alors que l'on a longtemps assisté à une stigmatisation du chiac dans les médias, on peut aujourd'hui observer une revalorisation de ce parler dans un secteur culturel qui met en exergue son caractère exceptionnel de fusion linguistique locale. Dès lors, son prestige latent allant croissant, il semble plus aisé de comprendre l'appropriation du chiac au niveau individuel et la constitution d'opinions qui ont valeur de définitions à la fois personnelles et collectives du statut du chiac.

Les non-linguistes disent également que le bilinguisme du Nouveau-Brunswick empêche l'attribution d'un véritable statut au chiac. Ils comparent cette situation à celle du Québec où le joual est traité comme « variété populaire du français canadien » (Pöll, *Francophonie périphérique* 114). Au Nouveau-Brunswick et surtout à Moncton, la situation sociolinguistique est différente : le français reste une langue minoritaire[10] et il est ainsi difficile pour les internautes de définir le chiac comme une variété du français en ignorant le rôle qu'y joue l'anglais :

> **K15** (14. Août 2013) : […] Il n'y pas vraiment d'évolution "positive" […]. Le chiac depuis les années 60-70 demeure quelque chose qui nuit au "bon français" ! J'utilise bien le terme "quelque chose" car en effet, le chiac n'est même pas défini... Certains en parle comme une

[9] *cf.* chapitre 3.3

[10] Au Québec, le français est la seule langue officielle de la province depuis 1977 (Loi 101) (*cf.* Pöll, *Francophonie périphérique* 109) tandis qu'au Nouveau-Brunswick, le français est parlé par seulement un tiers de la population, mais il jouit des mêmes droits que l'anglais (Loi 88)) (*cf. ibid.*134). Malgré tout, il s'agit d'une situation de minorité qui provoque une certaine insécurité linguistique des locuteurs quant au choix de la langue (*cf.* Péronnet, *Substrat gallo-roman* 102).

> langue, d'autres comme un dialecte, d'autres encore comme une "sous-langue" ... L'utilisation de ces termes encore aujourd'hui prouve bien une réticence, un refus de légitimer le nom […]. Contrairement au joual qui lui a bel et bien été défini comme une VARIETE du français ! […].
>
> **M41** (26. Août 2013) : […] le chiac (le 'franglo' ou 'franglais') est le résultat des politiques du bilinguisme […].

M41 renvoie explicitement au fait que le chiac a pu naître seulement dans le cadre de la politique linguistique du Nouveau-Brunswick, de sorte que l'on ne puisse pas lui donner un véritable statut. Au Nouveau-Brunswick, le français jouit des mêmes droits que l'anglais, mais effectivement, il s'agit de la langue dominée qui est fortement influencée par la langue dominante, l'anglais, qui, par contre, n'emprunte pas au français.

A l'égard de cet avis, il y a des internautes qui définissent le chiac comme une 'langue[11]', mais ce sont presque tous ceux qui sont également 'chiacophones'. Ils le définissent comme 'langue' parce que le chiac est soit leur langue socio-maternelle, soit la deuxième ou troisième langue qu'ils ont apprise. Selon eux, le fait que l'on puisse l'apprendre donne au chiac le statut d'une vraie langue :

> **I4** (31. Juillet 2013) : Oui je suis trinlingue (anglais, français et chiac) et j'aimerais aussi apprendre l'espagnol.
>
> **I37** (5. Août 2013) : [...] j'ai appris l'anglais à cinq ans et je le parle comme ma langue maternelle. j'ai appris le chiac après et je peux le parler comme ma langue maternelle itou.
>
> **N4** (27. Septembre 2012) : [...] Je ne prétend pas maîtriser le chiac à 100% mais je pense que je l'ai pas pire pareil. Je me considère donc trilingue puisque je donne au chiac le statut d'une langue au même titre que l'anglais ou le français.
>
> **L13** (7. Novembre 2012) : […] On a tous les outils en main pour aspirer à garder notre fierté de langue maternelle (ici, le chiac), avec une connaissance et une possibilité de pouvoir s'exprimer en français universel lorsque la situation le demande.

[11] La définition d'une 'langue' est encore et toujours discutée par des linguistes, mais nous pouvons plus ou moins associer au concept de 'langue' la façon de parler d'une certaine communauté, pendant un certain temps dans une zone géographique spécifique (*cf.* Glück et Rödel 637).

Dès qu'une langue est maîtrisable, les non-experts lui attribuent le statut officiel d'une langue. Pour mettre en évidence sa position, I4 change sa langue en chiac et l'utilise de façon écrite :

> **I4** (5. Août 2013) : Moi j'ai pas grandi en chiac but quand chu arrivé a Moncton 39 ans passé j'ai right vu que d'la way que j'parlais (le français de Nord) j'me f'rais pas comprendre de parsounne because qu'a Moncton y'avait inque dé chiac pi dé anglais ! So holy shit j'ai commencé a apprendre deux langues en même temps pi believe it ort not but dans no time (well tcheuques années là) je les avait de masteré toutes les deux pretty good. At least j'me faisais comprendre quansse que j'allais tchèke part pi que j'parlais a du monde.

Les membres du groupe qui ne sont pas chiacophones ne sont pas unanimes sur le statut du chiac et discutent plutôt pour savoir s'il s'agit d'un patois[12] d'un français de qualité inférieure, d'un dialecte[13] ou d'un argot[14]. Le dernier commentaire résume alors très bien le problème du statut du chiac :

> **N49** (27. Septembre 2012) : Langue ? Patois ? Argot ? Je m'y perds.

Seuls les locuteurs du chiac affirment qu'il s'agit d'une langue. Même les linguistes ne parviennent pas à un consensus concernant le chiac. Tandis qu'Arrighi (2014) le définit comme variété, Poirier (1994) utilise la désignation de langue parlée pour renvoyer au chiac. Roy (1979) préfère l'expression le français de Moncton alors que d'autres études plus récentes le définissent comme contact language 15(cf. Young 2002) ou code *hybride*[16] *français/anglais* (*cf.* Thibault 2011). Souvent, l'on évite également la

[12] A l'origine, le terme *patois* désignait les différentes variétés régionales du français, mais dès le départ et encore aujourd'hui, nous pouvons également remarquer que le terme est utilisé de façon péjorative pour désigner des variétés socialement stigmatisées (*cf.* Glück et Rödel 501).

[13] Une langue n'est jamais homogène. Il y a des variétés d'une langue p. ex. au niveau social (sociolecte), mais aussi régional ou bien aréal (la portée communicative) dont le dialecte fait partie comme variété la plus éloignée du standard (*cf.* Glück et Rödel 144*sq*).

[14] Selon Glück et Rödel, le terme *argot* peut être défini comme un sociolecte propre à certains groupes sociaux (*cf.* Glück et Rödel 55).

[15] Thomason définit le terme comme suit: « a contact language is any new language that arises in a contact situation. Linguistically, a contact language is identifiable by the fact that its lexicon and grammatical structure cannot all be tracked back to the same source language […]. Contact languages are not member of any language family […] » (Thomason 158).

[16] Parlant d'un code hybride, Thibault explique qu' « […] il peut parfois arriver que, dans une communauté de locuteurs presque tous bilingues, un nouveau type de discours apparaisse, qui combine dans un même énoncé des éléments (morphèmes et lexèmes) de chacune des deux langues, selon certaines règles (implicites) et sans qu'il soit toujours possible de dire à quelle langue appartient l'énoncé. […] Les

terminologie linguistique et utilise seulement le nom *chiac* (*cf.* Cormier 2010, King 2008, Perrot 2014). Pour les locuteurs du chiac, dont la plupart le définissent comme langue, il a alors aussi une grande valeur identitaire, ce que nous verrons dans les prochaines contributions des internautes sur Facebook.

2.4 La question de l'identité

Les non-linguistes constatent que l'utilisation de cette parler a une grande valeur émotive et culturelle tout en leur conférant une identité qui leur permet de se démarquer du monde francophone et anglophone :

> **I8** (30. Juillet 2013) : Le chiac n'est pas seulement la façon de parler, c'est une reconnaissance d'identité à travers la façon de parler.

I8 ajoute que le français suffirait au quotidien pour se faire comprendre dans la famille ou dans le monde de travail. Mais pour ne pas être aperçu comme étranger, il faut parler le chiac à Moncton. Ce parler est maintenant vu comme l'un des vecteurs de l'identité acadienne et jouit d'un fort attachement émotionnel de la part des internautes. Nous pouvons alors dire que le prestige latent est attribué au chiac, car il n'est pas nécessaire pour pouvoir se comprendre, pour communiquer, mais pour appartenir à une communauté dans laquelle les valeurs et les idées sont véhiculées par la même langue. La langue, ici le chiac, est donc médiatrice entre les citoyens. Les locuteurs du chiac ont pourtant dû aux origines cacher leur langue pendant une vingtaine d'années parce qu'elle était stigmatisée dans les médias (*cf.* Boudreau et Perrot 70). Ils étaient alors convaincus de parler mal et avaient honte de leur manière de parler. Ils ressentaient donc une insécurité linguistique[17] par rapport à leur langue, comme l'explique J11. :

---

locuteurs qui pratiquent ce type de comportement linguistique peuvent en arriver à perdre la possibilité de s'exprimer exclusivement dans l'une des deux langues. […] ; ils finissent par parler toujours de cette façon, et transmettent cette façon de parler à leurs enfants, qui la reçoivent comme leur langue maternelle » (Thibault 40).

[17] Le concept de l'*insécurité linguistique* provient de la sociolinguistique américaine (*cf.* Labov 1966) : « L'insécurité linguistique correspond à la conscience qu'il existe une norme exogène, que l'on associe à

> **J11** (27. Octobre 2013) : [...] Il me semble que les locuteurs du chiac premières mouture manifestaient surtout de la honte et de la gène par rapport à leur parler, tandis qu'à la fin des années 1990, les locuteurs du chiac mouture 2000+ ont été les premiers à affirmer une fierté de leur parlure. Cette fierté,. je la salue. Je l'explique à la fois par le dynamisme d'une population qui s'affirme enfin et par une instrumentalisation par une certaine petite bourgeoisie du Sud-Est qui se sent envahie par ces migrants francophones venus d'ailleurs. Après avoir méprisé le chiac première mouture pendant des générations, cette petite bourgeoisie veut maintenant se servir du chiac (devenu franglais) pour bloquer la parole aux francophones venus d'ailleurs, et surtout du Nord... et aux Québécois, évidemment. L'affirmation du chiac ou des Chiacs me ravit. Son instrumentalisation, me désole.

Aujourd'hui, le chiac n'a plus seulement cette fonction identitaire. J11 remarque que les gens ont commencé à l'instrumentaliser. Moncton, étant le centre francophone de l'Acadie, est une région qui attire aussi des francophones d'autres pays. La société chiacophone se sent menacée, car les nouveaux venus parlent un autre français et, pour communiquer en Acadie, se servent du français standard. Les gens parlant chiac ont peur que leur langue soit oubliée et craignent ainsi une perte d'identité. Ce faisant, ils l'instrumentalisent. Pour maintenir leur langue, ils s'en servent parfois à l'écrit , et ce surtout lorsque le statut et le rôle identitaire du chiac sont discutés. Ainsi, ils renforcent leur conviction :

> **I4** (5. Août 2013) : [...] j'aime cosse tu dis even tho que j'aime pas tout l'temps d'la way que tu l'dis. Moi j'pense que la best way de valoriser le chiac pi surtout d'aider a monter la fierté de ceuze pour qui cé leur seule langue cé de parler pi de l'écriere. Too bad pour ceuze qui l'comprennent pas. Yavons inque a l'apprendre cé toute. Right? [...]

Les membres du groupe qui ne sont pas chiacophones et qui vivent hors de l'Acadie ne comprennent pas cette tentative de démarcation et revendiquent la solidarité francophone en Acadie :

> **E12** (5. Mai 2014) : […] En tant que francophones, pourquoi se tiraillaient au lieu de s'unir et de tirer dans la même direction afin de maintenir cette langue qui nous défini si bien et qui fait de nous un peuple. Il faut avoir connu ce statut de minoritaires pour bien comprendre la fragilité et les enjeux en cours.

---

une région extérieure, qui serait supérieure par rapport à la variété linguistique en usage dans sa propre région. » (Gérin-Lajoie et Labrie 87).

Les locuteurs du chiac répliquent que la langue d'origine, le français, ne peut pas être vue comme langue identitaire. Ils mettent en valeur les efforts qu'il a fallu pour conférer du prestige au chiac :

> **E8** (4. Mai 2014) : Je constate [...] que vous êtes typique des Acadiens vivant au Québec, qui n'ont pas vécu nos batailles depuis 40 ans et n'ont aucune idée concrète des situations que nous vivons. Et cela n'a rien à voir avec l'origine de qui que ce soit. Vos propos sont franchement....racistes. Les jeunes générations fonctionnent heureusement d'une autre façon, parce que l'avenir de l'Acadie réside bien dans le métissage francophone, pas dans le repli frileux sur de vieux mythes.

Les locuteurs du chiac essayent alors de se démarquer des autres variétés françaises et du standard, tandis que la communauté francophone du Moncton et du Nouveau-Brunswick fait des efforts pour se démarquer des anglophones qui menacent, à leurs yeux, leur français. Les locuteurs du chiac se situent donc entre le français standard et l'anglais et craignent l'influence de ces deux langues. Ils considèrent leur propre identité chiac comme nécessaire à l'évolution de l'identité du français et de l'anglais au Canada en général :

> **E4** (5. Mai 2014) : N'est-ce pas exactement ce que nous faisons lorsque nous nous "réduisons" nous les francos contre eux les anglos? On commence par faire cette première division et ensuite on continue de diviser. Francos Québécois, francos Acadiens, francos du Nord, francos du Sud, etc. C'est la suite logique des choses quand on cherche à mettre l'accent sur ce qui nous divise plutôt que ce qui nous unit.

La relation du chiac aux langues normatives, le français et l'anglais, est analysée dans ce qui suit.

2.5 Le chiac et le français

Les chiacophones ressentent souvent une certaine insécurité linguistique lorsqu'ils sont confrontés au français standard. Elle apparaît souvent lorsque le groupe linguistique a conscience de l'existence d'une variété normée de sa façon de parler et conscience de ne pas y correspondre (*cf*. Lafontaine 388) et a pu être observée dans beaucoup d'autres régions francophones (*cf*. pour la Belgique : Lafontaine 1997, pour la Suisse : Knecht

1996, pour le Québec : Reinke 2004). Cette insécurité linguistique influence également le comportement des locuteurs :

> **K4** (18. Août 2013) : […] 'Well si le français d'un TRADUCTEUR est pas assez bon pour eux autres, imagine ouère le mien! Moi j'ai toujou cru que j'étais français but là j'give up. Quosse qué le point d'asseyer anyways? Ça s'ra jamais assez bon. Pi le plus weird dans toute cecitte cé que j'ai fait un bac de 4 ans à l'U de M en français!!!!
>
> **B1** (15. Mai 2014) : […] lorsque je suis allée donner une conférence pour la première fois en France, j'ai éprouvé un stress inhabituel. Mon coeur battait à tout rompre avant d'ouvrir la bouche et j'avais peur de faire des fautes. Quand j'ai raconté cela à un Acadien de la Nouvelle-Écosse, il était très étonné qu'une Québécoise puisse aussi éprouver de l'insécurité linguistique […].

Ici, l'internaute dévalorise directement son langage et affirme l'hypothèse des non-experts selon laquelle les francophones de l'Acadie ne maîtrisent pas un français impeccable. Dans le cas de B1, il s'agit d'une Québécoise qui est exposée aux mêmes problèmes. Lafontaine (384) explique que les locuteurs de la 'variété dominée' se représentent leur façon de parler de manière plus négative que ne le pensent vraiment les locuteurs de la langue dominante. C'est aussi le cas au Québec où les anglophones valorisent plus les francophones que les francophones ne le font eux-mêmes (*cf. ibid*.). Nous pouvons donc observer que le français du Canada est encore et toujours comparé à celui de la France, notamment à cause de l'Académie française qui se donne pour but d'intervenir de façon consultative, voire normative dans l'usage du langage[18] :

> **B4** (15. Mai 2014): Pensez-vous qui a juste les francos qui souffrent "d'insécurité linguistique"? Ça se pourrait tu que ça vient toute de la France pi de leur fameuse académie française c'te peur la de "mal parler" pi au fond c'est juste du pétage de broue pi de la dentelle inutile? On s'amuse à se corriger un et l'autre pi on a peur de mal paraitre parce qu'on "maitrise" pas la langue à 100%?

Les locuteurs des variétés du français doivent alors décider s'ils abandonnent leur identité, qui se manifeste surtout par leur langue, pour une langue standardisée dans le but d'éviter des situations où ils peuvent ressentir cette insécurité linguistique :

[18] Pöll (*Le français, langue pluricentrique* ? 15) décrit que le français est souvent vu comme « meilleur exemple d'une langue à norme unique » et avant tout, les non-linguistes associent le français à la France. En outre, Paris constitue la « référence légitime » (Lafontaine 384) et en comparaison avec le parisien, nous pouvons définir ce qui peut être classifié comme un français correct et ce qui est plutôt un français régional (*cf.ibid*.).

> **K15** (18. Août 2013): [...] Je pense que personne n'a le droit de priver quelqu'un de parler la langue qu'il souhaite parler, or quand on sait que la légitimation du chiac n'est pas pour maintenant, je pense qu'il est nécessaire de fournir un effort pour parler/ écrire un "bon français" afin de se faire respecté, afin de prouver que ce n'est pas le chiac qui compromet la qualité du français, et dire oui je parle chiac mais mon français est "correct" et je n'ai rien à me reprocher; afin d'être intégré tout simplement! Vos anecdotes montrent bien une certaine exclusion de la société des gens qui n'ont pas le "français requis"! Je pense qu'il est bien, même très bien de savoir conserver son identité, de revendiquer le droit de parler une langue (langue qui n'est pas toujours compréhensible pour tous francophones d'ailleurs!), c'est une fierté; mais si ça veut dire être exclu de la société parce qu'à côté de mon chiac je ne sais pas écrire un "bon français" alors ...

K15 décrit le tiraillement intérieur qu'éprouvent les locuteurs du chiac. Ne pas pouvoir se servir de la langue standard est synonyme d'exclusion de la société. Mais c'est aussi le cas lorsqu'on ne parle pas le chiac dans la région. Remysen (96) explique que la revalorisation du propre langage mène à une diminution de l'insécurité linguistique. Cette revalorisation peut également être réalisée par certaines qualités que l'on ne trouve pas chez la variété dominante comme par exemple. la chaleur, l'affectivité et la connivence (*cf*. Reinke 11). C'est aussi le cas pour les membres du groupe Facebook qui font preuve de beaucoup d'assurance :

> **B3** (15. Mai 2014) : Je ne crois plus dans le fait d'adapter son langage en fonction de l'auditoire ou de la personne qui nous fait face. J'avoue l'avoir fais, quoi qu'il y ai quelque chose de douteux dans cet approche. Tout en gardant mes régionalisme, j'utilise maintenant tout mon registre, structure et vocabulaire compris. Si quelqu'un ne comprend pas un mots, j'en explique la signification. De cette façon je ne ressent presque plus d'insécurité linguistique puisque je m'exprime vraiment librement.

> **B4** (17. Juin 2014) : C'est peut-être que la génération dont tu parles souffrait d'un complexe d'infériorité et faisait tout ce qu'elle pouvait pour essayer de "perler" comme le monde instruit tandis que la nouvelle génération est beaucoup moins complexée face aux "étrangers" et parle comme elle en a envie [...].

Selon les internautes, cette attitude est un pas important pour garantir la survie du chiac au Nouveau-Brunswick. Ils sont d'accord pour que l'on apprenne le français standard afin d'être compris dans le monde entier ou plutôt dans la Francophonie :

> **B5** (14. Mai 2014) : [...] Bien d'accord aussi sur le fait que le français n'est pas une matière parmi d'autres, mais LA matière qui irrigue toutes les autres et que pour cette raison, elle doit relever d'un "projet éducatif" qui englobe toute l'école.

Le manque de modèle dans les écoles à Moncton est un grand problème. Beaucoup d'enseignants ne connaissent pas bien la langue standard et transmettent le sentiment d'une insécurité linguistique :

> **B9** (15. Juillet 2014) : [...] Un enseignant ou une enseignante qui ne maîtrise pas le français ne devrait pas l'enseigner aux enfants […]. Tandis que, dans nos écoles, nous avons pleins d'enseignantes et d'enseignants qui ne maîtrisent pas le français mais qui l'enseignent. La situation est rendue lamentable, pour ne pas dire pitoyable!

> **B1** (15. Mai 2014) : En effet [...], les compétences linguistiques incluent la capacité d'adapter son registre de langue selon les circonstances. Pour enseigner le français en milieu minoritaire, il faudrait non seulement être "bon" en français, mais aussi éprouver assez de sécurité linguistique pour être capable, selon les circonstances et surtout pour rejoindre le cœur de certains adolescents, d'utiliser leur langue même en classe.

