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ABSTRACT
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This study situates English as a second language (ESL) pedagogy at the convergence of the discourses of culture, 'race' and nation in order to understand how these condition students' negotiations of belonging through language, and to think through questions of pedagogy and teacher performativity.

Drawing from feminist postmodern, 'race' and postcolonial theory, I map out the intersecting and diverging narratives of cultural and racial difference that circulate within narrations of the Canadian nation. I proceed to an analysis of a selected body of texts within the published academic discourse of ESL pedagogy. I trace the discursive tropes and semantic sedimentary traces through which ESL students are imagined as subjects of linguistic and cultural difference. In the course of this analysis I build an argument for a re-conceptualization in TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) theory of the notions of culture and cultural difference which incorporates the articulation of these constructs with subordinating discourses of social difference and particularly those of racism. Furthermore, I assert the importance for ESL teachers to base their pedagogy in integrative antiracism. Finally I apply my argument to a reflection on my own classroom practice. This final discussion grounds an exploration of the implications of integrative
antiracism for teacher reflexivity and identifications.

Throughout the thesis are interjected excerpts from interviews conducted with ESL practitioners and consultants engaged in antiracist pedagogy, as well as personal journal excerpts reflecting on issues arising in my ESL pedagogy.
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"[E]ducation is not the origin but does live the effects of how a nation dreams and what it must bury in order to sentimentalize these wishes" (Britzman, 1995:8)

A central premise of my research is that English as a Second Language pedagogy in Anglo-Canadian public schools represents a tremendously productive site of the narration of nation, and that it can not be understood outside of the discourses of social difference traversing it upon which the national narration depends. In this thesis I read the ESL classroom as a site at which this nation presents itself to those seeking a place within it, and those seekers are inculcated into taking up their places. Thus, it is one of the important loci at which difference is incorporated into identity within the continuous iteration of the nation's narrative address1. It is a busy crossroads, continuously inscribed by "the invisible lines of uneasy belonging" (Blankenburg, 1994).

This premise frames my inquiry into how ESL pedagogical theory lives the effects of Anglo-Canadian national dreams of

---

1 I base my thesis in these assumptions because of the provocative and intriguing arguments it allows me to pursue in my research: arguments which find resonances in questions I have struggled with in my own ESL pedagogy as well as in discussions with students and friends over the years around their experiences of immigration. I wish to signal, even while the scope of my thesis does not allow me to fully address, the further research that these assumptions invite: that is, how the nation is narrated, how this narration produces, erases and recuperates difference into identity, and how ESL students are invited into relations of contained diversity, through ESL curriculum, classroom practices and language (for this suggestion I am indebted to Kathleen Rockhill).
difference - in terms of the specific constructs of 'race', culture and language - and how it might do otherwise.

1.1 Methodology

My use of the term, 'Anglo-Canadian', requires some clarification. I do not presume to extend the scope of my research beyond the borders of English-speaking, or 'Anglo-Canada'. I recognize that there are dramatically different relations of power and histories making it impossible to compare the learning and teaching of English as a second language in Anglo- and Franco-Canada. These include: the specific history of the teaching of English in Quebec where language is a culturally and affectively over-determined signifier; the political and economic relations of domination and attempted assimilation between these two colonizing settler nations both historically and in contemporary unity wars; the historical experience of belonging to different empires and international alliances; and divergent immigration and internal inter-ethnic policies resulting in distinct discourses of national identity and ethnic and racial difference. In regards to the last point, discourses of racial difference are quite distinct within Quebecois society, self-defined as the 'white negroes of North America' (Vallieres, quoted in Lenk, 1997). At the same time, the constructs and relations of social difference within the discourses of Anglo-
Canadian nationalism can not be understood outside of the relationship with Quebec as Anglo-Canada's cultural Other². For example, the survival of Quebecois culture and ethnicity was incorporated into Anglo-Canadian narratives as evidence in support of a much celebrated trope: the Canadian tolerance of cultural diversity. This self-image persists in many discourses of multiculturalism today, as I explore in chapter II.