Beaucoup de citoyens de la région sont bilingues, mais ils constatent qu'ils parlent mieux anglais que français parce que cette langue est omniprésente dans la région et plus facile à apprendre, tandis que l'accès au français et son apprentissage sont assez difficiles (*cf.* Boudreau et Dubois 154). Les non-linguistes pensent que cette attitude n'est pas efficace et qu'elle contribue au fait qu'aucune de ces deux langues n'est suffisamment bien apprise. Nous pourrions parler ici d'un 'double semi-linguisme' (*cf.* Hansegård), terme qui a été critiqué par des linguistes, car les bilingues disposent d'un profil linguistique qui permet différentes spécialisations de l'usage des langues (*cf.* diglossie). Cela dépend de la situation et du contexte dans lequel ils utilisent une certaine variété de leur répertoire linguistique, mais le plurilinguisme n'implique pas qu'aucune des langues n'est maîtrisée suffisamment. Les individus bi- ou plurilingues démontrent cependant une manière de communiquer plus flexible (*cf.* Leibniz-Zentrum). Quelques internautes réfèrent tout de même au phénomène décrit ci-dessus :

> **E8** (26. Avril 2014) : C'est une idée reçue assez idiote que "le français s'apprend, l'anglais s'attrape" [...]. La réalité est que le niveau linguistique global, que ce soit au Québec ou en Acadie, est à améliorer. Que la majorité des Québécois et un bon nombre d'Acadiens n'ont de l'anglais qu'une connaissance très limitée et très médiocre - tout en étant bien sûr persuadés du contraire, parce que moins on en sait, plus on est convaincu d'être omniscient! C'est rendu que des étudiants de langue seconde ont une meilleure connaissance du français "standard" […] que des "francophones" : or un niveau standard correct est essentiel pour la communication, nationale comme internationale. Nous vivons sur l'idée que les "Canayens" et autres francos (dont les Acadiens) sont "naturellement" géniaux et bilingues "par osmose. [...] et on ne bâtit pas l'Acadie avec des gens qui cumulent les fautes de français, parlent un anglais approximatif et en comprennent encore moins, et à qui l'école n'inculque pas ce qui devrait être la valeur fondamentale, qu'elle enseigne le chiac, le

> mikmaw ou le français: la curiosité et la fierté de vraiment savoir correctement quelque chose. Parce que cela, on ne peut l'acquérir que...par soi-même!

Quelques membres du groupe renvoient au fait que le français des pays africains, où il a souvent le statut de langue seconde, est mieux maîtrisé bien que l'accès à la formation soit plus difficile qu'au Canada. Ils pensent alors que la compétence insuffisante du français a ses origines dans la transmission de la langue. Par la suite, B3 réplique que ce n'est pas seulement le devoir de l'école mais de toute une société de transmettre aux générations suivantes une langue et les valeurs ainsi que les idées qui sont véhiculées par cette langue :

> **B3** (21. Juin 2014) : [...] se comparer avec le passer ou la pauvreté dans laquelle apprenne nôtre langues certains jeune d'ailleurs, ne nourrie pas vraiment, n'indique pas le chemin des solutions. Il faux regarder de l'avant et incité les jeunes à être fiers de leurs racine, de leur héritage; c'est le travaille de toute une communauté que de transmettre ces valeurs […]. J'ai plus confiance en l'avenir que vous, et surtout en la jeunesse [...]

Nous pouvons voir qu'une tendance se dessine pour les chiacophones à dépasser la norme et l'insécurité linguistique qui l'accompagne afin de pouvoir librement parler chiac. Toutefois, il y a quelques internautes qui voient dans le chiac et dans ses éléments anglais une menace pour le français standard.

2.6 Le chiac et l'anglais

Les membres du groupe Facebook comparent l'infiltration de l'anglais dans le français des francophones d'Acadie à la situation des locuteurs des langues régionales en France où ces dernières ont perdu leur statut culturel parce qu'elles n'étaient pas reconnues comme telles par la loi (*cf.* Klare 68) :

> **I14** (30. Juillet 2013) : [...] Bref, si les Français parlent français, c'est surtout parce qu'on les a forcé à abandonner leurs dialectes et langues régionales […]. Actuellement en acadie, […], à force de dévaloriser le chiac, les chiacophones se tournent vers la langue dominante... l'anglais. C'est le même processus qu'en France il y a 130 ans. Que faire alors? Valoriser le chiac ou non ?

Cet internaute explique le recours à cette solution de refuge par la stigmatisation de leur façon de parler et du manque d'un 'bon français'. La communauté française critique les

locuteurs du chiac, car ils acceptent l'influence anglaise dans leur langue et ainsi diminuent la qualité du français. Les anglophones de la région, par contre, ne critiquent pas le chiac ni la qualité de leur anglais et ils ne parlent pas nécessairement mieux anglais que français. Les chiacophones peuvent alors ressentir une insécurité linguistique par rapport au français de référence et, s'ils se sentent en insécurité par rapport à la langue standard, ils ont recours souvent à l'anglais comme langue de refuge :

> **K4** (18. Août 2013) : On assiste donc à un cercle vicieux au niveau de la langue dans la région de Moncton. Les attentes d'une certaine classe de gens face à la qualité de la langue augmentent toujours et ceux qui, jusqu'à présent, pensaient parler français (et oui un chiac pense qu'il parle français même s'il sait que son français n'est pas parfait et s'identifie comme francophone) deviennent de plus en plus embarrassés de le parler et encore PLUS de l'écrire alors ils se tournent vers l'anglais comme lieu de refuge. Au moins ils ne se sentiront pas jugés.
>
> Cette classe de gens qui prétendent vouloir contrer l'assimilation forcent beaucoup de francophones du sud VERS cette même assimilation en les humiliant continuellement à propos de leur langue et en les obligeant à adopter l'anglais comme langue de travail plutôt que de continuellement subir les remarques désobligeantes de ces personnes qui se prennent pour des ambassadeurs de l'Académie Français Acadienne.

Mais ils ne recourent pas à l'anglais parce qu'ils peuvent le parler sans fautes : les non-linguistes affirment en effet qu'ils ne parlent pas l'anglais comme un locuteur natif. Mais ils ne sont pas critiqués par la communauté anglaise, entre autres, parce que l'anglais a une tradition bien moins normative que le français :

> **I8** (31. Juillet 2013) : Parler chiac ne signifie pas qu'on a une très grande connaissance de l'anglais non plus, en dépit des apparences...
>
> **L43** (7. Novembre 2012) : Le choix est claire dans ma tête, si nous critiquons les Acadiens avec leurs parlers chiac, voila une façon certaine de les encourager de passer à l'anglais. C'est ça l'assimilation, les francos qui critique une lanque populaire et vivante. Cette langue a survécu depuis les années 1700. Alors, ne me parlez pas d'assimilation, mais plutôt de survie .... Bravo aux Acadiens qui chérissent leurs langues plutôt que de ce tourner vers l'anglais " full time ". So what si y a d'langlais là-dedans. Vous n'avez qu'à voir la fierté de ce peuple pendant les célébrations annuelles de leur culture. Y a pas un anglais qui célèbre sa langue et sa culture comme les Acadiens.

Quelques Acadiens craignent une perte d'identité culturelle. Depuis le Grand Dérangement[19], le français doit s'imposer contre la domination de l'anglais. Selon les internautes, si la part de l'anglais augmente à tel point que l'on perçoit le chiac comme une variété anglaise à la place d'une variété française, l'on ne peut plus parler d'une perte de langue, mais également d'une perte de valeurs culturelles :

> **I4** (4. Août 2013) : […] Le vrai problème au fond c'est que les acadiens haïssent encore les anglais à cause de la déportation et ne veulent en aucun cas leur ressembler et surtout ne rien adopter de leur culture ou de leur langue […].

> **K17** (21. Août 2013) : j'crois qu'on est juste upset que les anglais aviont gagné la guerre, la guerre dans laquelle on aurait voulu rester neutres, pis on s'rattrappe depuis sans trop savoir. C'est definatly important de se regarder dans l'nombril / dans l'miroir, sans oublier qu'un miroir n'est qu'une réflexion de la réalité. c'est ça qui me trotte dans la t^te quand je vous lis.

D'autres internautes pensent qu'il y a une assimilation vers l'anglais parce que les locuteurs du chiac ne font pas assez d'efforts en français :

> **L28** (6. Novembre 2012) : Moi personnellement, le Chiac, ça m'énerve parce que ça représente un pas vers l'assimilation […]. [Ç]a reflète aussi la paresse intellectuelle de ne pas faire l'effort d'utiliser les mots de notre propre langue […]. Mettre le Chiac sur un pédestal au Québec est à mon avis une erreur pour la langue française, et ce n'est surtout pas une faveur à tous les Acadiens qui parlent et maîtrisent très bien leur propre langue.

L'assimilation vers l'anglais peut aussi être vue selon une perspective plus objective. Aujourd'hui, l'anglicisation des langues est un phénomène mondial[20], car la domination de l'anglais exige que tout le monde le parle. Ainsi, ce n'est pas seulement le cas des Chiacs :

> **G25** (30. Octobre 2013) : Cette évolution du chiac que vous notez […], n'y aurait-il pas un lien avec l'évolution globale du rôle de l'anglais sur la planète? […]

Une raison pour laquelle on remarque les emprunts à l'anglais dans le chiac de façon si forte pourrait être leur manque d'intégration dans le système phonologique. Il est typique

[19] Le Grand Dérangement (1755-1763) désigne la déportation violente des Acadiens par les Britanniques parce qu'ils n'ont pas prêté serment de fidélité à la couronne britannique (*cf.* Pöll, *Francophonies périphériques* 133).

[20] Au Québec, au contraire, on assiste à une élimination de tout mot anglais; les anglicismes lexicaux sont interdits à l'oral et à l'écrit (*cf.* Pöll, *Francophonies périphériques* 130).

pour un francophone d'intégrer les termes des langues étrangères à l'articulation de sa langue maternelle (*cf*. Boudreau 92). En chiac, les anglicismes gardent leur structure phonologique anglaise, de sorte que l'on les remarque facilement :

> **K4** (18. Août 2013) : […] je pense que ce n'est pas une question de qualité (anglicismes) mais plutôt une question de quantité (le nombre d'anglicismes utilisés) et surtout une question d'accent. Comme tu le dis, un anglicisme en chiac sonne beaucoup plus anglais que le même mot prononcé par une personne du Nord […]

L'influence de l'anglais est alors vue de deux façons. Une partie des gens pensent que les locuteurs du chiac parlent de plus en plus anglais parce qu'ils sont rejetés par la société francophone de la région. D'autres croient que l'assimilation au pôle anglais est un processus normal dans l'évolution d'une langue faisant partie d'une société mondialisée. Le rôle de l'anglais restera sans aucun doute l'aspect le plus discuté par les internautes sur les réseaux sociaux.

3. Conclusion

Nous avons pu voir qu'il n'y a pas de consensus des non-experts en ce qui concerne la définition du chiac. Même son statut n'est pas élucidé : les internautes qui se pensent chiacophones le considèrent comme langue, tandis que d'autres disent qu'il s'agit d'un dialecte ou d'un patois. Les locuteurs du chiac mettent en valeur son caractère identitaire, bien que d'autres y voient une menace pour les langues standard, surtout pour le français qui semble être noyauté d'emprunts à l'anglais. En outre, nous avons appris qu'il y a un rapport entre la compétence insuffisante de parler le français standard et l'augmentation de la part de l'anglais du chiac : les locuteurs ressentent une insécurité linguistique concernant le français et se sentent incompris par les francophones. Par conséquent, ils se tournent vers l'anglais, car la société anglophone dans la région ne critique pas leur façon de parler. Les chiacophones manifestant plus d'estime de soi ont commencé à instrumentaliser le chiac : ils l'utilisent consciemment pour se démarquer des autres communautés langagières et surtout contre le français standard. Celui-ci devient de plus en plus important dans la Francophonie et domine aujourd'hui aussi dans les provinces maritimes en raison d'une forte migration d'autres pays francophones. Les débats des

profanes sur le chiac, au cours desquels son rôle identitaire et sa structure entre les pôles français et anglais ont suscité le plus de discussions, continuent à se développer quotidiennement.

Liste des ouvrages cités

Arrighi, Laurence. "Le français parlé en Acadie: description et construction d'une ‚variété'." *Minorités linguistiques et société* 4 (2014): 100-125.

Boudreau, Annette. "Discours, nomination des langues et idéologies linguistiques." *Les Français d'ici. Description, représentation et théorisation*. PUL, Collection Les Voies du français (2012): 89-109.

Boudreau, Annette,et Marie-Ève Perrot. "'Le chiac c'est du français': représentations du mélange français/anglais en situation de contact inégalitaire." *Hybrides linguistiques: genèses, statuts, fonctionnements.* Ed. Henri Boyer. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2010. 51-82.

Boudreau, Annette, et Lise Dubois. "Mondialisation, transnationalisme et nouveau accommodements en Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick.". *Les actions sur les langues. Synergie et partenariat. Actes des 3es Journées scientifiques du réseau Sociolinguistique et dynamique des langues.* Ed. Gisèle Chevalier. Paris: CPI, 2005. 69-82.

--- "J'parle pas comme les Français de France, ben c'est du français pareil ; j'ai ma own p'tite langue." *Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain* 3-4 19 (1993): 147-168.

Canut, Cécile. "Le nom des langues ou les métaphores de la frontière.", *Frontières* (revue électronique du CERCE) 1 (2000): 1-18.

Cormier, Julie. *Représentations, dynamiques langagières et Internet : le cas du chiac en Acadie*. Moncton: Département d'études françaises, Université de Moncton, 2010.

Daoust, Denise, et Jacques Maurais. "L'aménagement linguistique.". *Politique et aménagement linguistiques.* Ed. Jacques Maurais. Montréal: Conseil de la langue française, 1987. 7-46.

Dubois, Lise. "Le bilinguisme à Moncton: lieu de divergence." *Sociolinguistique urbaine. Frontières et territoires*. Ed. Thierry Bulot and Leila Messaoudi. Cortil-Wodon: Éditions Modulaires Euopéennes, 2003. 135-168.

Facebook. "L'incubateur de l'esprit critique acadien", 27.06.2017. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/incubateur/>.

Ferguson, Charles A. "Diglossia." *Word: Journal of the Linguistic Circle of New York* 15 (1959): 325-340.

Fishman, Joshua. "Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967): 29-38.

Gadet, Françoise. "Un regard dialinguistique sur les 'français marginaux'". Le français d'un continent à l'autre. Mélanges offerts à Yves Charles Morin. Eds. Luc

Baronin et France Martineau, Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2009. 171-191.

Gérin-Lajoie, Diane, et Normand Labrie. "Les résultats aux tests de lecture et d'écriture en 1993-1994: une interprétation sociolinguistique" *L'enjeu de la langue en Ontario fra- nçais.* Eds. Normand Labrie et Gilles Forlot, Sudbury: Prise de parole, 1999. 79-108.

Glück, Helmut, et Michael Röhde. *Metzler Lexikon Sprache*. Stuttgart : Metzler, 2016.

Hansegård, Nils Erik. *Tvåspråkighet eller halvspråkighet?*. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonnier, 1962.

King, Ruth. "Chiac in context. Overview and evaluation of Acadie's joual." *Social lives in language: sociolinguistics and multilingual speech communities; celebrating the work of Gillian Sankoff*. (IMPACT Studies in Language and Society 24). Eds. Miriam Meyerhoff et Naomi Nagy. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2008. 137-178.

Klare, Johannes. "Französische Sprachenpolitik und Sprachpolitik im europäischen Kontext." *Interlinguistische Informationen* 6 (2001): 58-84.

Knecht, Pierre (1996), La Suisse romande: aspects d'un paysage francophone conservateur, *Le français dans l'espace francophone. Description linguistique et sociolinguistique de la francophonie 2*. Eds. Didier de Robillard/Michel Beniamino. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1996. 759-770.

Labov, William. "The social motivation of a sound change." *Word* 19 (1963): 273-303.

---. *The social stratification of English in New York*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

Lafontaine, Dominique. "Les attitudes et les représentations linguistiques." *Le français de Belgique. Une langue, une communauté.* Eds. Daniel Blampain. Bruxelles/Louvain-la-Neuve: Duculot, 1997. 381-390.

Lamizet, Bernard. "Y a-t-il un ‚parler jeunes'?". *Cahier de sociolinguistiques, Presses universitaire de Rennes* (2004): 75-98.

Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. "Die sogenannte 'Doppelte Halbsprachigkeit' : eine sprachwissenschaftliche Stellungnahme". 16.07.2017, <http://www.zas.gwz-berlin.de/fileadmin/material/presse/pressemitteilungen/pressemitteilung_doppelte-halbsprachigkeit_dez2010.pdf>

Péronnet, Louise. *Substrat gallo-roman du parler acadien du Sud-Est du N.-B. (Canada)*. Grenoble: Université de Grenoble III, 1985.

---. "Le changement linguistique en Acadie: étude lexicale." *Francophonies d'Amérique* 4 (1994): 45-55.

Perrot, Marie-Ève. *Aspects fondamentaux du métissage français/anglais dans le chiac de Moncton (Nouveau-Brunswick, Canada)*. Paris: Université de la Sorbonne, 1995.

---. "Le chiac de Moncton: description synchronique et tendances évolutives." *Le français en Amérique du Nord. État présent.* Ed. Albert Valdman. Québec: Les presses de l'Université Laval, 2014. 307-326.

Poirier, Claude. "La langue parlée en Nouvelle-France: vers une convergence des explications." *Les origines du français québécois. Langue française au Québec*. Eds. Raymond Mougeon et Édouard Beniak. Sainte-Foy: La Presse de l'Université Laval, 1994. 237-274.

Pöll, Bernhard. *Le français, langue pluricentrique?: Études sur la Variation diatopique d'une langue standard.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2005.

---. *Francophonies périphériques. Histoire, statut et profil des principales variétés du français hors de France*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2001.

Reinke, Kristin. *Sprachnorm und Sprachqualität im frankophonen Fernsehen von Québec. Untersuchung anhang phonologischer und morphologischer Variablen.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2004.

Remysen, Wim. "L'insécurité linguistique des francophones ontariens et néo-brunswickois. Contribution à l'étude de la francophonie canadienne." Eds. Simon Langlois et Jocelyn Létourneau. *Aspects de la nouvelle francophonie canadienne.* (2004): 95-116.

Roy, Marie-Marthe. *Les conjonctions „but" et „so" dans le français de Moncton*. Montréal: Université du Québec, 1979.

Statistique Canada. Série "Perspective géographique", Recensement de 2011, Province du Nouveau-Brunswick, 2015. 26.06.2017. <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-pr-fra.cfm?Lang=fra&GK=PR&GC=13>.

Thibault, André. "Un code hybride français/anglais? Le chiac acadien dans une chanson du groupe Radio Radio." *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur* 121 (2011): 39-65.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univerysity Press, 2001.

Trudgill, Peter. "Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich." *Language in Society* 1 (1974): 179-195.

Williams, Christopher. *Tradition and Change in Legal English: Verbal Constructions in Prescreptive Textes*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2007.

Young, Hilary Adrienne Nicole. *C'est either que tu parles français, c'est either que tu parles anglais. A cognitive approach to chiac as a contact language.* Houston: UMI, 2002.

Zouhour Messili et Hmaid Ben Aziza. "Langage et exclusion. La langue des cités en France". *Cahiers de la Méditerranée* 69 (2004): 1-6.

Public Memory and the Ongoing Reconciliation Process in a Post-TRC Canada

Alicia Krömer (University of Vienna)

1. Introduction

The following paper is based on the doctoral project by the author, entitled "Social Influence and Impact on the Collective Memory of the Native Residential Schools in Canada: 1867-1996" (Krömer). It provides a brief summary of the history of the Native residential schools (NRS) in Canada and an overview of the various issues that plagued the process of reconciliation. These issues include the turbulent path of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), controversy in the media, and a heated debate on whether the school's history could be described as a form of genocide. This paper also covers a turning point after the completion of the TRC and its final report, which signalled a political and social shift in Canada. The paper concludes with a discussion of John Bodnar's 1992 book *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*, and how it applies to the continuing story of reconciliation in a post-TRC Canada.

2. Native Residential Schools Background

The NRS were boarding schools for Indigenous children in Canada, initiated and funded by the Federal Government of Canada at its establishment in 1867, and administered and staffed by the Catholic, Anglican, United, and Presbyterian Churches of Canada. It was designed originally to educate and integrate the Indigenous child into White Christian society and "kill the Indian in the child" (Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs). 150,000 children were placed in a network of roughly 150 schools across Canada, and an estimated 3,200 children died while in attendance. Indigenous children were forcibly removed from their families and standard practice forbade the children from speaking their mother tongue. Canadian physician and former Chief Medical Officer, Dr. Peter Henderson Bryce, first alerted the Canadian Government and the

Canadian public of the widespread mistreatment of Indigenous children in residential schools in 1907. Originally hired by the Canadian Government to report on the health conditions in Native residential schools, Bryce was fired subsequent to completing his report, in which he correlated the poor living conditions and the mistreatment of Indigenous children as the cause of their extremely high death rate in these institutions. Bryce published his findings in 1922 as *The Story of a National Crime*. In spite of his tenacious advocacy to warn the Canadian Government and public of this crime, the schools continued to run for decades. In 2013, researcher Ian Mosby uncovered federal archives showing that nutritional experiments were conducted on these children (Weber). After the last school closed in 1996, reports came out that rampant physical, sexual, verbal and emotional abuse occurred in startling regularity across the country and for decades (Carney 15). After these reports and a successful lawsuit from several residential school students in British Columbia in the late 1990s, the Federal Government was initially slow to respond, setting up only small healing funds at first, yet ultimately culminating in a larger compensation program and the 2008 nationally-televised public apology from the then Prime Minister Stephen Harper. From this followed the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in 2008. The TRC had been fraught with controversy and issues.

3. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission: A Turbulent Path

The TRC was established on 2 June 2008 to act as a temporary, out-of-court fact-finding organisation investigating the human rights abuses reported to have occurred at the schools. Unfortunately, it had a tumultuous beginning, as there was confusion over leadership of the commission. Justice Harry LaForme of the Ontario Court of Appeal was initially appointed but then resigned in October 2008, four months after its inception, citing insubordination by the other commissioners, Claudette Dumont-Smith and Jane Brewin Morley, both of whom resigned in January 2009 (Kilpatrick). The initial fallout of the board of commissioners was resolved when, in June 2009, Murray Sinclair took on the role of chair of the commission. He was joined by Marie Wilson, a senior executive of a workers' compensation group in the Northwest Territories, and Wilton Littlechild,

former Conservative Member of Parliament and Alberta regional chief for the Assembly of First Nations. Under Murray Sinclair's leadership the TRC ran through to its completion in 2015. It was set up as a branch of the Federal Government to be conducted over the course of five years, including the compiling of historical records on the schools. The mandate of the Commission was as follows:

1. Acknowledge Residential School experiences, impacts and consequences,
2. Provide a holistic, culturally appropriate and safe setting for former students, their families and communities as they come forward to the Commission,
3. Witness, support, promote and facilitate truth and reconciliation events at both the national and community levels,
4. Promote awareness and public education of Canadians about the IRS system and its impacts,
5. Identify sources and create as complete an historical record as possible of the IRS system and legacy. The record shall be preserved and made accessible to the public for future study and use,
6. Produce and submit to the parties of the Agreement a report including recommendations to the Government of Canada concerning the IRS system and experience including: the history, purpose, operation and supervision of the IRS system, the effect and consequences of IRS (including systematic harms, intergenerational consequences and the impact on human dignity) and the ongoing legacy of the residential schools,
7. Support commemoration of former Indian Residential School students and their families in accordance with the Commemoration Policy Directive *(*TRC Mandate)

The Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission is unique in that it was the first TRC borne out of a litigation process (Stanton 4). Truth and Reconciliation Commissions that were set up in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Sierra Leone, for example, came out of a peace agreement between two parties after conflict. Canada is the only instance where a TRC was established after years of lawsuits were brought against the government for the residential schools, as well as after the negotiations between the different parties of these lawsuits (Stanton 4). It can be argued that the Canadian TRC was created to prevent further financial loss on the side of the Federal Government defending itself against the deluge of lawsuits. The Canadian TRC set up legal conditions, entitled 'Schedule N' which stipulated the goals, terms, and conditions of this functioning body. The terms and conditions determine that the TRC "shall not hold formal hearings, nor act as a public inquiry, nor conduct a formal legal process; …[it] shall not possess subpoena powers, and shall not have powers to compel attendance or participation in any of its activities or events…. [It] shall not name names in their events" (TRC Schedule N). The main tenet of the TRC is that it was created for the victims, in an attempt to be non-adversarial and

avoid mimicking the former Alternative Dispute Resolution in 2003 and the Independent Assessment Process in 2007, which were painful processes for those seeking compensation, as they would have to explain how they were abused in explicit detail. They required additional witnesses before court officials in order to obtain financial compensation. Truth Commissions are usually designed to fight against impunity where human rights abuses have occurred, so the Canadian TRC's specific exclusion of perpetrators and the refusal to name names could be seen as problematic and an arguably self-protective mechanism. However, while other Truth and Reconciliation Commissions have been granted authority to name names, it is not typically done (Hayner 107) and in many cases the perpetrators are deceased. In the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission, some of the 'perpetrators' are the Federal Government and the Catholic and Protestant Churches; ironically, these are the same parties participating in the activities of the TRC. However, the actual people that participated were representatives of the church and government and therefore not the specific perpetrators of the abuse suffered by the former students. Consequently, while a criticism of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission may be that it wielded no power to name names or to refer any perpetrator to court proceedings, it may be described as justified, albeit at the expense of any victim seeking justice. An additional reason for the creation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was to raise awareness of this part of history and to highlight the intergenerational impact the schools had on Native communities in Canada (TRC N document). The TRC was also tasked with creating the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation to preserve the memory of Canada's residential school system and legacy. It was officially completed and opened in July 2015 and houses the statements, documents, and other relevant material gathered by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation states that its mandate is to ensure that

> survivors and their families have access to their own history; educators can share the Residential School history with new generations of students; researchers can delve more deeply into the Residential School experience; the public can access historical records and other materials to help foster reconciliation and healing; the history and the legacy of the Residential Schools are never forgotten *(*National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, Mandate).

While the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation achieved its goal of opening in summer 2015, it was faced with numerous obstacles when attempting to obtain the materials necessary to open the institution. There was a delay in acquiring the documents for the centre in 2011. In June 2014, the news agency *Canadian Press* published a news story on the conflicting ideas of the fate of 40,000 residential school documents that detailed stories of abuse. At that time, the chief adjudicator of the Independent Assessment Process, Dan Shapiro, stated that "the only way that the confidentiality of participants can be respected and their dignity preserved is through the destruction of all IAP records after the conclusion of the compensation process" (Dyck, "Fate"). Terri Brown, a former residential school student, disagreed with the adjudicator, stating that "I think it is wrong to destroy them…I know it's not an arbitrary process. Dan [Shapiro] has thought about this and of how it protects, but I'm of another mind. It's the true record of what happened to us, once it's destroyed, it's gone forever" (Dyck, "Fate"). Ry Moran, the director of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation for the residential schools, claimed that these documents contain the "oral history of aboriginal people" and that it is therefore "fundamental" to include them in the centre. Once placed there, these files would be treated with the "utmost respect and no survivor would ever be unwillingly identified" (Dyck, "Fate"). Ultimately, it was decided by the Ontario provincial court in July 2014 that the testimonies would be "sealed for decades rather than destroyed" as the destruction of the documents would silence the stories of the former students (Dyck, "Destroying"). Julian Falconer, a lawyer co-Chair of the Equity and Aboriginal Issues Committee, declared that the "destruction of those documents will have a deep, irreversible impact on the state of the record" (Dyck, "Destroying"). While chief adjudicator Dan Shapiro had assumed he was speaking on behalf of the victims of the abuse, Joana Birenbaum, lawyer for the National Centre of Truth and Reconciliation, affirmed that "[w]hen the media reports of Mr. Shapiro went viral, (the research centre's executive director) was flooded with calls from survivors and others that said, 'We don't want our records destroyed…We want history to know how we were treated in the (claims) process" (Alamenciak). Opinions were divided because, on the one hand, this could be viewed as a further protective move by the government to hide testimonies

while, on the other, there is a case to be made for protecting the contract of confidentiality with those who gave testimony.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission undoubtedly had a turbulent path to its conclusion in 2015; including struggles to appoint effective leadership and the Supreme Court's order obliging the Federal Government to handover official NRS archives. As of 2017, there has been an ongoing debate over destruction of survivor documents. The TRC itself is also problematic as a branch of the Federal Government because it is the same government, which created the system of residential schools in the first place. The TRC was never able to act as a legal tribunal with judicial authority to name and prosecute perpetrators, and this still leaves little justice for the abused. Furthermore, the establishment of the TRC could be seen as a means of the Federal Government to mitigate future litigation from Indigenous groups. An interviewee who worked closely with the former Prime Minister Stephen Harper substantiated this impression by saying that "[t]he TRC was a way of getting the problem off the agenda" (Krömer 112).[21] If the Federal Government aimed at exploiting the TRC to silence Indigenous voices, they failed. Ultimately, in spite of the fraught path of controversies, limitations, and inability to address the myriad of embedded colonialist practices, the TRC still yielded a nation-wide paradigm shift: the greater Canadian public began to recognise the horrific impacts of residential schools on Indigenous people. Evidence and further discussion of this shift will be explored in the final section of this paper.

4. Backlash in the Media and Debate over Genocide

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was not free of backlash in the media. On 4 June 2015, one day after the official closing ceremony of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Canadian Hymie Rubenstein, a retired professor of anthropology at the

[21] The authors' dissertation is entitled "Social Influence and Impact on the Collective Memory of the Native Residential Schools in Canada: 1867-1996,'' which explored the perceived impacts of the schools and the present quality of life gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians. The author quotes interviewees from her research in this article, however their anonymity remains protected.

University of Manitoba, and Canadian Rodney E. Clifton, a professor of education at the University of Manitoba and a former residential school supervisor in the 1960s, wrote a joint article in the *National Post* entitled "*Debunking the half-truths and exaggerations in the Truth and Reconciliation Report*." Clifton and Rubenstein claimed that "similar traumas, indignities and deprivations faced by aboriginal students – loneliness, sexual and physical exploitation, and harsh living conditions, have been reported by the children of wealthy parents forced to attend elite boarding schools throughout the former British Empire" ("Debunking"). This article was followed up on 22 June 2015 by a scathing critique on the outcome of the TRC initial report. Clifton and Rubenstein stated that the report "conflat[es] so-called 'Survivors' (always capitalised and always applied to every former student)" and implies "without evidence that most of the children who attended the schools were grievously damaged." Clifton and Rubenstein further criticize:

> [t]he report also disingenuously implies that unlike all other people on Earth, indigenous Canadians never prevaricate, exaggerate or accept money for testifying at formal hearings, as occurred under the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement, which has already awarded $4.6 billion to tens of thousands of self-proclaimed 'Survivors' ("Truth").

While it is true that former students who claim to have suffered abuse at the schools were eligible for compensation at previous agreements, Indigenous participants of the TRC hearings received no financial compensation for sharing their story. Therefore, the latter statement from Clifton and Rubenstein is inaccurate and suggests a highly stringent and critical understanding of the residential schools. Without offering any tangible reasons, Rubenstein and Clifton asserted that the TRC report is "a clash of paradigms, which, if not bridged, will never lead to reconciliation," and that "[t]his history isn't over" and "[n]either is the truthful and accurate representation and interpretation of this history" ("Truth" Clifton & Rubenstein). Conrad Black, a Canadian magnate and conservative publicist, further asserts the views of Clifton and Rubenstein. Black wrote an article in the National Post on 6 June 2015, claiming that the term "cultural genocide" is deliberately provocative and sensational. Black described the relationship between the Federal Government and Indigenous Canadians as "full of sadness, mistakes and dishonour, but both sides share it, and respect for native government often results in grievous corruption and despotism by the native leaders." He went on to say that "a continuing orgy of recriminations will be unjust in itself, produce a nasty backlash, and

will aggravate grievances" (Black). He concluded his article by stating that "even the First Nations should be grateful that the Europeans came here" (Black). These 2015 articles by Black, Clifton, and Rubenstein in a prominent Canadian newspaper reveal a lingering tendency in mainstream Canadian society towards deeply ingrained colonial ideologies and harmful ignorance. More disturbingly, Black's article points to another larger issue at stake: the ongoing debate of the term 'genocide' to describe the history of the schools. On 30 July 2013, *The Globe and Mail* newspaper printed an article titled "Critics Press Ottawa to recognize wrongs against First Nations as genocide" (Galloway), detailing that the residential schools were a form of genocide, which prompted a fierce debate and response in the media. This happened in the wake of a report surfacing that nutritional experiments had been conducted on residential schoolchildren: "Canadian government withheld food from hungry aboriginal kids in 1940s nutritional experiments, researcher finds" (Weber). In the latter report, Canadian researcher Ian Mosby discovered government documents while investigating the development of health policy in Canada, which revealed a long-standing, government-run national experiment involving at least 1,300 Indigenous children. One example of the studies showed the children were intentionally withheld milk rations for several years to reveal the effects of lowered calories on children. Shortly thereafter, on 14 October 2013, Indigenous politician Phil Fontaine, the former Chief of the Assembly of First Nations in Canada, published a joint article with Bernie Farber, social activist and former head of the Canadian Jewish Congress, in *The Globe and Mail* titled "What Canada committed against First Nations was genocide. The UN should recognize it" (Fontaine & Farber). It was the first time that Phil Fontaine had officially used the word "genocide" and it prompted an angry backlash from the media. Ezra Levant, a journalist for the *Toronto Sun*, wrote an article in response to their use of the word "genocide": "Indian genocide: That's what former CJC boss Bernie Farber says Canada is guilty of – a bizarre and embarrassing (for him) allegation." Levant presented strong opposition:

> of course [genocide] is not true. Canada does not and never has had a policy of exterminating Indians. Genocides don't normally include billions of dollars a year in government grants to the group in question, affirmative action hiring quotas, land reserves and other privileges. … Canada is the most gentle, generous country in the world. It's a weird and desperate stretch to call us a country of genocide. … [Farber] is bringing a whole new level of extremism to Idle No More [which is] crazy [and] sad. (Levant)

Levant's position against the allegations of genocide was echoed by a news story in Winnipeg, Saskatchewan, where the Canadian Museum for Human Rights (CMHR) was scheduling its launch at the time. There was growing protest against the museum's decision to refrain from referencing the residential schools as a form of genocide. On 26 July 2013 the *Winnipeg Free Press* published an article entitled "CMHR rejects 'genocide' for native policies" where it was reported that the museum's senior staff, Maureen Fitzhenry, decided not to use the word. "Fitzhenry said the museum is not a court or government – the two bodies that have traditionally decided what counts as a genocide" (Welch). Fitzhenry stated academic research is still evolving: "We don't want to be seen as advocating or involving ourselves in a debate that is still playing out" (Welch). Fitzhenry was correct in stating that the debate over the terminology was still ongoing as on 2 June 2015, *The Globe and Mail* published an article titled "Residential schools amounted to 'cultural genocide'" which coincided with a speech by Beverly McLachlin, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who confirmed that Canada committed "cultural genocide" (Galloway). John Milloy, a professor of history, who published widely on the history of the residential schools, stated that some have been "reluctant to use the word out of concern that it would be seen as an attempt to equate Canada's history with the genocide of Jews by the Nazis during the Second World War." However, "he believes the term 'cultural genocide' is appropriate to the aboriginal experience" (Galloway). It was also suggested in the article that the TRC did not have the resources to answer the question of whether the United Nations' (UN) definition fits with what happened in Canada (Galloway). While the Canadian media has seen authors like Levant, Rubenstein, and Clifton protest against the use of the word genocide in any form, the TRC's and Supreme Court Justice Beverly McLaughlin use of the phrase "cultural genocide" seemed to have provided a powerful and decided shift in the national discourse. The result has been fewer people challenging that the schools were merely well-intended with instances of abuse and rather a systematic failure of subverting one group over another. Canada may have been concerned with the phrase "genocide" long before the TRC declared it as a form of one. There are indeed indications that the Canadian government was concerned about the use of the term genocide. It was not until 2000, four years after the last residential school closed, that Canada adopted a limited

definition of genocide that excluded the last line about the forcible transfer of children. Courts have rejected Indigenous claims of genocide against Ottawa and the churches because "Canada had no law banning genocide while the schools were operating" (Galloway). These actions by the Canadian government indicate that it had been aware of the history of the schools as a form of genocide but took steps to ensure that its own definition would not apply. Raphael Lemkin first used the term "genocide" in 1944, as a new way to describe the intentional destruction of a people. After its formation in 1946, the United Nations made genocide a crime under international law and determined what constitutes genocide in the 1948 *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, specifically in Article 2:

> In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
>
> - Killing members of the group;
> - Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
> - Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
> - Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
> - Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. (UN General Assembly, Article 2)

This definition contrasts with the Canadian one, adopted in 2000:

> 'genocide' means an act or omission committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, an identifiable group of persons, as such, that at the time and in the place of its commission, constitutes genocide according to customary international law or conventional international law or by virtue of its being criminal according to the general principles of law recognised by the community of nations, whether or not it constitutes a contravention of the law in force at the time and in the place of its commission. (Canadian Department of Justice, Act, S.C. 200, c24).

It could be argued that, according to the latter Canadian law, the label "genocide" therefore applies to acts of genocide occurring after the definition has been formed and not before. The Canadian definition does not include the forcible transfer of children of one group to another group. Canada recognises only two of the above five elements of the United Nations Genocide Convention (UNGC), which is "killing members of the group" and "causing serious or mental harm to members of the group" (UN General Assembly Article 2). The two definitions present a problem when Canadian citizens interpret them

on their own and publish in mainstream media what they believe constitutes genocide without any court or legal proceedings supporting it. The use of the word in the media seems to have generated controversy between individuals who wish to use it to describe the history of the residential schools and those who do not. In the wake of the ruling of Supreme Court Justice Beverley McLaughlin and the pronouncement of the history by the TRC as "cultural genocide," it appeared that the problematic use of the word "genocide" had been resolved by adding "cultural" to it. *The Globe and Mail* published an article on 7 July 2015 entitled "Five reasons the TRC chose 'cultural genocide.'" In the article, the author, David Macdonald, explored how Canada officially recognized five genocides that violated the United Nations Genocide Convention of 1948; however, the Native residential school history was not one of them. Macdonald highlighted how currently many "survivors conclude that genocide was committed by both federal institutions and churches and have said so publicly" (D. Macdonald). Furthermore, he referenced how Justice Murray Sinclair wrote in 2012 that "IRS [Indian Residential School] policy was an act of genocide under the UN Convention. Canada, however, cannot be convicted of the crime….The evidence…certainly supports the fact that this fell within the definition of genocide in the UN Convention" (D. Macdonald). Macdonald concluded that the TRC and Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin could not have labelled the history as "genocide" even if they wanted to due to the fact that it was not a legal tribunal with legitimacy to prosecute, grant amnesties, or subpoena witnesses. The 2006 Settlement Agreement prohibited the TRC from acting as such. It was not legitimised to refer the potential civil or criminal liability of any person or organisation; therefore, any declaration of genocide would far outreach the mandate and legitimacy of the TRC. Macdonald explained that this was the first reason the TRC referred to the NRS history as "cultural genocide." The second reason is that, according to Canada's definition of justice, it cannot be termed genocide when it happened before the definition was introduced and, as such, the forcible removal of children does not qualify as genocide in Canada, unlike the definition of the United Nations. Referring to Indigenous groups from Australia, Rwanda, and Yugoslavia, Macdonald additionally argued that the third reason is that simply calling the history of the residential schools "genocide" would not necessarily improve the quality of life for First Nations in Canada. However, this point

could be contested because defining a portion of history as genocide does not necessarily mean justice for the victims or perpetrators. Macdonald's fourth reason for using the term "cultural genocide" is to balance truth and reconciliation. He argued that by promoting the academic term "cultural genocide," it prevents inciting a right-wing backlash and rather promotes the spirit of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. He argued that the TRC "has created a ground floor for proceeding further in discussing and describing how the native Canadian experience is consistent with the definition of the UN Genocide Convention" (D. Macdonald). Macdonald then concluded by shedding light on the futility of the word in contrast to the construction of memory on the part of Canadian citizens:

> Neither the summary report [of the TRC], nor the upcoming final report represent the final word; memory and history will continue to flow, our understanding of the system at the time will grow and change. More children will be discovered to have been part of the death toll, … more instances of abuse will be detailed, more nutrition and medical experiments will be uncovered, more memories will be preserved. This is the beginning of a momentous process of fully discovering the history of Canada and its foundations" (D. Macdonald).

Macdonald contends in this excerpt that the TRC is a sense of a beginning, and echoes Maurice Halbwachs' theory of collective memory when he writes that "memory and history continue to flow, influencing our understanding of what the residential schools actually were" (D. Macdonald). He eloquently captures the fact that we are in the midst of a "momentous process of fully discovering the history of Canada and its foundations" (D. Macdonald). This is reiterated in another interviewee in the author's research: "it's a historical narrative that is still being written" (Krömer 106). However, Macdonald's argument leaves out present implications, such as the ongoing forced removal of Indigenous children from their families and communities through the Indigenous child welfare system.[22] It can thus be argued that Canada persists in different forms of genocidal practices according to the UN definition, while being protected by its own

[22] Executive Director of the First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada, Cindy Blackstock, has done monumental work on advocating for Indigenous children's welfare in Canada. Her efforts contributed to the 2016 landmark decision from the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal. The Tribunal ruled that the Federal Government's neglect and underfunding of Indigenous child welfare discriminates against 163,000 Indigenous children and subsequent order of the Government to cease this discriminatory practice. (Canadian Human Rights Tribunal).

definition of genocide. An area of study that needs further development is to explore the justification Canada has made for its own definition of genocide, different from the UN. As it stands, it appears that Canada has intentionally created its own definition to shield itself from culpability. As previously mentioned in this article, there have been assertions from prominent Indigenous scholars and authors that the residential school system fits the UN definition of genocide (Chrisjohn; Fontaine; Palmater). Others, such as journalists like Levant, Black, Clifton and Rubenstein, express outrage and rejection of the term, perhaps exposing an underlying fear of its consequences. Continued opposition to the applicability of the NRS as genocide overlooks the suspicious nature of Canada's own definition. It also may perpetuate an ignorance of the full extent of the damage done to Indigenous groups in Canada. In other words, McLaughlin's proclamation of the NRS history as cultural genocide is not, to borrow Macdonald's words, "the final word." In order for Canada to move forward from this past, it is necessary to acknowledge and understand the full impact of this history, which perhaps also means a broader and more legitimate investigation to determine whether the NRS system is considered genocide under the UN definition. However, to move forward it also requires a sustained effort to educate the Canadian public, to expose deeply ingrained colonial ideologies, and to support the empowerment of Indigenous communities in Canada.

5. Public Memory in the Ongoing Reconciliation Process of a Post-TRC Canada

Halbwachs, a French philosopher and sociologist, discussed a theory of collective memory in the 1920s and 30s, asserting that memory is a social phenomenon formed through interaction and communication, whereby the past is reconstructed by groups and arranges the present perspective (48). Collective memory is a dynamic and ever-changing paradigm, subject to adding and deleting various elements chosen by the group. Halbwachs had a following of theorists who furthered his notion of collective memory, such as John Bodnar who wrote about official, vernacular and public memory in his work *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth*

Century (1992). His further contribution to the theory of Halbwachs' collective memory can be related to the history of the NRS and the ongoing reconciliation process. Bodnar defines official memory as the remembrance of the past adopted by state institutions to maintain power. Leaders select an interpretation of past events and present a type of reality to "reduce the power of competing interests" (Bodnar 13). Those in power manipulate history to subvert subgroups, the latter hold what Bodnar calls "vernacular memory" (13). Vernacular memory is derived from what a society is and not what it aims to be. The subgroups struggle for this vernacular memory to be heard (in other words, their version of history). Vernacular memory from "ordinary people" opposes the manipulative elite who tries to "influence and, therefore, distort the discussion over how the past related to the present" (Bodnar 13). The distinction between official and vernacular memory poses deeper questions about the national identity of a society; which gives rise to an exchange of historical narratives between those in power and the subgroups. Through this negotiated process of contested narratives in the public sphere, public memory is produced (Bodnar 14). Public memory deals with a core understanding of how the past is interpreted. This communicative process, while contending with the interpretation of past events, is more concerned with how this interpretation impacts the present. It confronts and potentially dismantles power structures, presenting new horizons of understanding. The subgroups take power back from the elite through sharing their vernacular memory of the past. The subgroups challenge the supposed legitimacy and accuracy of official memory. Out of this exchange public memory is constructed, resulting in a fuller interpretation of the past, shedding light on vernacular memory through contesting official memory.