My initial research questions and impetus for this research arose directly from contradictions and challenges in my daily life. My experiences teaching in East Asia and South America, activist involvement with immigrant community groups in Toronto around issues of racism and immigration policy, as well as an increasing engagement with questions of social difference in feminist movements in Canada in the late 1980's and early 1990's have all influenced my concerns and goals as an ESL teacher with the Toronto public board of education. As I began to explore what a commitment to issues of equity implied for my pedagogy it became apparent that different systemic forms of subjugation and stigmatization combine in students' experiences differently to organize these experiences within the frame of nation into relations of belonging and alterity.

One of the central problematics in this thesis, then, concerns "the discursive slippage or connotative resonance" between 'race', culture, language and nation (Gilroy, p. 15): I

² I will argue in chapter II that First Nations peoples were represented as Anglo- (and Franco) Canada's racial Other.
interrogate this elision that so elusively refuses separation, asking how these constructs unevenly intersect and diverge to frame ESL learners as subjects of difference. The political and social vicissitudes of the last quarter century since multiculturalism was first proposed have made this question an increasingly pressing one. With expanding racial diversity in immigration, discussions of the implications for how this ‘nation of immigrants’ should define itself have proliferated in popular discourses (The Toronto Star, November 7, 1996). In the process, the construct of social difference as cultural difference within the Anglo-Canadian discourse of multiculturalism has progressively become racially inflected such that, for example, the term "multicultural" can also sometimes mean "multiracial". The slippage that evidences itself between racial difference and cultural difference can be deployed both to disrupt and re-entrench the whiteness of dominant Anglo-Canadian narrations of identity. This shift has found resonance in the increasing contestation of the multiculturalist Canadian national narration in the context of rising aboriginal and post-colonial critical

---

3 I use the term ‘post-colonial’ with some caution and ambivalence, in consideration of the many valid points made by Ella Shohat (1991) in reference to it. She argued that the ‘post-’ suggests the idea of movement beyond, that "the ‘colonial’ in ‘post-colonial’ tends to be relegated to the past and marked with a closure". She also took issue with the collapsing of different geographical regions and chronologies or histories effected by the term: while Palestinians and indigenous peoples might more accurately refer to the present period as one of continued colonialism, the peoples of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East might find the term ‘neo-colonialism’ a more apt description.
voices. The slippage has also been deployed to reinforce racial exclusion.

In relation to language, these distinctions and elisions have become increasingly salient as issues of language gain prominence in Quebec nationalism, as the federal government seeks to cut settlement and language training costs and emphasizes proficiency in Canada's two official languages in ranking immigrant applicants.

In recognizing and framing this problematic, the work of 'race' and post-colonial theorists has been crucial to my research, especially as they have asked how the projects of modernity and colonialism established and repeatedly deployed discursive constructs of racialized, cultural, linguistic and national difference. In my circumnavigation of these questions, I have turned to Paul Gilroy, Homi Bhabha, Nira Yuval-Davis, James Clifford and David Goldberg, among others.

My research has involved asking how, not only the Canadian nation, but also the very project of teaching English as a second language to immigrants and refugees in Canada, must bury "the brutality of [their] origins" (Britzman 1995b:8) in order to sentimentalize their dreams of identity and difference. After all, the teaching of English as a second language (TESL) is an industry made possible by violent origins whose repercussions are evident in several key arenas. British and American imperialism secured white Anglo-Saxon control of the vast, rich continents of North America and Australia, while setting colonial Africa, Asia
and Latin America on the paths to political volatility, economic underdevelopment, dependency and the production of economic refugees (George, chapters 1, 2, 14). In the contemporary global context, transnational neo-colonialism plays a central role in the continuing creation of unprecedented numbers of political refugees and economic migrants to prosperous nations. According to Corrigan (1987, p. 23) "the world-wide compulsory shifting of subordinate populations" is crucial to the ongoing imperialist project: the colonization, impoverishment and conversion of formerly independent countries into net exporters of cheap labourers for first world industrial profits⁴. In this context the teaching of English, whether done elsewhere as a foreign language (EFL) or domestically to new immigrants (ESL), must be understood as part of the international integration of exploitable labour into this 'new world order'.