How does Bodnar's official, vernacular, and public memory relate to the NRS and the path of reconciliation to the present? At this point, it is necessary to examine exactly what initiated "reconciliation" in the first place. In 1988, a group of former students from St. George's Indian School in Lytton, British Columbia, were the first to press charges against a priest, the Federal Government, and the Anglican Church of Canada. They won their case, known as *Mowatt v. Clarke,* ten years later in 1998. In 1990, another group of former students from St. Joseph's Residential School in Williams Lake, British Columbia, filed suit for damages for sexual assault against the Catholic Church and the

Federal Government—and won. In 1995, 30 former students from the Alberni Indian Residential School, British Columbia, filed charges of sexual and physical abuse against Arthur Plint in *Blackwater v. Plint*, and were successful in obtaining a settlement in 2005. In 1993 and 1994 respectively, the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches publicly acknowledged and apologised for its participation in the abuse of residential schoolchildren. In 1996, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples interviewed former Native residential school students about their experiences, which was the first time in Canadian history that it became apparent that not just individual cases of abuse occurred at the schools, but that this abuse was a widespread epidemic across Canada, spanning the decades since its inception. This led to the first public apology by the Federal Government of Canada to the former students, the setting up of a CAD $350 million government Aboriginal Healing Fund, and a specialised court process called the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). Many former students felt that the fund was insufficient in addressing the long-lasting damage of the school's legacy; therefore, a class action lawsuit was brought against the Federal Government in 2005. In 2006, the *Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement*[23] was created, which increased compensation for those who claimed to have suffered abuse at the residential schools and promised the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Those in power had to quickly react to the legal 'threats' in order to prevent future lawsuits. This was confirmed by a Canadian Government official who was in power at the time of these events: "It became an enormous surge of complaints to the point where the government had to respond to it…I think [the government] gave away far more than they would have had to or should have, but they were trying to bury the problem." He continued, "it was the simplest way out, politically they were going to face a whole series of class action litigation upon certain outcomes" (Krömer 111). The Federal Government's attempt to "bury the problem" had the opposite effect of bringing it out into the open. The TRC published their final report in December of 2016, along with the politically significant "94 calls to action." Indigenous Senator Murray Sinclair has been appointed with the

[23] Please note that the term 'Indian' is used in 'Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement' as it was the accepted (however incorrect) term used at the time.

intent to keep reconciliation a high priority for the Canadian government, stating that "education is the key to reconciliation" (N. Macdonald). The current Canadian Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, promised to fulfil the 94 calls to action and to address the myriad of social and economic issues that face Indigenous communities in Canada. Trudeau appointed Jody Wilson-Raybould as Minister of Justice in 2015, who also happened to be the first Indigenous woman appointed to the position. There has been a growing response from schools and ministries of education across Canada committing to include the NRS in their curriculum (Baker).

In May of 2016, Canada signed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, something Canada had considered only an aspirational document until then. There is a renewed commitment by the Federal Government to make cases of missing and murdered Aboriginal women a higher priority and to increase funding for education and housing for Indigenous communities. The National Research Center for Truth and Reconciliation has been established in Winnipeg, Manitoba, to preserve the memory and legacy of the NRS, ensuring that former students, educators, and the general public have access to the NRS archives. These events represent the important paradigm shift Canada underwent after the completion of the TRC in 2015. Before this, many Canadians did not understand the full impacts of the residential schools. Marlene Brant Castellano, a prominent scholar of Indigenous studies in Canada, asserted in 2008 that prior to the final report of the TRC, most Canadians did not view the schools as harmful: "Consensus that the residential school experience was injurious in itself, and not just in instances of physical and sexual abuse, is shared by only a small proportion of Canadian citizens, in contrast to the view of most First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people" (385). This was further confirmed in a poll conducted for *Native Residential School Resolution Canada* and the TRC in May 2008, which found that 6 out of 10 Canadians were not able to state any long-term negative impacts for students who had gone through the residential school system (Environics Institute). In the authors research, one Indigenous interviewee stated in 2014: "I think that most Canadians don't know anything about it. I think that Canadians just go on living their lives with absolutely no knowledge of that part of Canada's history" (Krömer 121). In 2017, the post TRC paradigm shift shows the opening up of this historical narrative. Most Canadians now view this history

as having had a negative impact on the Indigenous peoples of Canada. According to a 2016 survey from the Environics Institute, a majority (87 per cent) of non-Indigenous Canadians agreed that more measures have to be taken to educate Canadian schoolchildren about the historical abuses of the NRS and discrimination faced by Indigenous people in Canada. This statistic is the evidence of a massive paradigm shift unprecedented in Canadian history. It is also the result of a small group of Indigenous individuals who positioned themselves against powerful institutional bodies. This group of former residential school students (the subgroup) who first spoke out against the abuse (vernacular memory) challenged the government, churches, and school staff (those in power) that the schools were not educating Indigenous children into Christian society (official memory) but rather causing unspeakable damage to generations of Indigenous people.

The time from the first lawsuit against the Church and Canadian Government in 1988 until the present has been a period of intense struggle and mediation for the subgroup to have their narrative heard after being silenced for so long. The lawsuits, healing funds, agreements, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, all represent the interactive exchange between vernacular and official memory, which culminates into the new mediated reality of public memory, successfully brought about by the subgroup. This new mediated public memory is best reflected in the paradigm shift Canada has experienced (Environics Institute; Castellano). Indigenous leaders who are now in power have the potential to influence policy at the provincial and federal levels, raising awareness of the history and facilitating education on the subject. As of 2017, provincial and territorial curriculum on Indigenous history, cultures, and rights is now being gradually implemented in elementary and high schools in Canada (Baker). An expert on Indigenous issues) from the authors' research stated in 2014: "It is about acknowledgement and awareness of it in the Canadian public, and this is the issue. It requires a paradigm shift that needs to happen within the community, and I argue that through education that could happen. Through education and awareness empathy could be created" (Krömer 118). Assembly of First Nations National Chief Perry Bellegarde states that the "efforts aimed at public education and awareness about First Nations people, priorities, and history builds support among Canadians for a positive agenda. … Understanding how we got

here and how to address the gap in the quality of life between First Nations and non-Indigenous Canadians is essential to forging a brighter future for us all'' (*Alberta Native News*). This paper in no way claims that the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Canada is restored, nor does it claim that due to the TRC all the issues facing Indigenous communities in Canada have been addressed. On the contrary, there remains an urgent list of needs (by no means conclusive nor exhaustive): to bring justice to the victims of the Murdered and Missing Indigenous women, to close the negative quality of life gap for Indigenous groups in Canada, to end widespread high rates of suicide in Indigenous youth, to provide clean drinking water and proper housing conditions for Indigenous communities, to achieve equal funding for Indigenous child welfare, for racism and stereotypes to be continuously fought against, and above all, for Indigenous communities and cultures to be promoted and celebrated. While these needs and numerous others still require action, this paper points out that the TRC heralded an unprecedented paradigm shift which signalled a new mediated public memory of the NRS, which is the direct result of decades of efforts from Indigenous groups. This paradigm shift has taught Canadians that the residential schools caused unspeakable damage to generations of Indigenous communities across Canada and has greatly contributed to their present-day concerns. A compassionate and fuller understanding of the history provides a starting place for healing. As Canada moves forward from this history, heeding the voices of vernacular memory is paramount to the ongoing reconciliation process in a post-TRC Canada.

List of Works Cited

Admin2. "Environics survey shows public education is essential to reconciliation and closing the gap." *Alberta Native News.* Alberta Native News, 9 June 2016. Web. 10 March 2017.

Alamenciak, T. "Residential school survivors raise outcry over possible erasure of records." *The Toronto Star*. Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd., 16 July 2014. Web. 4 June 2016.

Baker III, O. "Mandatory Indigenous curriculum part of N.B.'s 10-year education plan." *CBC.ca.* CBC/Radio-Canada, 27 Feb. 2017. Web. 10 March 2017.

Black, C. "Canada's treatment of aboriginals was shameful, but it was not genocide." *National Post.* Postmedia Network Inc., 6 June 2015. Web. 8 March 2017.

Bodnar, J. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century.* 1992. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Bryce, Peter H. *The Story of National Crime, Being and Appeal for Justice to the Indians of Canada*. Ottawa: J. Hope, 1922. Print.

Canadian Department of Justice. "Definition of genocide by Canadian Law: Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act." Justice of Canada, Act. S.C. 2000, c. 24. 2000. Web. 20 Feb. 2017.

Canadian Human Rights Tribunal. "First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada et al. v. Attorney General of Canada (for the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada)." 2016 CHRT 2, Decision. 26 January 2016. Web. 11 November 2017. Castellano, M. "A Holistic Approach to Reconciliation: Insights from Research of the Aboriginal Healing Foundation." *From Truth to Reconciliation: Transforming the Legacy of Residential Schools.* Ed. M. Castellano and M. Degagne. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2008. 385-402. Print.

Carney, R. "Aboriginal Residential Schools before Confederation: The Early Experience." *CCHA Historical Studies* 61 (1995). 13-40. Print.

Chrisjohn, R. "Genocide and Indian Residential Schooling. The past is present." *Canada and International Humanitarian Law: Peacekeeping and War Crimes in the Modern Era*. Ed. R. Wiggers & A. Griffiths. Halifax: Dalhousie University Press, 2002. Print.

Clifton, R., and H. Rubenstein. "Debunking the half-truths and exaggerations in the Truth and Reconciliation Report." *National Post.* Postmedia Network Inc., 4 June 2015. Web. 5 Sept. 2015.

Clifton, R., and H. Rubenstein. "Truth and Reconciliation report tells a 'skewed and partial story' of residential schools." *National Post.* Postmedia Network Inc., 22 June 2015. Web. 5 Sept. 2015.

Dyck, D. "Fate of documents detailing abuse at residential schools undecided: TRC researcher wants documents kept in national archive but IAP chief says records should be destroyed." *CBC.ca.* CBC/Radio-Canada, 19 June 2014. Web. 1 May 2016.

Dyck, D. "Destroying sensitive Indian school *survivor* accounts 'irreversible,' court told." *CBC.ca.* CBC/Radio-Canada, 16 July 2014. Web. 1 May 2016.

Environics Institute. "Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples." Final Report 2016. Environics Institute, 2015. Web. 10 March 2017.

Environics Institute. "National Benchmark Survey prepared for Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission." Final Report 2008. Environics Institute, 2008. Web. 10 March 2017.

Galloway, G. "Critics press Ottawa to recognize wrongs against First Nations as genocide." *The Globe and Mail.* Phillip Crawley Publishers, 30 July 2013. Web. 10 May 2016.

Galloway, G. Curry, B. "Residential schools amounted to cultural genocide, report says." *The Globe and Mail.* Phillip Crawley Publishers, 2 June 2015. Web. 28 Apr. 2016.

Government of Canada Official Website. Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs. *Statement of Apology to Former Students of Indian Residential Schools*. 11 June 2008. Web. 2 June 2016.

Fontaine, P. Farber, B. "What Canada committed against First Nations was genocide. The UN should recognize it." *The Globe and Mail*. Phillip Crawley Publishers, 14 October 2013. Web. 3 May 2016.

Halbwachs, M. *On Collective Memory*. 1952. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Hayner, P. *Unspeakable Truths: Confronting State Terror and Atrocity*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Kilpatrick, S. "Chairman quits troubled residential school commission: Accuses two fellow commissioners of not heeding his authority." *CBC.ca*. CBC/Radio-Canada, 20 Oct. 2008. Web. 1 May 2016.

Krömer, A. "Social Influence and Impact on the Collective Memory of the Native Residential Schools in Canada: 1867-1996." Dissertation. U of Vienna, 2016.

Levant, E. "Indian genocide: That's what former CJC boss Bernie Farber says Canada is guilty of – a bizarre and embarrassing (for him) allegation." *Toronto Sun*. Post Media Network, 3 Aug. 2013. Web. 3 May 2016.

Macdonald, D. "Five reasons the TRC chose cultural genocide." *The Globe and Mail*. Phillip Crawley Publishers, 6 July 2015. Web. 10 May 2016.

Macdonald, N. "Senator Murray Sinclair on truth and reconciliation's progress." *Macleans.ca*. Rogers Digital Media, 1 June 2016. Web. 4 June 2016.

Mowat. v. Clarke. BCSC 432. 2000. Supreme Court of British Columbia. 3 Sept. 2000. Print.

National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation. "Mandate." University of Manitoba (NCTR), 2016. Web. 10 March 2017.

Palmater, P. "Genocide, Indian Policy, and Legislated Elimination of Indians in Canada." *Aboriginal Policy Studies*. 3.3 (2017). 27-54. Print.

Stanton, K. "Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission: Settling the Past?" *The International Indigenous Policy Journal* 2.3 (2011): 1-18. Print.

TRC Institution. "Mandate." The Official website of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. N.d. Web. 10 May 2016.

TRC Institution. "N Schedule Document." The Official website of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. N.d. Web. 10 May 2016.

UN General Assembly. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide." United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 78, p. 277, 9 December 1948. Web. 2 March 2017.

Weber, B. "Canadian government withheld food from hungry aboriginal kids in 1940s nutritional experiments, researcher finds." *The Globe and Mail*. Phillip Crawley Publishers, 16 July 2013. Web. 3 May 2016.

Welch, M. "CMHR rejects 'genocide' for native policies." *winnipegfreepress.com* Winnipeg Free Press, 26 July 2013. Web. 14 Apr. 2016.

The Controversy Around Joseph Boyden's Identity: A Missed Opportunity at Reconciliation

Patrizia Zanella (Université de Fribourg)

This paper originally proposed to investigate Joseph Boyden's task as a bridge-builder through the border-crossings in his novel *Through Black Spruce*. The literary analysis concluded that the novel crosses geographical, generic, temporal, generational, cultural, and linguistic borders. The novel indigenizes crime fiction and the plot merges the road narrative with the homing plot. Most importantly, the paper aimed to point out how the novel builds bridges between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities and traditions without erasing differences. However, the recent controversy around Joseph Boyden's self-ascribed and fabricated identity revealed that he has indeed erased differences. As a consequence, it became imperative to address these allegations of identity theft and cultural appropriation in lieu of analyzing his novel. Literary works are not divorced from their author's self-presentation, in which literary scholars, reviewers, and public media are necessarily implicated. It becomes even more urgent to address these questions in light of the ongoing incomprehension around cultural appropriation with prominent editors supporting an "appropriation prize" in May 2017 (Wente). What follows is an overview of the controversy, an elucidation of the rift between many Indigenous scholars and the literary establishment, as well as a reflection on the larger implications for the project of reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in the territory we now refer to as Canada. As one of the earliest commentators, Nooksack/Kwantlen member Robert Jago, put it: "In the 'Reconciliation' Era, Boyden has taken on a very prominent role. The path that he proposes for Reconciliation isn't one I would choose, and before Non-Native Canadians latch on to it, they should find out if it comes from an actual Native, or from a fabulist" (Jago, "Why I Question").

A novelist, short story, and non-fiction writer, Joseph Boyden is the author of three novels that have all earned prestigious prizes, such as the Scotiabank Giller Prize for the 2013 novel *The Orenda*. In 2005, his first novel *Three Day Road* established Boyden as one of the most prominent Indigenous voices on the Canadian literary scene. He subsequently became a public spokesperson on issues pertaining to Indigenous people

and to reconciliation. However, questions around Boyden's heritage intensified when he undermined his advocacy for missing and murdered Indigenous women by rallying artists to take a stand on behalf of UBC professor Steven Galloway in November 2016. Galloway was suspended after allegations of sexual assault and Boyden penned a public letter accusing the University of British Columbia of unfair treatment and calling for due process. The letter was signed by well over a hundred prominent authors and publishers, among which were Margaret Atwood, Michael Ondaatje, and Yann Martel. A few signatories withdrew their names following a public outcry and many added personal statements apologizing to survivors of sexual violence who felt silenced by the letter. The controversy led to a split within the Canadian literary scene that in many ways seemed to oppose a major portion of the established literary elite and, especially, emerging female writers (Lederman, "CanLit Civil War"). The response of Indigenous women was particularly indicting with regards to Joseph Boyden, whose involvement in penning the letter they considered at odds with his vocal support for missing and murdered Indigenous women (Bertrand and Longman). The discrepancy increased concern over Boyden's entitlement to the role of spokesperson on Indigenous issues. Criticism around Boyden intensified when Margaret Atwood tweeted that Boyden had confirmed to her that Steven Galloway had Indigenous heritage (Bertrand and Longman). Many critics responded outraged questioning the relevance of this statement, which seemed to imply that Indigeneity would act as an extenuating circumstance. They further challenged whether Boyden had the authority to confirm anyone's Indigeneity, which in turn prompted a more thorough investigation into Boyden's own background.

Interestingly, many of the arguments involving the Galloway scandal also resonate with the debate about Joseph Boyden's identity. Indigenous women, in particular, perceived the literary establishment's support of Galloway as "silencing – like a brigade of CanLit starts lining up to protect one of their own" (Lederman, "CanLit Civil War"). Similarly, the publishing industry's backing of Boyden has been perceived as dismissive of Indigenous voices (Lederman, "CanLit Civil War; Lederman, "Heritage Controversy"). Moreover, critics of the UBC accountable letter were accused of "McCarthyism" (Lederman, "CanLit Civil War"), just as critics of Boyden are now painted as enacting censure through identity politics. Both scandals have taken place in a fairly polarized

environment and, in the case of the identity debate, Boyden has been complicit in the polarization by not only triggering but reinforcing it.

On December 23, 2016, the controversy over Joseph Boyden's Indigenous heritage took the Indigenous academic world by storm after journalist Jorge Barrera published an article on "Author Joseph Boyden's Shape-Shifting Indigenous identity" in the *APTN* (Aboriginal Peoples Television Network) *National News* following a tweet by Robert Jago, which featured a video compilation of Boyden's contradictory ancestry claims (Barrera, "Shape-Shifting Identity"). Confusion about Boyden's Indigenous heritage has reigned for a while and Jonathan Kay rightly recognized that "this reckoning has been a long time coming" (Kay). However, the editor-in-chief of *The Walrus* attributed the spotlight on Boyden's heritage to motives of envy and dislike of his fiction when, in fact, Boyden's conflicting statements on his origin are responsible for the investigation as the article's title makes clear. Chronicling Boyden's contradictory claims over the years, the most baffling of which might be his self-description as Métis in the commonly misconceived sense of mixed-blood, Barrera detailed his failed search for an Indigenous ancestor in Boyden's family tree.

While many have commented that Joseph Boyden's use of the category Métis, while incorrect, is widespread, his ignorance or perhaps disinterest in using the right terminology is particularly baffling given that he is the author of *Louis Riel and Gabriel Dumont*, the famous nineteenth-century Métis leaders. In fact, the dust jacket describes Boyden as a "Canadian of Irish, Scottish, and Métis roots" (Boyden, *Riel*), a disingenuous description because it mistakenly advertises Boyden as an insider and confers an authority upon him to which he cannot lay claim. The book has been criticized by leading Métis scholars, who have also dismissed John Ralston Saul's concept of Canada as a Métis nation ('Métissage') as a reductive, neocolonial, and assimilationist concept. Incidentally, Ralston Saul wrote the foreword to *Louis Riel and Gabriel Dumont* and Boyden has openly embraced Ralston Saul's concept of 'Métissage' and has, in many ways, become its poster child. His use of the word Métis is particularly problematic because it validates one of the main criticisms aimed at Boyden, namely that he has colonized a space that was designed for Indigenous, in this case Métis, voices. His

repeated self-identification as Métis, regardless of whether he intended to use it as another term for mixed-blood rather than laying claim to ancestry from the Red River Métis, has inarguably made him the spokesperson on Métis issues in the eyes of many. While his self-identification as Métis in the metaphorical sense has endeared him to the Canadian mainstream as cultural interpreter between two worlds, that very role has discredited him in the eyes of Indigenous academics:

> He's the great reconciler, the 'Shining Bridge' between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, John Ralston Saul's dream made manifest...or not. Either way, he seems to exist in a representational vacuum, in part of his own making but largely created by a Canadian literary and media establishment that can only handle one Indigenous personality at a time, and almost always a straight, photogenic dudebro who tells the stories Canada wants to hear about itself. (Justice, "As I'm already")

Joseph Boyden's self-identification as Métis has indeed contributed to the "representational vacuum" in which he finds himself. In 2008, Boyden claimed that his mother was of Métis rather than Ojibwe ancestry and described himself as "a card carrying member of the Métis Nation who lives between Northern Ontario and Southern Louisiana" (Boyden, *Mushkegowuk* 19, 20). While Boyden has admitted to using Métis in the sense of mixed-blood (Talaga), to employ the term "card carrying member" is dangerously close to implying possession of a status card and points to a larger pattern of obfuscation. In an article published in Maclean's at the beginning of August 2017, Boyden surprisingly renewed his Métis claims and referred to his membership of the controversial Ontario Métis Aboriginal Association (Boyden, "My Name"). Whether or not it is a coincidence that he mentioned his membership for the first time since 2008 only days before Eric Andrew-Gee's exhaustive profile in the Globe and Mail made that connection public (Andrew-Gee), it remains a fact that there have been several shifts in how Boyden used and claimed the term Métis over time, including in the last year.

Boyden's at times liberal interpretation of the term Métis is comparable to his misuse of the term "Two-Spirit" (Friesen). Coined in 1990 as an intertribal umbrella term for the Indigenous queer community (Morgensen 81), Boyden was criticized for defining himself as "a bit of a two-spirit person" because he is at home in New Orleans and in Northern Ontario. At best, that is "a very ignorant thing to say" (Mailhot "Natives Don't Get Pity"); at worst, it represents a textbook case of appropriation of the term by a

straight, cisgender male unaware of his privilege. Boyden committed a similarly ignorant gaffe when he likened Trump to a trickster figure, who is the cultural hero of many Indigenous nations (Hampshire). Boyden's frequent misuse of the term Métis is therefore emblematic of a larger pattern of appropriation and ignorance. Terminology is crucial because words reflect and create reality, and the appropriation of Indigenous terminology and culture is connected to the appropriation of Indigenous lands and bodies in North America ("Cultural Appropriation" 21'-25').

Joseph Boyden has further admitted to having confused the term Mi'kmaq with the term Nipmuc, an Eastern nation to which his father's family supposedly has ties. Although Boyden initially blamed the mistake on reporters mishearing him, he admitted to the mistake in the second interview following the controversy (Boyden, "My response to APTN"; Medley). In the article he published in August 2017, his explanation shifted once again: "one of my siblings found a Boyden Mi'kmaq clan in Newfoundland. We were thrilled, although we later learned we were unrelated. Such is the complicated process of learning a family history" (Boyden, "My Name"). The credibility of the individual explanations is undermined by the competing tales Boyden has spun since December 2016 alone.

In addition, the Nipmuc ties Joseph Boyden claims through his father's lineage have not been verified either and the Nipmuc Nation Chief pointed out that there are no Nipmuc from Dartmouth, Massachusetts as Boyden claimed (Blair). These ties seem strenuous at best and are further complicated by articles about his father's brother, Erl König Boyden, also known as "Injun Joe." The 1950s articles denounce Erl Boyden as a white impostor who played Indian as a way of pandering to tourists and to sell supposedly authentic Native trinkets (Sangster). This is particularly problematic since Boyden has claimed Indigenous status through his uncle (Jago, "Not about Bloodline"; Boyden, *Three Day Road* 387-89). While Boyden has argued that his uncle had to hide his Indigenous roots due to racist attitudes of the day, that statement seems at odds with his uncle's overt display of 'Indianness.' He lived in a tepee, dressed himself in Plains Indian fashion, and openly made fun of the fact that white tourists believed his charade (Sangster).

Joseph Boyden's shifting tribal affiliations are paralleled by an ever-changing narrative of how he discovered his Indigenous heritage. In 2014, Boyden claimed that he discovered his family's Nipmuc heritage through membership rolls (Barrera, "Shape-Shifting Identity"). However, since he has not produced any such evidence, it seems logical to conclude that there is none. As lawyer Peggy Blair put it, "this isn't about an absence of records. The archival records exist: they just don't support Boyden's claim to indigenous ancestry" (Blair). In fact, Blair claims to have found the missing record of Boyden's maternal great-grandmother Kate Ellis, the only missing link Barrera was not able to verify in the *APTN* article. The record shows that both her parents were born in England (Blair). In recent interviews, Boyden did not linger on the question of the archival records he previously invoked but instead referenced family stories as proof of his heritage. These claims, however, are at odds with earlier statements. Boyden has repeatedly reiterated that his Indigenous heritage was unknown to him in his childhood and both his mother Blanche Boyden and her brother Richard Gossling confirmed to *APTN* that Joseph discovered the connection and did the research: "'He [Joseph] is really the one who raised this issue to begin with or indicated there was a connection'" (Barrera, "Shape-Shifting Identity"). Blanche Boyden further reiterated that Joseph was in possession of archival evidence. If that were the case, however, he could have pointed out the mistake in Jorge Barrera's research or, alternatively, explained how his own research unintentionally misled him to discover Indigenous ancestors.

Unable to produce the documentary evidence he had previously claimed to possess, Joseph Boyden instead invoked his families' stories as proof of his Indigenous heritage. Unfortunately, he only referred to these stories in the vaguest terms, repeatedly characterizing them as "painful," "beautiful," "amazing," and, above all, implicitly, personal (Boyden, Interview with Candy Palmater). However, several critics have pointed out that the tradition of oral storytelling does not imply that there are no verification mechanisms: "The basis of community isn't storytelling. The basis of community is community, in which stories make sense — not the reverse. Any claim that stories are the basis of it all, is just self-promotion by the writer class" (Salutin). Terese Mailhot further points out that, even within communities, storytelling is not immune to embellishment, quite on the contrary: "People laud oratory as record keeping, absolute

truth, and truly Indigenous, but not all storytellers and orators are authorities and record keepers. Some of us are raised in the tradition of embellishment -- in the way a story can lie to tell the truth, or the way language creates reality. Story is more dynamic than simple truth, and a writer should know that" (Mailhot, "Apology"). What is at stake in Boyden's reference to oral storytelling is the potential misappropriation of Indigenous orality in a fetishized, essentialized manner.

In a similar fashion, Terese Mailhot took issue with Boyden's demand for a sit-down with an elder in a circle during potential interviews: "He's somewhat perpetuating a stereotype by assuming the only right way to handle an issue is to sit in a circle with an Elder in Residence" (Mailhot, "Natives Don't Get Pity"). She reminded Boyden that contemporary Natives do not live within "'the sacred and safe place' of a 'speaking circle'" but conduct their debates on social media in real time. She further pointed out his position of privilege in that he had the opportunity to explain himself and apologize while most Natives are not allotted the benefit of the doubt and "the luxury of pity" (Mailhot, "Natives Don't Get Pity"). She urged Boyden to take that opportunity and "stop trying to Hippy Native his way out of this" (Mailhot, "Natives Don't Get Pity").

Despite his assertion that the subject of his ancestry is a personal and painful topic, Joseph Boyden and his supporters failed to acknowledge that the same holds true for the Indigenous people speaking up in the debate. While Boyden has been under attack from a considerable number of critics, others have come forward on social media to voice their support for him, and some have voiced anxiety over the fact that the debate has reinforced their fear of rejection (Hayden Taylor). By obscuring his heritage, Boyden has unwittingly stoked the fires set alight by colonialism while disregarding the work conducted in "the burgeoning field of tribal constitutionalism" (Doerfler xiii). In fact, a very complex and well-informed debate is taking place in Indigenous communities and academic circles about how to reform and decolonize criteria for tribal membership, which remains the prerogative of each tribal nation. Centuries of colonialism, oppression, and legislated identity have complicated questions of Indian status and tribal membership. The imposition of the US-Canadian border has divided nations and created confusion and outside pressure on Indigenous communities persists (Jarvis; "Indigenous Identity"). As recently as 2013, the Family Homes on Reserves and Matrimonial Interests

or Rights Act, "passed against the objections of First Nations, forced every First Nation to examine membership rules, including how they relate to Non-Natives inheriting the rights and property of their First Nations partners" (Jago, "Not about Bloodlines").[24]

In his refusal to hold himself accountable to Indigenous communities, the rhetoric Joseph Boyden employs bears similarities to colonial discourse. He has painted himself as the victim and characterized Indigenous critics as unfairly attacking him based on colonial, racist standards. As Cherokee scholar Daniel Heath Justice put it, "[w]orst of all, he & advocates have spun 'savage' narrative about his critics--all to protect his entitlement claims. Unreal" (Justice, "Worst of all"). In fact, just like John Ralston Saul's concept of 'Métissage' represents "a settler move to innocence" as articulated by Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang (Vowel, Métissage), Boyden's assertion of his innocence, good intentions, and victimhood is reminiscent of what David Treuer has labelled "the fiction of goodness [that] is itself an act of violence" because it conceals the violence it enacts on others (Treuer). Boyden in fact reprimanded people who asked him to produce evidence, not acknowledging the fact that his own claims were the reason documents were invoked in the first place. In doing so, Boyden perpetuated the narratives of non-Indigenous journalists such as *The Walrus*'s editor-in-chief, Jonathan Kay, who framed the investigation in racial terms by proclaiming that "[a]n attack upon a man's racial composition is never an entirely benign exercise" (Kay). Kay quotes excerpts from John Milton Earle's 1861 report, a resource for Barrera's investigation that showcases the difficulty of recording genealogies. His article strikes a somewhat condescending tone as he lectures us that Earle, a

> nineteenth-century writer seemed, in some ways, more progressive, and more realistic about the multiracial human animal, than Boyden's own critics. Consider this passage from Earle: "When it is considered that the intermixture, both with the whites and the blacks,

[24] Jago goes on to specify that "[t]he outcome of these debates has been varied, and ranges from the widely criticized blood quantum rules of Kahnawake, to a laissez-faire contract-based system of inheritance—one that is open to inheritance by non natives—that my mother is helping to introduce on the Kwantlen First Nation" ("Not about Bloodlines"). In fact, there is no unified response among and within Indigenous communities to these questions. If I use the terms Indigenous community in this essay, I aim above all to indicate the overarching rift between the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous community that has emerged from the debate (Rivas).

> commenced more than two hundred years ago, and that, in the course of ten or twelve generations, there has been an opportunity, from intermarriages among themselves, for the foreign blood early introduced to permeate the whole mass … it would be a marvel indeed, if any Indian of the pure native race remained." (Kay)

The passage Kay quotes to illustrate the progressive rhetoric of Earle that is supposed to enlighten Boyden's critics in truth operates with concepts of racial purity that are anything but forward-thinking. Kay's argument illustrates the fact that "[o]utside commentators, especially those working in mainstream media, have failed to understand what's at stake" (Bertrand and Longman). Not only has Kay failed to grasp that the conversation revolves not around discussions of racial purity, he is portraying Boyden's critics, who are mostly Indigenous, as backwards, removed from reality, and colonized while somehow failing to acknowledge the realities of colonization. Indigenous people are very much aware of the fact that residential schools, the Sixties Scoop, and the ongoing bias in the child welfare system have torn families apart and muddied the waters. Kay's comments dismiss both the efforts of individuals to reconnect with their Indigenous heritage in a responsible way and the hard work of tribal nations to regulate membership criteria in a way that does not endanger their sovereignty. Verifying claims to Indigenous ancestry is not only a benign exercise for tribal nations but essential to their survival. Discrediting these efforts by pointing at the history of intermarriage, without counting instances of sexual violence, is a way of using Indigenous ancestors, who are often imagined rather than real, in order to silence contemporary Indigenous people and undermine their claims to sovereignty.

As a result of outside commentators framing the controversy in terms of race and undue identity politics, Indigenous commentators spent much time reiterating the premise of the controversy: "In the non-Native media, the issue has been debated entirely on Boyden's terms—of blood, dna, and ancestry. […] For us, the issue is right there in the aptn article's title: 'Boyden's shifting identity'" (Jago, "Not about Bloodline"). This is not a case of identity politics. This is about honesty and accountability. Many people have come forward to say that he still has a place in the conversation and that they encourage him to keep writing fiction, but that he needs to earn his place first, or, rather, again. One of his most high-profile defenders in the early stages of the controversy, Anishinaabe artist and politician Wab Kinew, has characterized Boyden's response so far as

insufficient, as the beginning rather than the end of a conversation, and has admitted that while he stands behind Boyden's fiction, "this whole episode has made me want to go reread his work" (Austen). Kinew penned an opinion piece in the *Globe and Mail* at the beginning of January in which he asserted that Boyden's "place among us was built by writing about, giving back to and befriending us" and that he will continue to hold that place "if he keeps coming back" (Kinew). At the same time, Kinew expressed the wish that Boyden would "rescind the UBC letter, apologize for his comments about missing and murdered women, and be direct with us about his ancestry" (Kinew). Boyden's public appearances only comprised the apology, which for many rings hollow without rescinding the letter, and neglected to be straightforward about his ancestry.

The debate has doubtlessly tainted Joseph Boyden's fiction in academic circles, at least among Indigenous scholars. Sandra Muse Isaacs announced that she will withdraw Boyden's books from her class on Indigenous literature at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and others will doubtlessly follow suit (Roache). Many non-Indigenous responses, in turn, contained worry about the prospective shunning and loss of Boyden's fictional voice. Journalist and author Stephen Kimber wrote an article aimed at protecting Boyden's place in the literary scene and his "powerful, sympathetic, empathetic voice" (Kimber). The reason that voice is endangered, however, is not attributable to Boyden's background but to his disingenuous self-representation. Kimber's statement that "Boyden's CanLit success had long since transcended whatever his real roots are" is strangely evocative of Boyden's subsequent interpretation that his fame has outgrown his blood quantum (Kimber; Medley). Both statements implicitly locate the problem as one of quantum and percentages when it really is about a possible absence and its concurrent disguise. Kimber's statement further implies that Boyden's literary success is being reduced to and conflated with his self-ascribed Indigenous identity. However, critics do not diminish the quality of his fiction but question the way Boyden has marketed his authority on the subject of his fiction (Paradkar). If anyone undermined the quality of his fiction, it was Boyden himself when he felt the need to market himself as an Indigenous author by falsely claiming tribal affiliations. Despite withdrawing his novels from her classroom, Muse Isaacs "admires Boyden's quality of writing and says there is a place for his books in Canadian literature…just not in her

classroom," which is devoted to Indigenous literature (Roache). Kimber and others also bemoaned and belittled the debate that has been taking place on social media as a "rush to judgment" (Kimber; Kay). This does not do justice to the sophisticated and complex ways in which Indigenous scholars have broached questions of identity and identity theft. While believing that Boyden made an innocent mistake is a comforting narrative, it is hard to sustain in the aftermath of his evasive public appearance.

If the Boyden identity debate is not about blood quantum, DNA, or ancestry, but about honesty and accountability, it is also first and foremost about Indigenous sovereignty. Doug Cuthand, a Cree columnist for the *Saskatoon StarPhoenix*, argues for a more inclusive approach in the face of the "growing diaspora of off reserve people" but never at the expense of Indigenous self-determination: "Boyden has stated that he has Ojibway heritage and I won't dispute it. It is between himself and the Ojibway Nation to determine" (Persson). It is "about nations' rights to decide who is a member or part of their community" (Talaga). Anishinaabe scholar Veldon Coburn admonished Boyden in the following terms: "don't put your self-identification before their right to self-determination" (Coburn). Disrespecting the need for a specific community's acknowledgment undermines Indigenous sovereignty. Even with proof of ancestry, community acknowledgment is central to Indigenous concepts of identity and belonging. Onondaga scholar David Newhouse has pointed out that Indigenous identity can be determined through four ways: ancestry (which requires documentation), community membership, Aboriginal nation membership, and the Indian Act or Supreme Court of Canada. He has further pointed out that only the Canadian state converts ancestry into Indigenous identity without requiring acknowledgement by an Indigenous community (Newhouse). For Indigenous nations, determining identity is an exercise of their sovereignty. Fraudulent claims put that sovereignty at risk: "Ethnic fraud sabotages the necessary work of rebuilding indigenous nations" and "asking where you're from can be as much a greeting as a form of self-preservation" (Hayden). By committing ethnic fraud, Boyden continued the colonial project of dismantling Indigenous sovereignty.

This does not mean that anyone disputes Boyden's personal ties to many individual tribal members who claim him, such as the Tozer family near Moosonee. The fact that Boyden

has ties to individuals of Indigenous communities and that he has involved himself in those communities is undisputed, but that his representation as a spokesperson for those communities remains questionable as Gchi'mnissing Anishinaabe writer and educator Hayden King argued with regard to Christian Island and as others argued with regard to the Mushkegowuk Cree communities (Hayden; Austen). Involvement in Indigenous communities does not grant the right to fabricate an Indigenous identity. Boyden's fiction could have been an example of appreciation of Indigenous stories and involvement with Indigenous communities, but his own refusal to be truthful about his false tribal affiliation claims turned his fiction into an example of appropriation.

In fact, Joseph Boyden's recent adoption into an Ojibwe family does not disentangle the convoluted narrative he has presented so far (Robinson-Desjarlais). He revealed the adoption plan during his first public interview with Candy Palmater, a friend of the author, three weeks after Barrera's article. Many have raised eyebrows at the adoption's timing while for the most part maintaining that it is the prerogative of a sovereign nation to regulate their adoption process. In ways that again defy the mainstream accusation of divisive identity politics conducted by Indigenous critics, academics have used the opportunity to engage in a larger discussion about adoption. Ojibwe scholar Damien Lee, who was adopted at a young age and recently enrolled into the Fort Williams First Nation, offered particularly thoughtful comments on Boyden's adoption in a Twitter thread. In his eyes, adoption is valuable because it "centres familial self-determination in claiming" and "queers citizenship." At the same time, he worried that it "can become the easy out. The ace up the sleeve. The stamp of validity" (Lee). He therefore drew attention to the "limits on adoption" and to the nuance that adoption creates "the POSSIBILITY of belonging, but not belonging itself," which is still tied to accountability and reciprocity (Lee). Most Indigenous academics who have spoken out on the issue would have liked to see accountability preceding adoption, just as truth is a prerogative for reconciliation (Dumont).

To recap the ways in which Joseph Boyden has flunked the accountability test, he has claimed to be part Métis, Ojibway, Mi'kmaq, and Nipmuc. As far as his mother's Ojibwe origins are concerned, he has pinpointed the Wasauksing First Nation as well as Cape

Croker, which is Saugeen Ojibway (Blair). None of these claims have ever been substantiated by historical evidence. Boyden not only shifted the narrative of his tribal affiliation but also his explanations of its discovery. He went from claiming documented evidence to evoking family stories before seeking shelter behind the adoption narrative. Adoption is a legitimate tool but it fails to answer any of the questions he was initially asked. It has further infuriated people who see it as an attempt to protect his privileged position without holding himself accountable for his earlier narratives.

As Daniel Heath Justice put it, the problem is less Boyden's bloodline (although it would be problematic if he had none) but more a question of behaviour (Justice, "As I'm already"). By crafting a confounding and ever-changing narrative, Boyden forfeited his right to the sort of privacy he might otherwise claim. His insistence on privacy also seems a little disingenuous in light of the revelations that he used the real names of elders in his novels without their knowledge nor permission (Carpenter). While Boyden stated in his second interview with *The Globe and Mail* that "[i]t is time for me to listen" (Medley), many Indigenous people feel that his interview is proof that he either has not listened to the concerns they raised and that he deliberately employed diversion tactics (Fontaine). His use of the terminology "pedigree" and "bloodline" seems to lend credence to non-Indigenous critics who claimed the controversy amounted to a race-based witch hunt. As Robert Jago pointed out, "it is Boyden himself and his supporters who refer to blood. 'I have one-eighth aboriginal blood, the same amount as Louis Riel,' he once declared" (Jago, "Not about Bloodline"). In fact, Boyden interpreted the controversy in the following manner: "'What I think has happened, if I can put my finger on it, is that my go-to-guy role as a spokesperson for indigenous issues has outgrown my blood quantum,' he said, which he called a 'colonial means' for establishing indigenous heritage" (Medley). This statement is clear evidence that he has not engaged with the criticism and sadly seems to lend credence to Daniel Heath Justice's claim that Boyden "clearly knows little of the field, its critical debates, its analytical contours, its history and heritage" (Justice, "As I'm already"). He disingenuously frames himself as the victim of racialized identity politics when in fact he got tangled in the web of his own shifting narrative.

Joseph Boyden's apology was limited to his role as a spokesperson but that does not represent the crux of the problem. In fact, his political activism can also be interpreted as a sign of good faith, good intentions, and an effort to give back to Indigenous communities. His role as spokesperson has little to do with blood quantum, since Boyden has always been frank about the fact that, as he reiterated in mid-January 2017, "a small part of me is indigenous, but it's a big part of who I am" (Medley). While many non-Indigenous Canadians conceive of Boyden as speaking from a privileged insider position (Rettino), Indigenous people always knew that he wrote as an outsider in the sense that he had not grown up within an Indigenous community and certainly not within the communities he wrote about. As Wab Kinew pointed out, Boyden always occupied the role of "a talented outsider" in authoring short stories and two novels about the Mushkegowuk Cree of James Bay (Kinew). The same holds true for *The Orenda* that centers on the Wendat, also known as Huron, and Haudenosaunee, or Iroquois, as he has never claimed descendancy from either nation. Or so we thought. It was pointed out in mid-January 2017 that Boyden had previously claimed that "his ancestors were from the bear tribe (Attignawantan) of the Wendat population" in an interview with CBC News (Blair; Stojsic). If the article mistakenly described Boyden as Wendat, he has not bothered to correct the statement, and neither has he addressed this latest in a string of misrepresentations since it was presented on social media. Everything points to the fact that he misappropriated identity and misled the public in a deliberate attempt to present himself as an insider. Indeed, the Wendat claim dates back to an interview with Peter Mansbridge about *The Orenda* in December 2013, roughly two months after the novel's release, which points to an intentionally fraudulent ancestry claims for promotional purposes.