In the course of imperialism and neocolonialism English has been raised to the level of the international language of commercial and political power in the twentieth century. In fact, mapping imperialism and neo-colonialism as the originating grounds, as the "inescapable horizon"⁵, of the vast industry of

---

⁴ See also Georges Fouron on the "Dependency Theory of Migration" and Haiti's tragic experiences in this century (in Benesch (ed.) 1991), as well as the many excellent contributions to Vic Satzewich's anthology.

⁵ Michael Peters (1995) argues that the Holocaust and the current rise of Neo-Nazism and the "New Right" represent "the inescapable horizon of historical and ethical responsibility within which social scientists must approach their tasks of knowledge production and policy formation in the late twentieth-century" (p. 237). Said has also written that "imperialism is the
teaching English to non-native speakers in Canada is necessary in order to understand the historical and contemporary frame of this field and to take responsibility for the role of practitioners and theorists within it. Yet like an "absent presence" (Morrison, 1990), this "determining political horizon" (Said: 60) that so profoundly constitutes the life histories and subjectivities of both ESL students and teacher, is consistently maintained outside the bounds of thinkability of ESL academic literature.

How is such "passionate ignorance" (Lacan in Felman: 79) secured and maintained? By what means does a field of pedagogy inextricably intertwined with the histories of European colonization and racially discriminatory Canadian immigration policy secure these subjects outside the classroom door? In my thesis I suggest that the knowledge of racism and colonialism as not simply forgotten but as the abject knowledge of predominant practices and theories of ESL pedagogy. In Bodies that Matter Judith Butler postulates the formation of a social subject as a major determining horizon of Western culture" (1993, p. 60). I would argue that imperialism, neocolonialism and resulting global diaspora (especially the massive migrations in this century of refugees fleeing poverty and underdevelopment, wars and repressive state regimes supported by Cold War- and transnational commercial interests) (George, 1988; Chomsky, 1993) represent equally critical horizons for social scientists and educators in general, but especially for those fields which have emerged in response to such events as the massive immigration of non-English speakers to countries like ours.

I am referring to the restrictions, bans and head taxes placed upon various immigrant groups of colour such as the Chinese and South Asians in the last century of Canadian history (see Jackson) Goldberg also discusses the consequences of exclusionary racist discourse on the immigration policy of Britain and the U.S.A. (Goldberg, 1994, pp. 55-6).
process in which aspects of self contradictory to the discursive subject position being taken up are cast off in order for the subject to be recognizable within hegemonic social discourse (while the persistence of the abject represents a constant threat of the subjects' dissolution) (1993, pp. 3-4, 243). If one frames the field of ESL pedagogy as Britzman has framed the project of public education (1995) - that is, as characterized by the same psychic dynamics of abjection as social subjects - one might speculate that certain schools of ESL pedagogy understand themselves as neutral or innocent only at the cost of forgetting this project's complex relation to the violent production of ESL students. Shoshana Felman makes a point useful here: "Ignorance is ... [not] simply opposed to knowledge: it is itself a radical condition, an integral part of the very structure of knowledge ... it is not a simple lack of information but the incapacity - or the refusal - to acknowledge one's own implication in the information." (Felman 1987, p. 78-9) These authors have helped me to articulate what has been for me an emotionally-charged question delineating the ethical horizon of this thesis. That is, what might it mean to approach ESL's pedagogical goals while trying to learn from its "fertile ignorances" (Felman 1987, p. 80), to map the relationship between teacher and student, nation and immigrant, onto their violent intersecting histories which continue to structure the realm of the possible (Simon 1992)?