The best articulation of the harm Joseph Boyden's self-identification inflicts upon the Indigenous community is perhaps best articulated in a letter penned by prominent female Indigenous scholars when they raised questions about alleged Cherokee scholar Andrea Smith in 2015:

> our concerns about Andrea Smith do not emerge from statist forms of enrollment or non-enrollment, federal recognition or lack thereof. They are not about blood quantum or other biologically essentialist notions of identity. Nor are they about cultural purity or authenticity, or imposing standards of identification that those who would work for or with indigenous communities must meet.
>
> Rather, our concerns are about the profound need for transparency and responsibility in light of the traumatic histories of colonization, slavery, and genocide that shape the present. (Barker et al)

The letter specifies that the questions are intended to "challenge both individual and structural forms of indigenous erasure" (Barker et al). Hayden King similarly frames the Boyden controversy as an example of erasure. King contends that Boyden has no Indigenous ancestry and his role as a spokesperson for Indigenous people has thus led to "basically having a white man tell other Canadians what native people want," which amounts to fulfilling "the ultimate goal of a colonial society: Erase the native people" (Austen). By continuing to claim Indigenous roots while refusing to resolve his conflicting narrative and to answer the Indigenous community's questions, Boyden actively participates in Indigenous erasure. It seems baffling that the author of the 2015 *Macleans* article "First Came Truth. Now Comes the Hard Part" fails to understand why transparency on this issue has to be the prerequisite for his inclusion in the Indigenous community.

Indigenous people feel justifiably betrayed by Joseph Boyden's inability to answer questions about belonging and community. His deception is consequential because he was in many ways a symbol Indigenous people took pride in: "We thought the system actually worked – an Indigenous person made it through the struggle and earned these things. We celebrated Joseph" (Paquette). A profound sense of betrayal also emerged from the responses on Twitter as people compared the competing claims Boyden made to them personally. Métis scholar Chelsea Vowel felt used and guilty: "I feel complicit in a way, for tutoring him on certain issues. So he could 'pass' better?" (Vowel, "I feel complicit"). She further expressed frustration at Boyden's lack of intervention at false identity claims: "When I said he needs to stop identifying as Métis, and stop letting people identify him as Métis he said it was out of his hands" (Vowel, "When I said"). Stephen Kimber rightly perceived that "Twitter filled with angry shouts" but labelling those as a "rush to judgment" fails to credit the fact so many Indigenous individuals have

given Boyden the benefit of the doubt for over fifteen years (Kimber). It further fails to acknowledge the commonplaceness of the wannabe Indian as the Twitter responses evoked a plethora of stories about other impostors. Playing Indian has a long history in North America that persists to this day, a phenomenon that has become known as "Grey Owling" (Rivas). Playing Indian is easy and it is "safe" because one can do so without "hav[ing] to face the discrimination and pain of inheriting an Indigenous identity" (Paquette). Whilst many individuals struggle to prove their place in the community in responsible ways, "PretendIndians are an assault on Indigenous sovereignty" (TallBear), and, unlike the Rachel Dolezal phenomenon, that assault continues unabated through a string of impostors. Awareness of that history and its ubiquity is essential if we are to understand the outrage the *APTN* article has sparked.

Indigenous people's familiarity with wannabe Indians may explain one of the most striking aspects of the debate about Boyden's identity, namely the divide between non-Indigenous commentators and more skeptical Indigenous responders. The publishing industry and mainstream media have stood behind Boyden, invoking his literary accomplishments that remain untainted by the controversy and separate from his heritage, decrying the controversy to be a case of identity politics gone awry, and even going so far as to accuse the Indigenous community of a witch-hunt and racism in their questions over blood quantum. What such responses fail to understand is the fact that Boyden's heritage is not solely a question of blood quantum but a question of relations and accountability to a community. Accusing the Indigenous community of perpetrating colonialist concepts of blood quantum is a little ironic given that this is precisely the colonial criteria imposed on Indigenous communities that have complicated questions of membership and belonging. In Robert Jago's words, "[f]or non-Natives to call this investigation a "lynching" or a racial witch hunt is the epitome of colonial arrogance" (Jago, "Not about Bloodlines"). It is also a sign of hypocrisy, as Robert Jago astutely remarked, because demands for accountability are portrayed as outrageous even while there are stringent rules and regulations established to safeguard Canadian cultural content from being appropriated by the overwhelming US market (Jago, "Hypocrites"). Canadians, and Europeans for that matter, are acutely aware of the power imbalance between the United States and Canada, but the non-Indigenous response as a whole betrays a distinct lack of understanding of or

deliberate blindness toward the power imbalance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities, cultural appropriation, and Indigenous sovereignty.[25]

Non-Indigenous responders along with a few Indigenous commentators such as Drew Hayden Taylor moreover tend to refuse the complaint that Joseph Boyden has taken up space on the national stage at the expense of other Indigenous artists (Hayden Taylor). His success has no doubt introduced a number of Canadians to Indigenous literature and prompted them to read further. While Boyden accepted that he had overstepped his role as a spokesperson on Indigenous issues, he refused to accept any such criticism related to his fiction: "The idea that I've somehow hogged all the air in the room, it doesn't hold a lot of water. What I hope and think that my books do, just like Thomas King's do, just like Lee Maracle's beautiful work does, like Drew Hayden Taylor – it makes readers hungry for more, not less" (Medley). As a literary critic, I would like to concur with his belief that fiction opens people's minds and makes them more receptive to and curious about Indigenous voices. However, it is an undeniable political reality that there is a limited amount of space accorded to Indigenous writers on the national public stage. In addition, Boyden's comparison of his own work to that of major Indigenous writers in Canada unambiguously signals that he is not willing to give up the space he has come to occupy.

Boyden also vehemently refused to apologize for any financial support he may have received that was reserved for other Indigenous artists, a benefit that Rebeka Tabobondung, editor of *Muskrat Magazine*, has characterized as "easily the most troubling to the Indigenous arts community" (Bertrand and Longman). He referenced a single award, the McNally Robinson Aboriginal Book of the Year Award, for which he was nominated by others and whose prize money of 5.000 dollars he decided to split with the other four nominees. He responded to the question about his involvement in the Reconciliation arts project where he wrote the script for a ballet about residential school

[25] Robert Jago noted that mainstream media had become more skeptical in their reaction to Boyden's article published in August 2017 ("Indigenous Identity"). The way Boyden's forthcoming novel will be marketed and received will also be telling.

by citing that he received very little money for his efforts. His comments were perceived as incendiary, condescending, and cited as further proof of his privileged position: "I don't think Boyden realizes how a thousand dollars could impact a Native artist's life" (Mailhot "Apology"). Awards and grants destined for Indigenous artists are not merely symbolic recognition but they are designed to "even the playing field after centuries of inequality" (Paquette). While Boyden only acknowledged the financial benefit of the McNally Robinson Award, he has undoubtedly collected a lot of speaker fees as the go-to-guy on Indigenous issues, in particular on reconciliation (Blair). Case in point, prior to this debate we had planned to invite him to the Young Scholars' Forum of the Association of Canadian Studies in German-Speaking Countries in 2018. While he is no longer a viable option for us, Boyden continues to be sought out as a speaker and has appeared at the Edmonton Public Library, the Red Deer Public Library, the Canadian Museums Association, the Kama Reading Series, and Curious Minds since February 2017. Contrary to what his supporters feared, the controversy has not hurt his career and, by virtue of his fiction, he continues to be a symbol for reconciliation in the eyes of the broader public. In France, the literary festival Oh Les Beaux Jours openly advertised Boyden as a bicultural writer whose fiction portrays the birth of Canada from an Indigenous perspective for the first time and whose performance will include shamanistic elements ("Les beaux jours"). This essentialized, romanticized version of the lone Indigenous writer is precisely what critics cautioned against with regards to Boyden's talk about being Indigenous rather than belonging to a specific nation: "we are still nations like any others on Earth — we're not new-agey, touchy-feely 'states of mind'" (Jago, "Indigenous Identity").

Joseph Boyden keeps taking away grant money and space from Indigenous writers, partly owing to a system that provides limited space for Indigenous voices but in which he is complicit by obscuring his heritage. In fact, the problem lies with the expectation the label of Indigenous writer creates for his readership and literary critics have a role in managing audience expectations. While it is the role of Indigenous nations to ascertain identity, it is the role of literary critics to present writers as Indigenous in a way that does not undermine that tribal sovereignty. Especially as non-Indigenous literary critics of Indigenous literature, our work needs to engage with texts in an ethical way that does not

undermine Indigenous sovereignty and that contributes to decolonization. Indigenous scholars today still harbour deeply engrained suspicions towards academia: "the academy's primary intention is to use Indigenous peoples and our knowledge systems to legitimize settler colonial authority within education as a training ground to legitimize settler colonial authority over Indigenous peoples and our nations in Canadian society" (Simpson). At this point of the conversation, presenting Joseph Boyden as an Indigenous writer is tantamount to legitimizing settler colonial authority over Indigenous peoples.

Joseph Boyden's identity controversy is enlightening for non-Indigenous critics because it exemplifies the high degree of accountability to which Indigenous writers are held. The fact that these standards are not shared by the larger literary community is perhaps best exemplified by J. K. Rowling's Native American-inspired wizard story. Even more than the cultural appropriation the story participated in, Rowling's silence in the face of vocal Indigenous criticism contributed to Indigenous erasure. When an author is unaccountable to a community, appropriation and erasure are often the logical consequence. The case of Boyden is obviously different but it participates in those self-same mechanisms of erasure, especially as further evidence has arisen that he has not properly credited Indigenous sources and even plagiarized from Lac La Croix Ojibway storyteller Ron Geyshick's *Te Bwe Win* (Barrera, "Similarities"). Plagiarism is the most blatant form of appropriation, which is not tolerated by any literary community. The fact that the plagiarism allegations have not generated much debate is as much a proof of the indefensibility of this particular instance of appropriation as it is a symptom of the mainstream's wilful blindness towards Boyden's manifold acts of appropriation. His dubious and contested explanation that Geyshick's story was "an oral story that was floating around in the mid-1990s up north," his uninformed assertion that "[n]obody owns an oral story," in addition to his characterization of historical novelists as explorers are dangerously aligned with settler colonial rhetoric that betray once again his lack of accountability (Barrera, "Ojibway"; Dundas; Jure). As Métis artist and curator David Garneau put it, "ethical behaviour is not a necessary condition for being an artist. Ethics is, however, a requirement for curators" (Garneau). Literary critics are part of the literary world's curatorial apparatus and, especially in light of Joseph Boyden's refusal to hold himself accountable to Indigenous communities, accountability falls to us.

While the response to Joseph Boyden's shifting claims among Indigenous communities has been varied, Indigenous academics overall have rejected Joseph Boyden's explanations as insufficient in the aftermath of the debate (Ahearn). Both Indigenous and non-Indigenous supporters of Boyden have mainly framed the controversy in terms of blood quantum, the literary quality of his fiction, and his involvement with Indigenous communities without addressing his conflicting identity claims, which remain unresolved. His ongoing contradictions and evasions center around a vague notion of Indigenous heritage that undermines Indigenous sovereignty and fail to recognize his own complicity in the controversy. This is particularly problematic because Joseph Boyden is still one of Canada's poster children for reconciliation. In fact, readers are enamoured with Boyden's books because they "reek of reconciliation, a concept Canadians have consumed to the point of euphoria," at least in its articulation of apology for the past without recognition of and action against ongoing colonialism (Hafez). Given his prominent role in the reconciliation process, the controversy presented an opportunity for Boyden to show Canada a concrete example of truth, dialogue, and reconciliation. His evasive responses amount to a missed opportunity at reconciliation, and the debate at large is an important reminder to the literary community that if reconciliation is to happen in meaningful ways, if it can happen at all, we must listen to voices of dissent, hire more Indigenous editors, resist the urge to appoint a limited number of spokespeople, and diversify the literary canon beyond the inclusion of a few token minority writers, of which Boyden is not one.

List of Works Cited

Ahearn, Victoria. "Joseph Boyden Statements on Indigenous Roots Too Vague, Say Academics." *The Province* 12 Jan. 2017 (updated 13 Jan. 2017). Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.theprovince.com/entertainment/joseph+boyden+statements+indigenous+roots+vague+academics/12701403/story.html>.

Andrew-Gee, Eric. "The Making of Joseph Boyden." *The Globe and Mail* 04 August 2017. Web. 04 Aug. 2017. <www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/joseph-boyden/article35881215/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&>.

Austen, Ian. "A Voice for Indigenous Canadians Defends His Claim to Be One." *The New York Times* 13 Jan. 2017. Web. 14 Jan. 2017.

<www.nytimes.com/2017/01/13/world/americas/canada-joseph-boyden-indigenous-canadians.html>.

Barker, Joanne, et al. "Open Letter from Indigenous Women Scholars Regarding Discussions of Andrea Smith." *Indian Country Media Network* 7 July 2015. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/opinions/open-letter-from-indigenous-women-scholars-regarding-discussions-of-andrea-smith/>.

Barrera, Jorge. "Author Joseph Boyden's Shape-Shifting Indigenous Identity." *APTN National News* 23 Dec. 2016. Web. 23 Dec. 2016. <www.aptnnews.ca/2016/12/23/author-joseph-boydens-shape-shifting-indigenous-identity/>.

-----. "Ojibway Healer's Family Rejects Meeting with Joseph Boyden." *APTN National News* 02 Mar. 2017. Web. 05 Mar. 2017. <www.aptnnews.ca/2017/03/02/ojibway-healers-family-rejects-meeting-with-joseph-boyden/>.

-----. "Similarities between Joseph Boyden Story and Ojibway Healer's Published Work Trigger Questions." *APTN National News* 22 Feb. 2017. Web. 23 Feb. 2017. <www.aptnnews.ca/2017/02/22/similarities-between-joseph-boyden-story-and-ojibway-healers-published-work-trigger-questions/>.

Bertrand, Nahka, and Nickita Longman. "How Joseph Boyden's Claims to Indigeneity Affect Us All." *Ricochet* 1 Jan. 2017. Web. 11 Jan. 2017. <www.ricochet.media/en/1609/how-joseph-boydens-claims-to-indigeneity-affect-us-all>.

Blair, Peggy. "The Inconsistencies in Joseph Boyden's Various Backgrounds." *Peggy Blair*, 13 Jan. 2017. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <https://peggyblair.wordpress.com/2017/01/13/the-inconsistencies-in-joseph-boydens-various-backgrounds/>.

Boyden, Joseph. "First Came Truth. Now Comes the Hard Part." *Maclean's* 25 June 2015. Web. 24 May 2016. <www.macleans.ca/news/canada/first-came-truth-now-comes-the-hard-part/>.

---. Interview with Candy Palmater. "Full Interview: Joseph Boyden on His Heritage." *CBC Radio Q* 12 Jan. 2017. Web. 12 Jan. 2017. <www.cbc.ca/radio/q/full-interview-joseph-boyden-on-his-heritage-1.3932147>.

---. *Louis Riel and Gabriel Dumont*. Toronto: Penguin, 2010.

---. *A Mixed-Blood Highway: From Mushkegowuk to New Orleans*. Edmonton: NeWest Press, 2008.

---. "My Name Is Joseph Boyden." *Maclean's* 02 Aug. 2017. Web. 04 Aug. 2017. <www.macleans.ca/news/canada/my-name-is-joseph-boyden/>.

---. "An Open Letter To UBC: Steven Galloway's Right To Due Process." *UBC Accountable* 14 Nov. 2016. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.ubcaccountable.com/open-letter/steven-galloway-ubc/>.

---. *Three Day Road*. Toronto: Penguin, 2005.

---. *Through Black Spruce*. Toronto: Penguin, 2008.

Boyden, Joseph (josephboyden). "My response to APTN." *Twitter* 24 Dec. 2016, 3:15 p.m.
Web. 24 Dec. 2016. <www.twitter.com/josephboyden/status/812798846438928384?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw>.

Carpenter, Lenny. "Boyden: 'I discovered a gold mine' on James Bay." *Lennyshish* 30 Dec.
2016. 16. Jan. 2017. <https://lennyshish.wordpress.com/2016/12/30/boyden-i-discovered-a-gold-mine-on-james-bay/>.

Coburn, Veldon (VeldonCoburn). "@josephboyden don't put your self-identification before
their right to self-determination." *Twitter* 24 Dec. 2016, 3:23 p.m. Web. 17 Jan. 2017. <www.twitter.com/VeldonCoburn/status/812800910606946304>.

"Cultural Appropriation Is an Inherently Political Act." *Canadaland Commons* 16 May 2017. Web. 16 May 2017. <www.canadalandshow.com/podcast/6970-2/>.

Doerfler, Jill. *Those Who Belong. Identity, Family, Blood, and Citizenship among the White Earth Anishinaabeg*. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2015.

Dundas, Deborah. "Joseph Boyden Defends His Story against Allegations." *The Star* 24 Feb. 2017. Web. 24 Feb. 2017. <www.thestar.com/news/canada/2017/02/24/joseph-boyden-defends-his-story-against-allegations.html>.

Fontaine, Tim. "Joseph Boyden's First Interview 'a Start' but It Leaves Unanswered Questions." *CBC News* 12 Jan. 2017. Web. 12 Jan. 2017. <www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/joseph-boyden-indigenous-unanswered-questions-1.3932355>.

Friesen, Eric. "Joseph Boyden. A Spirited Voice." *Nuvo Magazine* 28 May 2011. Web. 08 Mar. 2017. <www.nuvomagazine.com/magazine/spring-2011/novelist-joseph-boyden>.

Garneau, David. "A Few Thoughts on Inappropriate Appropriations." *Facebook* 16 May 2017. Web. 16 May 2017. <www.facebook.com/david.garneau.79/posts/10154432552541363>.

Hafez, Shady. "10 Reasons Why Joseph Boyden Is a Problem and Should Go Away." *Not Your Average Indian* 2017. Web. 07 Mar. 2017. <https://notyouraverageindian.wordpress.com/2017/03/07/10-reasons-why-joseph-boyden-is-a-problem-and-should-go-away/>.

Hampshire, Gareth. "Writer Joseph Boyden Dares Edmonton Indigenous Community to Dream Big." *CBC News* 09 Nov. 2016. Web. 22 Jan. 2017. <www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/boyden-indigenous-innovation-summit-1.3844277>.

Hayden Taylor, Drew. "Is Joseph Boyden 'Grey Owling'?" *Now* 10 Jan. 2017. Web. 06 Feb. 2017. <www.nowtoronto.com/news/in-defense-of-joseph-boyden/>.

"Indigenous Identity and the Case of Joseph Boyden." *The Current* from CBC Radio 05 Jan. 2017. Web. 20 Jan. 2017. <www.cbc.ca/radio/thecurrent/the-current-for-january-5-2017-1.3921340/january-5-2017-full-episode-transcript-1.3923512#segment3>.

Jago, Robert. "The Boyden Controversy Is Not about Bloodline." *The Walrus* 10 Jan. 2017. Web. 17 Jan. 2017. <www.thewalrus.ca/the-boyden-controversy-is-not-about-bloodline/>.

---. "Joseph Boyden Won't Find Indigenous Identity in a Test Tube of Spit." *Canada Land* 04 Aug. 2017. Web. 14 Aug. 2017. <http://www.canadalandshow.com/joseph-boyden-indigenous-dna/>.

---. "On Cultural Appropriation, Canadians Are Hypocrites." *The Walrus* 18 May 2017. Web. 18 May 2017. <www.thewalrus.ca/on-cultural-appropriation-canadians-are-hypocrites/>.

---. "Why I Question Joseph Boyden's Indigenous Ancestry." *Canada Land* 24 Dec. 2016. Web. 15 Jan. 2017. <www.canadalandshow.com/question-joseph-boydens-indigenous-ancestry/>.

Jarvis, Brooke. "Who Decides Who Counts as Native American?" *The New York Times Magazine* 18 Jan. 2017. Web. 19 Jan. 2017. <www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/magazine/who-decides-who-counts-as-native-american.html?_r=0>.

Jure, Brendan Kyle. "Author's Claims Questioned." *Niagara College's Community News Source* 18 Mar. 2017. Web. 20 Mar. 2017. <www.niagara-news.com/authors-claims-questioned/>.

Justice, Daniel Heath. "As I'm already well on record for my strong belief that Joseph Boyden gets way too much air time…" *Facebook* 23 Dec. 2017, 8:52 p.m. Web. 23 Dec. 2017. <www.facebook.com/daniel.justice.7393/posts/716714078504628>.

Justice, Daniel Heath (justicedanielh). "Worst of all, he & advocates have spun 'savage' narrative about his critics -- all to protect his entitlement claims. Unreal." *Twitter* 14 Jan. 2017, 11:06 a.m. Web. 15 Jan. 2017. <www.twitter.com/justicedanielh/status/820346311014649856>.

Kay, Jonathan. "Why Is Joseph Boyden's Indigenous Identity Being Questioned?" *The Walrus* 28 Dec. 2016. Web. 12 Jan. 2017. <www.thewalrus.ca/why-is-joseph-boydens-indigenous-identity-being-questioned/>.

Kimber, Stephen. "Who Is Joseph Boyden, and Does the Answer Matter?" *Halifax Examiner* 08 Jan. 2017. Web. 12 Jan. 2017. <www.stephenkimber.com/who-is-joseph-boyden-and-does-the-answer-matter/>.

Kinew, Wab. "There Is Room in Our Circle for Joseph Boyden." *The Globe and Mail* 03 Jan. 2017. Web. 10 Jan. 2017. <www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/there-is-room-in-our-circle-for-joseph-boyden/article33467823/>.

Lederman, Marsha. "Amid Heritage Controversy, Publishing Heavyweights Stand by Joseph Boyden." *The Globe and Mail* 06 Jan. 2017. Web. 11 Jan. 2017. <www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/amid-heritage-controversy-publishing-heavyweights-stand-by-joseph-boyden/article33526706/>.

---. "How the Steven Galloway Scandal Sparked a CanLit Civil War." *The Globe and Mail* 25 Nov. 2016. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/how-the-steven-galloway-scandal-sparked-a-canlit-civil-war/article33049536/>.

Lee, Damien (@damienlee). "I just listened to this JB interview with Candy Palmater. Some thought…" *Twitter* 11 Jan. 2017, 7:02 p.m. Web. 11 Jan. 2017. <www.twitter.com/damienlee/status/819382749425319937>.

"Les beaux jours de… Joseph Boyden." *Oh Les Beaux Jours*. Web. 17 May 2017. <ohlesbeauxjours.fr/evenement/beaux-jours-de-joseph-boyden/>.

Mailhot, Terese Marie. "I'm Sorry Joseph Boyden's Apology Was So Impotent." *The Huffington Post* 16 Jan. 2017. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.huffingtonpost.ca/terese-marie-mailhot-/joseph-boyden-impotent-apology_b_14172388.html?utm_hp_ref=canada&ir=Canada>.

---. "Joseph Boyden, Natives Don't Get Pity." *Indian Country Media Network* 9 Jan. 2017. Web. 09 Jan. 2017. <www.indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/opinions/joseph-boyden-natives-dont-get-pity/>.

Medley, Mark. "Boyden Admits to Mistake, Backs Down as Indigenous Spokesperson." *The Globe and Mail* 11 Jan. 2017. Web. 13 Jan. 2017. <www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/boyden-admits-to-mistakes-backs-down-as-indigenous-spokesperson/article33593742/>.

Morgensen, Scott Lauria. *Spaces Between Us. Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Newhouse, David. "How Should We Evaluate Joseph Boyden's Claim to an Indigenous Identity?" *The Star* 13 Jan. 2017. Web. 15 Jan. 2017. <www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2017/01/13/how-to-evaluate-josephs-boyden-claim-to-an-indigenous-identity.html>.

Paquette, Aaron. "A Question for Joseph Boyden: What Is Your Struggle?" *Metro News* 10 Jan. 2017. Web. 19 Jan. 2017. <www.metronews.ca/views/edmonton/urban-compass/2017/01/10/what-is-joseph-boydens-struggle.html>.

Paradkar, Shree. "Oh, Please. Joseph Boyden Not the Victim in Indigenous Ancestry Saga: Paradkar." *The Star* 16 Jan. 2017. Web. 18 Jan. 2017. <www.thestar.com/news/canada/2017/01/16/oh-please-joseph-boyden-not-the-victim-in-indigenous-ancestry-saga-paradkar.html>.

Persson, Heather. "Cuthand: There Is Room in the Tent for Boyden." *Saskatoon StarPhoenix* 14 Jan. 2017. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.thestarphoenix.com/opinion/columnists/cuthand-there-is-room-in-the-tent-for-boyden>.

Rettino, Matthew. "Joseph Boyden on His Identity and Origins." *The Vinciolo Journal.* 13 March 2017. Web. 23 Feb. 2017. <https://matthewrettino.wordpress.com/2015/03/13/joseph-boyden-on-his-identity-and-origins/>.

Rivas, Julio César. "La Supuesta Ascendencia Indígena Del Escritor Joseph Boyden Causa Polémica." *La Vanguardia* 15 Jan. 2017. Web. 15 Jan. 2017. <www.lavanguardia.com/vida/20170115/413390408863/la-supuesta-ascendencia-indigena-del-escritor-joseph-boyden-causa-polemica.html>.

Roache, Trina. "University professor cutting Joseph Boyden novels from her course." *APTN National News* 18 Jan. 2017. Web. 18 Jan. 2017. <www.aptnnews.ca/2017/01/18/university-professor-cutting-joseph-boyden-novels-from-her-course/>.

Robinson-Desjarlais, Shaneen. "'He Has Agreed to Be My Brother' Why Lisa Meeches Is Adopting Joseph Boyden." *APTN National News* 16 Jan. 2017. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.aptnnews.ca/2017/01/16/he-has-agreed-to-be-my-brother-why-lisa-meeches-is-adopting-joseph-boyden/>.

Salutin, Rick. "The Boyden Affair Just Got Murkier: Salutin." *The Star* 13 Jan. 2017. Web. 16 Jan. 2017. <www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2017/01/13/the-boyden-affair-just-got-murkier-salutin.html>.

Sangster, Dorothy. "The Double Life of 'Injun Joe'." *Macleans* 21 July 1956. Web. 16 Mar. 2017. <www.macleans.ca/archives/the-double-life-of-injun-joe/>.

Stojsic, Leslie. "Joseph Boyden Talks Writing Process with Peter Mansbridge." *CBC News* 17 Dec. 2013. Web. 17 May 2017. <www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/joseph-boyden-talks-writing-process-with-peter-mansbridge-1.2466197>.

Talaga, Tanya. "Joseph Boyden's Identity Crisis Opens up Questions on Who Is Part of a Community." *The Star* 14 Jan. 2017. Web. 15 Jan. 2017. <www.thestar.com/news/canada/2017/01/14/joseph-boydens-identity-crisis-opens-up-questions-on-who-is-part-of-a-community.html>.

TallBear, Kim (KimTallBear). "YES. this is why PretendIndians are an assault on indigenous sovereignty. Why they make yet another colonial claim." *Twitter*, 1 July 2016, 11:24 a.m. Web. 19 Jan. 2017. <www.twitter.com/kimtallbear/status/748945277428441088>.

Treuer, David. "The Savage Mind, Pt. 1." *The Rumpus* 01 Apr. 2017. Web. 18 Apr. 2017. <www.therumpus.net/2017/04/the-saturday-rumpus-essay-the-savage-mind-pt-1/>.

Vowel, Chelsea (apihtawikosisan). "I am also bringing this up, because I feel complicit in a way, for tutoring him on certain issues. So he could 'pass' better?" *Twitter* 26 Dec. 2017. Web. 10 Jan. 2016. <www.twitter.com/apihtawikosisan/status/813512303433940992>.

---. "The Mythology of Métissage: Settler Moves to Innocence." *Âpihtawikosisân* 11 Mar. 2015. Web. 11 May 2017. <apihtawikosisan.com/2015/03/the-mythology-of-metissage-settler-moves-to-innocence/>.

---. "When I said he needs to stop identifying as Métis, and stop letting people identify him as Métis he said it was out of his hands." *Twitter*, 26 Dec. 2016, 4:05p.m. Web. 22 Jan. 2017. <mobile.twitter.com/apihtawikosisan/status/813506154160685056>.

Wente, Jesse. "Jesse Wente Reacts to the Appropriation Prize Controversy." *CBC News Toronto* 15 May 2017. Web. 15 May 2017. <www.cbc.ca/player/play/944045123528/>.

"Bih'kee-yan": Richard Wagamese's *Keeper'n Me* and the Imaginative Renewal of Relationships

Melanie Braith (University of Konstanz)

Opening a collection of essays on the resurgence of Indigenous peoplehood in 2008, Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred's foreword offered a memorable statement: "Now, then, and forever, the fight is for the land. The land, and all it has to teach, to give, and all it demands, is what it means to be Indigenous" (Alfred qtd. in Simpson 10). The tenet that the land is constitutive for Indigeneity inspired the research for this essay and builds the foundation for all lines of thought that emerged and interwove in the process of researching, writing, and learning. One of the earliest insights of this process has been the realization that Indigeneity is in fact not only contingent on land but interconnected with a complex network of which land is the most integral part. In the present study, I conceptualize the connection to said network as *territoreality*: the existence as part of an interrelational network connected to a particular place. Territoreality's network consists of the interplay of five components: the *individual* in relation to a community, the individual's and the community's relations with *other-than-human beings*, their relationships with the *land*, and the resulting *cultural practices*. Colonialism has harmed the relationships of this network in multitudinous ways. However, Indigenous peoples have persevered and have managed to keep territoreality alive by continuing to enact its cultural practices as far as possible.

This essay argues that Indigenous artists counter and transform the impacts of colonialism, and envision regenerated, embodied forms of territoriality in a process I refer to as "imaginative territorealization." In this essay, I analyze how Richard Wagamese's novel *Keeper'n Me* performs imaginative territorealization on an intra-textual level for its characters and on an extra-textual level for its readers. The novel addresses the forced segregation of Indigenous people from their communities and traditional territories. Its main character, Garnet Raven, who was taken away as a child and put into foster care, returns to his family. The process of imaginative territorealization that is performed by and in *Keeper'n Me* is therefore one of imagining a

reconnection to the elements of territoreality. This imaginative reconnection is accompanied and supported by stories. Wagamese, who passed away on March 10, 2017, was one of many Indigenous children that were removed from their families during what is referred to as the "Sixties Scoop," and for *Keeper'n Me* he draws on his own experiences. However, as Métis scholar Jo-Ann Episkenew points out, "although Wagamese is able to imagine healing for his fictional twin Garnet, he is unable to heal himself" (Episkenew 145), which is why "Wagamese uses his imagination to reinvent the narrative of his subsequent reunion with his birth family and home community" (Episkenew 145). I argue that the idealized depiction of Garnet's process of reconnection is one of the novel's strengths; it demonstrates how an Indigenous author re-imagines processes of reconnection without any constraints that reality might entail.

This essay proceeds by first introducing the concept of territoriality based on the ideas of various Indigenous scholars from Turtle Island and by then giving an overview of the impacts of colonialism, focussing on Indigenous peoples' segregation from their traditional homelands and communities because of residential schooling and the Sixties Scoop. The subsequent textual analysis of Richard Wagamese's novel *Keeper'n Me* demonstrates how the novel performs imaginative territorealization on an intra-textual level by depicting a young man's reconnection to territoriality. The analysis also demonstrates how the novel performs extra-textual imaginative territorealization for its heterogeneous audience.

1. Territoriality

Turtle Island, as North America is referred to in an Indigenous context, is home to a vast number of Indigenous peoples, and their communities. Life in these communities is shaped by distinct modes of subsistence, languages, and cultural practices. Notwithstanding this diversity, however, Indigenous scholars still identify commonalities; there exist philosophical tenets that all Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island adhere to. Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred claims:

> [W]e share a common bond […]: commitment to a profoundly respectful way of governing, based on a world-view that balances respect for autonomy with recognition of a universal interdependency, and promotes peaceful coexistence among all the elements of creation. There may be 500 different ways of expressing these values, but in our singular commitment to them we find what is perhaps the only pan-Indian commonality. (*Peace* xvi)

Alfred's description of this common bond resonates with what other scholars have described as territoriality: a pan-Indigenous reality that originates from and is embodied by Indigenous people's close connection to a certain place.[26] This essay argues for a conception of territoriality as a reality that emerges from the interplay of the following elements: the *individual* in relation to a *community*, the individual and the community's kinship relations with *other-than-human beings*, their relationships with the *land*, and the resulting *cultural practices*.

How deeply interconnected the above-named five components are, is conspicuous in the inevitable connection between the first two components: the individual in relation to a community. According to Alfred, "what makes an individual 'indigenous' is his or her situation within a community" (*Peace* xvi). An Indigenous individual identity evolves in a community context because "one cannot be truly indigenous without the support, inspiration, reprobation and stress of a community as facts of life" (*Peace* xvi). The pre-eminence of community in Indigenous cultures arises from Indigenous peoples' interaction with the land. Espousing this idea that an emphasis on community is common to all Indigenous worldviews, Cherokee scholar Jace Weaver explains that the "need for collective survival in diverse, often quite harsh, natural environments led to such an emphasis" (37). This emphasis on community, however, does not entail that an Indigenous community completely overrides an individual's identity. On the contrary, Indigenous thinkers emphasize the weight that many Indigenous cultures give to individual autonomy. It is in the individual "where tribal values become concrete" (Alfred, *Peace* xix), where cultural practices are embodied and sometimes re-imagined.

[26] Sam McKegney gives a concise definition of "ecosystemic territoriality," conceptualizing it as "an abiding relationship of reciprocal knowing with(in) a specific constellation of geographic places; such relationships are enacted and affirmed through embodied practices and rendered meaningful through the embedding of personal experiences and stories within narratives of intergenerational inhabitation" (n 3).

Community, however, is "the highest value to Native peoples, and fidelity to it is a primary responsibility" (Weaver 37).

The manner in which Indigenous communities and the numerous relationships within them are structured, differ from people to people. One defining feature of many Indigenous communities is, however, that they are characterized by "nonnuclear social dynamics" (Rifkin 12), by systems of enhanced kinship. How exactly these kinship relations are arranged is, again, community-specific. Not only are kinship relations within their own communities constitutive for Indigenous peoples, kinship relations with other-than-human beings that share a community's place or territory are of equal importance. These other-than-human beings—living beings like plants, animals, or elements of the landscape—are not regarded as insensitive species but as "'peoples' in the same manner as the various tribes of men are peoples" (Deloria 103). Therefore, Cherokee scholar Daniel Heath Justice for example speaks of the "Animal-People" and the "Tree-People" (Justice 22). Indigenous communities' ties with other-than-human beings are highly reciprocal in that they entail what Justice calls "kinship rights and responsibilities" (Justice 6). All Indigenous peoples and other-than-human beings live in a close relationship to the land since it is the land that gives them "life and sustenance" (Justice 22). Again, this relationship is regarded as being reciprocal: Indigenous peoples depend on the land for their survival and therefore they ought to give the land "respect, honor and care" (Justice 22). Indigenous communities are consequently embedded in a web of kinship relations with other-than-human beings and the land. Justice emphasizes that these kinship relations are not a state but a constant process, which is why he proposes to think of kinship as a verb rather than a noun: "kinship isn't a static thing; it's dynamic, ever in motion" (Justice 5). Kinship relations are consequently adaptable to changing circumstances.

Out of interactions with the land and other-than-human beings arise an Indigenous community's *cultural practices*. First stories emerged from people's interactions with the land and other natural entities. Basil Johnston describes this process in an Anishinaabe context, explaining that the land told his ancestors "the most wonderful stories without words. Instead of words Mother Earth showed them the realities of life" (Johnston 7). It

is out of these stories that a community's oral literature developed. Jeannette Armstrong (Okanagan) positions "Indigenous oral literature as the 'voice of the land', as a record of the way land itself establishes how humans, over generations might speak its required realities" (Armstrong 354). Stories not only arise from kinship relations but also reinforce them in several ways. Many of them are, for example, "communal in character, forming identity, explaining one's place in the cosmos, creating a sense of belonging" (Weaver 15).

The interplay between Indigenous individuals and communities, other-than-human beings, the land, and resulting cultural practices creates what I call *territoreality*: the existence as part of an interrelational network connected to a particular place. Constantly embodied and performed, territoreality, like Justice's "kinship", is a process rather than a state. As a process, territoreality is dynamic and therefore constantly changing and growing, undergirded by cultural practices that perform what I refer to as "territorealization." It is out of territoreality that tribal-specific Indigenous peoplehood[27] arises, because what differs from culture to culture is how the relationships within communities and between communities and the land and other-than-human beings are performed, which accounts for differing cultural practices.

1.1 Settler Colonialism and Its Impacts

Under settler colonialism's eliminatory policies, Indigenous peoples were framed as a problem one solution to which was assimilation. In its attempt to systematically destroy territoreality and Indigenous peoplehood, the Canadian state focused on Indigenous children. As of the 1880s, Canada adopted a residential school policy for Indigenous children that entailed three components: "separating Aboriginal children from the influence of their parents and communities; re-socializing them in the values, beliefs and

[27] Justice defines Indigenous peoplehood as the "relational system that keeps the people in balance with one another, with other peoples and realities, and with the world. Nationhood is the political extension of the social rights and responsibilities of peoplehood" (7).

habits of colonial society; and absorbing them on completion of their training into the non-Aboriginal world" (Brant Castellano 6). This involuntary separation of children from their communities and their culture was traumatizing for many individuals as well as communities. Furthermore, students suffered physical and sexual abuse in residential schools and many students died of malnutrition and diseases (TRC). After 1946, the federal government changed its education policy and decided to shut down the residential school system in favour of Indigenous children's integration into a day school system and their transfer to provincial schools (Milloy 190).

By then, however, decades of settler colonialism and forced assimilation had left their marks on Indigenous communities, which often suffered from precarious living conditions on their reserves. Many communities faced social problems like poverty, unemployment, violence, and addiction. Therefore, "some social workers felt a duty to protect the local children" (Hanson, "Sixties Scoop") and to remove them from their communities. Analysts argue that "the interventions of social agencies reflected colonial attitudes and attempts to assimilate Aboriginal children and continue the work begun by residential schools" (RCAP, "Families" 24). The term "Sixties Scoop" refers to a period in Canada that lasted roughly from the end of the residential school policy to the mid-1980s in which "thousands of Aboriginal children were removed from birth families and placed in non-Aboriginal environments" (Raven Sinclair 65). In many instances, the families were not given a warning and children were taken without consent of families and communities. Approximately 70 per cent were adopted into non-Indigenous families and by the 1970s one third of all Indigenous children "were separated from their families by adoption or fostering" (Raven Sinclair 66). The child welfare system did not require social workers to be trained in dealing with Indigenous children and "[m]any of these social workers were completely unfamiliar with the culture or history of the Aboriginal communities they entered" (Hanson, "Sixties Scoop"). Therefore, their conception of proper care "was generally based on middle-class Euro-Canadian values" (Hanson, "Sixties Scoop"). Residential schools and the sixties scoop assaulted all elements of territoreality: they attempted to destroy bonds between the individual and the community, disrupted relationships with other-than-human beings and the land, and aimed at annihilating cultural practices. However, despite decades of forced assimilation and

segregation from territory and community, Indigenous people persevered and managed to keep their cultures alive.

2. Reconnecting the Individual: Richard Wagamese's Keeper'n Me

This chapter analyses how Ojibway[28] author Richard Wagamese's 1994 novel *Keeper'n Me* performs imaginative territorealization intra-textually and extra-textually. Since the colonial impact that the novel deals with is Indigenous peoples' segregation from their traditional territories and communities, territorealization in this case first and foremost consists of a process of reconnecting to territoreality. That stories play an important role in the intra-textual as well as the extra-textual process coincides with an Anishinaabe worldview, to which stories are central. Anishinaabe scholar Niigaanwewidam Sinclair foregrounds the relationship-building nature of stories as discursive practices in the interrelational network of territoreality, delineating them as "strands that connect Anishinaabeg with everything around us, across space, time, and geography" (Sinclair qtd. in Doerfler et al. xxiii). Reflecting this Anishinaabe worldview, the novel performs imaginative territorealization by utilizing stories and concomitant forms of reception.

2.1 Intra-Textual Imaginative Territorealization: Reconnecting Characters

Central to *Keeper'n Me* is main character Garnet Raven's need for reconnection to territoreality in order to mitigate and eventually heal his personal trauma of loss and cultural alienation. According to Sto:lo scholar Jo-ann Archibald's Indigenous concept of holism, the following four realms form a whole and healthy person: "the intellectual, spiritual (metaphysical values and beliefs and the Creator), emotional, and physical (body and behaviour/action)" (Archibald 11). Garnet's statement that "mind, body, spirit, and emotion" are constitutive for a person, demonstrates the novel's consonance with

[28] Ojibway (or Ojibwe) is a name for Anishinaabe people given by Europeans.

Archibald's concept (176). Garnet's reconnection with the various components of territoreality interrelates reciprocally with the four realms of his personality; and stories support his process of reconnection with family and community, the other-than-human, and the land. I will discuss the interplay of Garnet's process of reconnection and the four realms of his personality, as well as the role of stories by interpreting the book's structure of four chapters in the following way: chapter 1 focuses on Garnet as individual and on his body, chapter 2 focuses on his reconnection with his family and on his mind, chapter 3 focuses on his reconnection with the community and on his emotions, and chapter 4 focuses on his reconnection with the other-than-human as well as the land and on his spirituality. Despite this allocation, my argumentation aims at maintaining a certain degree of fluidity given the fact that the themes transcend chapter boundaries and are highly interconnected.

Garnet's retrospectively recounted story opens with a description of the land that betrays his close, embodied connection to the land. Speaking from a present in which reconnection to territoreality has already been achieved, Garnet describes the land as a feeling: the more time one spends on it, the more "you can feel it start to work on your bones" (5). His opening description establishes a binary opposition between civilization and the land, with the latter being described more benevolently. Civilization, the realm of roads that is measured in kilometres, is described as "bumpy," "hell," "agonizing," "hard," and "slippery" (4). The land, referred to as "country" and "place," is the realm of "tall and green" trees, the "big silver lake," and "sunlight"; in Garnet's description, the land is itself a living entity, covered with "a big green carpet rolling up and down like waves" (4-5). Because of its judgmental tone, I read this dichotomic opening as a metaphorical comment on territoreality and colonialism. What follows is an actual description of colonialism's impacts, demonstrated by Garnet's life story as a victim of the Sixties Scoop. As a small child, Garnet is taken away from his family and grows up in foster homes because of the government's disregard for what "[s]ociologists call […] the extended family concept" (10) which functions here as a synecdoche for Anishinaabeg culture. Garnet is then constantly exposed to the distorted Western picture of "Injuns. Scary devils. Heathens" (12). He is also confronted with films, books, and the stereotypes that include the "usual stuff": "Indians were lazy, no account, drunken bums, living on

welfare, mooching change on street corners and really needing some direction" (13). Because of the negative images that those othering voices instill, Garnet tries to escape his Ojibway identity by creating other identities. Growing up without immersion in his native culture, he "[doesn't] know how to be an Indian" (13) and when his friend Lonnie's African-American family reaches out to him, he gladly accepts, and starts to embody and perform a new transcultural identity by "dressing like Lonnie and his brothers, adopting their strut and mannerisms" (23).

Letters from his brother Stanley trigger Garnet's journey home. Arriving on reserve, his appearance leads to alienated reactions from the community, the people teasing him that he "[l]ooks like a walkin' fishin' lure or somethin'" (35). For the White Dog community, Garnet resembles an image "seen on TV that time"—a simulacrum without any connection to reality. Simultaneously, however, Garnet's body manifests the connection to the Raven family because the physical resemblance to his brother gives him the feeling of "looking into a mirror" (34). While Garnet's body is connected to the family, the cultural discourses he has adopted (and that he is literally wearing) are not and his appearance is the first thing to change on reserve. Garnet's brother gives him "a pair of shoes to wear around" (42) and his "ma [cuts his] Afro off about three days after [he is] home" (62). In chapter 1, Garnet already starts to reconnect with his family, especially his mother. Hugging her for the first time, he starts to listen with his body and "to be able to feel the rhythm of her heartbeat" (53) and his body remembers "a time when their souls shared the same space and time" (54). With his mother, Garnet starts a process of embodied reconnection to his family. This process is accompanied by stories about the past whose tellings are introduced by descriptions of the land like "that place where the lake cuts in there" (55) or triggered by interactions with the land like a thrown rock that hits the water "with a dull plop instead of a splash" (43). Through those stories, Garnet simultaneously learns about himself and the land and is furthermore taught his first words in Ojibway, amongst them "Meegwetch," literally meaning "I hold what you've given me with honor" (51).

Chapter 2 focuses on Garnet's reconnection with his family and his relationship to his teacher Keeper, who plays an important role in educating Garnet's mind. While

reconnecting with his kin, Garnet, who according to Keeper "need[s] a guide right now" (72), receives the teachings of his grandfather through Keeper. Using stories, Keeper teaches Garnet about Anishinaabeg culture, and according to Keeper "the important thing about our stories isn't so much the listening, it's the time you spend thinking about them" (100). Keeper's education therefore strongly engages Garnet's mind. Keeper teaches him about ceremonies and the drum, which represents "the heartbeat of Mother Earth" and which Anishinaabeg use to "join [themselves] up to that heartbeat" (113).

Chapter 3 focuses on Garnet's reconnection with the community of the White Dog reserve and his emotional education which includes finding a way to balance the two different worlds he has inhabited. When Garnet yearns for a connection to the world off-reserve, he talks to one of the community members about starting a radio station. Keeper recognizes Garnet's restlessness and concludes that Garnet is "feelin' lost here again" (129), which is why he explains that Garnet has to learn to "[f]ind a way to balance this world [he] live[s] in now with the other one [he] came from" (129). Keeper emphasizes that there is no way back to the ways of living that existed before colonialism. According to Keeper, "[t]he truth is that most of us are movin' between Indyuns" (137) and the important thing is to "find balance between two worlds to survive" (137). Keeper's emphasis on change and also on the flexibility of culture coincides with the adaptable and living network of territoreality. The chapter gives an example of how this balance between two worlds can be achieved: The radio station that Garnet thought would bring the outside world to the reserve, is in the end used to strengthen the community. With community members literally "all connected up" (133), the community is strengthened through faster and increased communication. A Western technology is indigenized and becomes the epitome of balance. As Keeper says: "that's what this radio thing's taught the boy and ev'ryone around. About that balance" (137). That Garnet has reconnected to the community becomes evident towards the end of the chapter when he is out on the lake, looking at the reserve, tenderly describing various community members. He then hears a song and can "feel the power of the earth all around" him (148)—a feeling that "[f]eels like coming home" (149). The repeated use of the words "feeling" or "feel" shows Garnet's emotional engagement in this moment that constitutes a first

reconnecting to the land. This process is continued in chapter 4, which opens with the statement "The land is a feeling" (155).

Chapter 4 describes Garnet's spiritual reconnection with the land and alludes to his reconnection with the other-than-human. He also achieves a spiritual reconnection. In this chapter Garnet leaves the community for four days in order to live on the land by himself. He describes the land with words that betray its close connection to Anishinaabeg culture: He hears "the whispers of old people's voices when the wind blows through the trees. Little gurgles and chuckles like babies when the water from a creek rolls over the rocks" (157). He describes the water making a "silky sound like the ripple of a lady's shawl in a fancy dance" and he hears thunder "sounding like a big drum in the sky" (157). Elements of the land are here connected to the community and to elements of Anishinaabeg culture.

Spending time on the land is a common practice for Indigenous people who, as described by Anishinaabe scholar Melissa K. Nelson, "work hard to maintain, restore, and renew […] kinship with [their] other-than-human family, with all of the living beings and 'extended relatives' of this created earth" (Nelson 216). This renewal of kinship ties "requires unmediated time spent alone in landscapes to refamiliarize ourselves with, and listen deeply to, the language of the land" (Nelson 216). As demonstrated below, Garnet listens to this language in various ways. Upon entering the land, Garnet feels embraced, feeling the bush "close itself behind [him]" (168). Garnet's renewed relationship to the land is captured in his act of offering tobacco, a cultural practice Keeper has recommended to him (160). The offering of tobacco is a way of giving thanks to the land, an act of gift-giving which according to Sinclair is a "relationship-making practice" that is foundational to the workings of an Anishinaabeg reality (Sinclair "Anishinaabeg Narrative" 5).

Garnet is gifted with a dream of two eagles transforming into an old man and an old woman (174). The dream once again emphasizes the connections between the human and the other-than-human as well as Garnet's connection to his heritage, symbolized by the old people who stand for his ancestors. After this experience, Garnet feels "the heartbeat

of life all around [himself]" (176), which shows his accomplished reconnection. Finally reconnected to territoreality, Garnet hears from Keeper about the responsibility this entails: "givin' it to someone else sometime" (186)—an intergenerational responsibility that is part of territoreality and ensures its survival. Garnet eventually describes himself as a "firekeeper" (186), suggesting that the connection to territoreality slumbers within Indigenous people like embers, remnants of a once-burning fire, and that "it just takes a good guide to lead us back there and teach us how to stoke them up again" (214). Having reconnected to territoreality through discursive practices, this is the task that Garnet adopts in the end: He becomes a guide for others, a firekeeper, a storyteller.

2.3 Extra-Textual Imaginative Territorealization: Engaging the Reader

Garnet's emergence as a storyteller who retrospectively narrates the story of his reconnection begets the novel's circular structure and turns *Keeper'n Me* into a discursive practice that reaches out to an extra-textual level. Following Acoma Pueblo writer Simon Ortiz, who states that "[a] story is not only told but is also listened to [and that] it becomes whole in its expression and perception" (Ortiz qtd. in Blaeser 245), this subchapter involves the readership by illustrating how and to what extent *Keeper'n Me* as a discursive practice performs imaginative territorealization for its audience. For this purpose, I conceptualize the novel as a collection of closely connected stories and anecdotes that encourage the reader to follow Garnet's example and to listen (or rather, to read) and reconnect with the various elements of territoreality. However, while Garnet's intra-textual act of territorealization is one of embodied reconnection that is imaginative because of its fictionality, the reader's experience of territorealization is imaginative because the reading process alone cannot establish a holistic reconnection with territoreality's extra-textual elements. It can, however, inspire and undergird a process of reconnection and support the maintenance of an existing connection to territoreality. Assuming an Anishinaabe reader, the following analysis will demonstrate how this can be achieved and will consider the effects on a multi-ethnic audience at the end of the chapter.

The most obvious manner in which the novel performs extra-textual imaginative territorealization is that it invites the reader to identify with Garnet and to regard the character as a role model. Thereby, the novel thus potentially inspires the reader to embark on a process of reconnecting herself or himself. I argue, however, that the novel goes much further than merely to offer a model for a potential process of reconnecting. To begin with, the novel sets out to actually (re)connect the reader to Anishinaabeg culture via the teachings it incorporates. Together with Garnet, the reader learns from Keeper about cultural practices and their significance. The reader also gets to learn a few words of Anishinaabemowin that incorporate additional teachings about an Anishinaabe worldview: One example is "Meegwetch," which is translated with "I hold what you've given me with honor" (51) and emphasizes Anishinaabeg principles of reciprocity and gratitude that underlie Anishinaabeg territoreality and peoplehood.

The novel's cultural teachings are also embodied in the text's narrative structure and layout. One example is that *Keeper'n Me* is made up of four chapters—a meaningful number in Anishinaabeg culture that signifies, for example, the four facets of a holistic personality, the four stages of life, and the four directions. However, in contrast to the straightforward teachings of the novel's content, the teachings embedded in the novel's structure are reminiscent of the oral tradition in which "lessons […] were conveyed indirectly. Listeners would draw their own conclusions with no attempts to directly impose meaning" (Peacock 105). The reconnection with Anishinaabeg culture that the novel's teaching dimension fosters, occurs predominantly by involving the reader's mind.

Keeper'n Me constitutes what Cherokee author Thomas King terms "interfusional literature": "a blending of oral culture and written literature" (King 186). The novel has two first-person narrators, Garnet and Keeper, the voice of the latter optically set apart via italics. Both voices are constructed to resemble the linguistic style of the oral tradition's storytellers, although Keeper's style is more pronounced than Garnet's. According to Renate Eigenbrod, an oral style in written literature includes features like "sentence structures which are common in conversational English – informal and short – repetitions, interjections, questions to include the listener/reader […] and demonstrative pronouns to verbalize body language" (Eigenbrod 93). Garnet and Keeper speak in

conversational sentence structures with especially Keeper talking in the vernacular and thereby subverting English grammar: "*So just doin' the culture things don't make you no Indyun*" (38). The orality of Keeper's voice is furthermore underscored by instances of laughter, spelled out as "*[h]eh, heh, heh*" (2) and conversational noises like "[h]*mmpfh*" (149). By addressing the reader directly after a joke, Keeper's voice evokes a dialogic situation: "Sorry. Was there, had to use it, you know?" (113). The utterance is followed by "[a]nyways" (113), suggesting a distraction that resembles the meandering flow of oral narrative rather than a linear flow of (conventional) written narratives. Garnet's voice, which displays less oral features, morphs towards the novel's end, adopting some of Keeper's oral features: "Hmmpfh. Guess we're all Indians really. Heh, heh, heh" (214). Hereby, the novel underscores Garnet's transformation into a storyteller. For the reader, who is positioned as a participant in an imaginative act of oral storytelling, the instances of direct address throughout the novel foster a connection to the characters. What is established, is an imaginative reconnection to a community that is accompanied and supported by the engagement of the reader's emotions, especially through the novel's use of humour. The text's written orality furthermore engages the reader's body to a certain extent since Keeper's vernacular and his linguistic play literally invite the reader to read parts of the story out loud ("*Say it's TRA-DISH-UNN*" (2)). I therefore argue that the oral qualities of the text engage the reader's body and emotions and create an imaginative connection to a community by putting her or him in an imaginative dialogic situation. The more the novel resembles orality, the more it is able to perform imaginative territorealization that engages the various facets of the reader's personality.

The imaginative dialogic situation is further reinforced by the text's structural orality. In her reading of *Keeper'n Me*, Episkenew argues that "Garnet's narrative relates the events and actions that make up his story [and] Keeper's provides context and social commentary while moving Garnet's healing journey forward" (Episkenew 143). What is established between the two often intertwined voices, then, is a form of heteroglossic interplay: The reader gets the same story from two different points of view, for example when Garnet recalls how the community members scrutinized him upon his arrival on reserve, and Keeper later gives the community's point of view, stating that Garnet "*looked funny enough when he got here"* (39). Through the voice of the other, the reader

gets to know what "Keeper said" (71) or what "*Garnet said*" (74). The novel takes the interplay further by having the two narrative voices comment on each other when Garnet recalls the powwow as "one of the funniest things ever seen around here" (135) and Keeper directly below laughingly picks up where Garnet left off: "*Heh, heh, heh. Sure was fun that night*" (135). The novel's structure hereby embodies the reciprocal nature of the various relationships that Garnet forms and lets the reader experience this reciprocity. Reciprocity and dialogue are two of the formal structural principles of the novel which again evokes a strong connection to the oral tradition, where "stories interlock and connect in web-like formations; one story creates the conditions for telling another" (McCall 40). The interplay of Garnet's and Keeper's voice strengthens the reader's impression of taking part in an act of imaginative oral storytelling that creates a community composed of storyteller and audience. Reconnecting imaginatively to a community might prepare the reader for processes of reconnection with people in the extra-textual world.

The connection to an imaginative community involves the reader's mind, emotions, and to a certain extent even body—but it is and will always remain *imaginative*. *Keeper'n Me* evokes the oral tradition but cannot actually establish the "dynamic relationships at its core" (Simpson qtd. in Doerfler et al. 281) through which the stories "would be shaped and adapted in the telling by the expectations, knowledge, and responses of the audience" (Murray 71). Oral storytelling in the context of territoreality implicates even more than a reciprocal relationship between storyteller and audience—it is what Sophie McCall calls a "model of collaborative production" in which "different audiences create different inflections, nuances, and references in the narrative" (McCall 40). When it comes to these aspects of oral storytelling, the novel reaches its limits and cannot reproduce the same generative relationships. I agree with Simpson, who feels that "[w]hen mediated through print or recording devices, these relationships become either reduced (technology that limits interactivity) or unilateral […]" and that then some of the processes' "transformative power" is lost (Simpson qtd. in Doerfler et al. 281). Although this emphasizes the limits of written literature, I hope to have demonstrated that imaginative territorealization does have inspiring and engaging effects on the reader—effects that, given the novel's potential for reaching a wide audience, should not be underestimated.

Text can be easily reproduced and widely distributed, reaching a large and heterogeneous audience. For a pan-Indigenous audience—Indigenous readers that are not Anishinaabe—the novel's imaginative reterritorialization might trigger cultural resurgence through the pan-Indigenous principles of territoreality evoked by the novel. Furthermore, learning about another Indigenous culture might foster intertribal relationships based on mutual respect and understanding. Based on her reading of Jeannette Armstrong's novel *Slash*, Jodi Lundgren similarly argues that "similarity of spiritual practice provides a means of pan-Indigenous coalition that does not replace but enhances alliances formed in the context of counter-hegemonic political activism" (Lundgren 409). Though non-Indigenous readers might not be targets for imaginative territorealization, they are still affected by the process. Episkenew argues that Indigenous narratives implicate settler readers "by exposing the structures that sustain White privilege and by compelling them to examine their position of privilege and their complicity in the continued oppression of Indigenous people" (Episkenew 17). A non-Indigenous reader thereby gains an understanding not only of another culture but also of their own culture's role in the often traumatic history of this other culture. With non-Indigenous readers, imaginative territorealization therefore potentially turns settlers into allies and inspires the creation of new relationships built on learning and respect.

In *Keeper'n Me*, Garnet's mother creates a song with which she calls her son home: "Bih'kee-yan, bih'kee-yan, bih'kee-yan" (58), which literally means "[c]ome home, come home, come home" (59). Just like the mother's song, the novel itself constitutes a voice that calls the Indigenous, and especially the Anishinaabe, reader home. The home I am referring to here, is territoreality, a reality in which one lives an embodied connection to an interrelational network, emerging from the interplay between the individual, the community, the other-than-human, the land, and cultural practices. As my analysis of Richard Wagamese's *Keeper'n Me* has shown, the novel's act of imaginative territorealization is predominantly an act of imaginative reconnection under an Anishinaabe framework due to the novel's discussion of Indigenous people's segregation from traditional territories and communities under colonialist policies. Intra-textually, reconnection in *Keeper'n Me* is a multi-leveled process of an individual's reconnecting with all aforementioned elements of territoreality. This process is depicted as engaging

all four realms of a holistic personality: the reconnecting person does so physically, emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually. On all levels, stories accompany this process. Extra-textually, imaginative territorealization attempts to (re)connect the Anishinaabe reader to Anishinaabe culture and inspires their reconnection with an actual community by imaginatively putting them in relation with a fictional community. The extra-textual process is also facilitated through stories and despite the fact that imaginative territorealization is manifested in printed form, it is most powerful when it imitates the traditional discursive practice of oral storytelling. The inspiration of reconnection can thus lead to a re-activation of territoreality.

As mentioned at the outset, *Keeper'n Me* depicts an idealized process of reconnection. One has to acknowledge that due to the effects of colonialism and ongoing systemic oppression, many Indigenous communities face severe challenges and problems in contemporary Canada that are not explicitly discussed in the novel. However, I argue that despite the novel's idealization, or maybe exactly because of it, the imaginative territorealization it performs has implications for contemporary Indigenous peoplehood. The main implication is presumably the novel's championing of a resurgence of Anishinaabe (or in a wider context, Indigenous) culture in general and the resurgence of discursive practices such as storytelling in particular. The novel implies that people should not only reconnect to their culture using their mind, but also by engaging their body and their emotions—for example by learning a traditional language. The novel emphasizes the principles of reciprocity and dialogue as bases for contemporary Anishinaabeg peoplehood. Applying these principles to the relationships with the other-than-human and the land inspires respectful relationships that prohibit the extensive resource extraction of present-day Canada. The novel furthermore emphasizes that what is learnt in a process of reconnection, should be shared with future generations, implying that it is part of Indigenous peoplehood to be perpetuated through intergenerational education. Complying with territoreality, the novel suggests that Indigenous peoplehood is a constant process, able to incorporate change.

List of Works Cited

Alfred, Taiaiake. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Oxford UP, 1999.

----. "Opening Words." *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations*, edited by Leanne Simpson, Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2008, pp. 9-11.

Archibald, Jo-ann. *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit.* UP of British Columbia, 2008.

Armstrong, Jeannette. "Literature of the Land: An Ethos for These Times." *Literature for Our Times: Postcolonial Studies in the Twenty-first Century*, edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Rodopi, 2012, pp. 345-56.

Blaeser, Kimberly. "Wild Rice Rights: Gerald Vizenor and an Affiliation of Story." *Centering Anishinaabeg Studies: Understanding the World Through Stories*, edited by Jill Doerfler, Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, UP of Manitoba, 2013, 237-58.

Brant Castellano, Marlene. *Final Report of the Aboriginal Healing Foundation. Volume I: A Healing Journey: Reclaiming Wellness*. Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2006.

CBC. "Interview with Thomas King" in *Q*. 3 Sep. 2014. Podcast.

Deloria Jr., Vine. *God Is Red*. Grosset & Dunlap, 1973.

Doerfler, Jill, Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, editors. *Centering Anishinaabeg Studies: Understanding the World Through Stories.* UP of Manitoba, 2013.

Eigenbrod, Renate. "The Oral in the Written: A Literature Between Two Cultures." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* vol. 15, no. 1 (1995): 89-102.

Episkenew, Jo-Ann. *Taking Back Our Spirits*. UP of Manitoba, 2009.

Hanson, Erin. "Aboriginal Title." *Indigenous Foundations*. First Nations Studies Program UBC, 2009. Web. 4 Dec. 2015.

---. "Reserves." *Indigenous Foundations*. First Nations Studies Program UBC, 2009. Web. 4 Dec. 2015.

---. "Sixties Scoop." *Indigenous Foundations*. First Nations Studies Program UBC, 2009. Web. 4 Dec. 2015.

Johnston, Basil. *The Gift of the Stars*. Kegedonce Press, 2010.

---. *Ojibway Heritage*. McClelland and Stewart, 1976.

Justice, Daniel Heath. "Go Away Water!: Kinship Criticism and the Decolonization Imperative." *Reasoning Together: The Native Critics Collective*, edited by Craig S. Womack, Daniel Heath Justice, and Christopher B. Teuton, Oklahoma UP, 2008, pp. 147-68.

Little Bear, Leroy. "Traditional Knowledge and Humanities: A Perspective By a Blackfoot." *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, vol. 39, no. 4 (December 2012): 518-27.

---. "Aboriginal Relationships to the Land and Resources." *Sacred Lands: Aboriginal World Views, Claims, and Conflicts*, edited by Jill E. Oakes, Canadian Circumpolar Institute, 1998, pp. 15-20.

Lundgren, Jodi. "Fanon and Beyond: Decolonizing Indigenous Subjects in Jeannette Armstrong's *Slash* and Lee Maracle's *Sundogs*." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, vol. 28, no.2 (2008): 399-419.

McCall, Sophie. *First Person Plural: Aboriginal Storytelling and the Ethics of Collaborative Authorship*. UP of British Columbia, 2011.

McKegney, Sam. "'pain, pleasure, shame': Masculine Embodiment, Kinship, and Indigenous Reterritorialization." *Canadian Literature,* vol 216 (Spring 2013): 12 -33.

Milloy, John S. *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879 to 1986*. UP of Manitoba, 1999.

Murray, David. "Translation and Mediation." *The Cambridge Companion to Native American Literature*, edited by Joy Porter, Cambridge UP, 2005, pp. 69-83.

Nelson, Melissa K. "The Hydromythology of the Anishinaabeg: Will Mishipizhu Survive Climate Change, or Is He Creating It?" *Centering Anishinaabeg Studies: Understanding the World Through Stories*, edited by Jill Doerfler, Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, UP of Manitoba, 2013, pp. 213-36.

Peacock, Thomas. "Teaching as Story." *Centering Anishinaabeg Studies: Understanding the World Through Stories*, edited by Jill Doerfler, Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, UP of Manitoba, 2013, pp. 103-17.

RCAP. "Chapter 2: Families." *Report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Volume 3*. Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1996, pp. 9-106.

Rifkin, Mark. *When Did Indians Become Straight?: Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty*. Oxford UP, 2010.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake, editor. *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The Liberation, Resurgence, and Protection of Indigenous Nations*. Arbeiter Ring, 2008.

---. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring, 2011.

Simpson, Leanne, and Edna Manitowabi. "Theorizing Resurgence from within Nishnaabeg Thought." *Centering Anishinaabeg Studies: Understanding the World Through Stories*, edited by Jill Doerfler, Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, UP of Manitoba, 2013, pp. 279-94.

Sinclair, Niigaanwewidam James. "Nindoodemag Bagijiganan: A History of Anishinaabeg Narrative." Diss. University of British Columbia, 2013.

Sinclair, Raven. "Identity Lost and Found: Lessons from the Sixties Scoop." *First Peoples Child and Family Review*, vol. 3, no.1 (2007): 65-82.

TRC. *Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future: Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.* TRC. Web. 6 Dec. 15.

Wagamese, Richard. *Keeper'n Me*. Doubleday Canada, 1994.

Weaver, Jace. *That the People Might Live: Native American Literatures and Native American Community*. Oxford UP, 1997.