---

7 I am indebted to Judith Robertson's thesis (p. 80) for the wording of this sentence.
The work of postcolonial and ‘race’ theorists also became invaluable to my thesis in their struggles to elaborate conceptions of ‘race’ and culture which might address and facilitate more complex understandings of the ongoing histories of colonialism, systemic subordination and resistance. The second chapter is the product of my lengthy and painful struggle to develop an understanding of culture as integrally intertwined with colonialist discourses of social difference; an understanding which might present an alternative to relativist, absolutist notions of ‘multi-cultures’, on the one hand, and structuralist-materialist analyses of cultural and racial domination (focused mainly on resources, institutions and attitudes) on the other. In this connection, Bhabha’s notion of culture as pedagogical in its intersection with discourses of nationalism is extremely valuable. It suggests that the articulation and propagation of exclusionist narratives of cultural inheritance and authenticity are incessant, working at all societal levels to organize relations of discrepant authority, legitimacy and identity/alterity. Bhabha’s framework for complex understandings of the articulation of culture, nation, language and ‘race’, as well as his concept of ‘cultural difference’ are also crucial for thinking about critical and resistant understandings with which to approach literature and other cultural forms in ESL pedagogy.

This points to another central problematic of my thesis closely linked with the first: what are the implications of
understanding the discursive workings of racisms, culturalisms, linguicisms and nationalisms for my reflexivity and pedagogy as an ESL teacher committed to change? In framing my attempt to answer this, I wish to gesture to feminist postmodernism and certain feminist and queer articulations of psychoanalytic theory, both of which greatly informed my methodology in terms of the questions I was able to ask and conclusions I reached.\(^8\)

The importance of feminist postmodern theory to my thesis lay in its conceptualization of power, not as a commodity, but as taking the form of non-localisable systems of regulatory relations through which individuals move and are constituted (Foucault, 1982). The latter are closed systems of "knowledge" self-maintained through: differentiation through internal logics of hierarchical binary oppositions; exclusion and prohibition of contradictory knowledges\(^9\); and self-legitimation through resort to designated external, universal, neutral "regimes of truth". This understanding of power/knowledge informs my analysis of the discourses which circulate through the literature on ESL learning. Conceiving of power as "local, continuous, productive, capillary and exhaustive ... not emanat[ing] from a central source but circulat[ing] throughout the entire the social body down to its tiniest and apparently most trivial extremities" (Fraser in Grundy, 1994) also allows me to ask how practitioners

\(^8\) For the wording and conceptualization of this sentence I am indebted to Kathleen Rockhill.

\(^9\) See Britzman, 1995 "On the Study of Limits".
and students come to understand their experience\textsuperscript{10} in terms of these discourses. It points to the question of how a teacher or student's capacity to act in ways that act upon the actions of others is not so much a matter of individual charisma, or lack of it, as it is the ability to 'draw upon modes of domination structured into social systems'" (Britzman, 1991, p. 18).

In asking how dominant discourses circulate as 'actions upon the actions' of teachers and students I am drawing on Butler's rethinking of subjectivity and bodies in terms of materialization. I am also drawing upon her notions of performativity as citationality of discursive norms, as a reiteration of fictive identities each with a narrowly circumscribed range of appropriate desires and conduct. I appreciate Butler's complex conceptions of discursive regulation,  

\textsuperscript{10} Joan Scott, in her article "Experience" (1992), discusses the ambivalence of the \textit{foundational} use of experience as a basis of knowledge construction. She recognizes its value within the traditions of women's consciousness-raising groups in the 1970's (see also Weiler, 1991) as well as popular education as a source of oppositional knowledge for resistance by marginalised groups of dominant knowledge which erases, discredits and disempowers them. At the same time, she raises the issue of its socially constructed nature which precludes exactly the questions - " questions about discourse, difference, and subjectivity, as well as about what \textit{counts} as experience and who gets to make that determination " (Scott, p. 33) - that might allow an interrogation of how we are discursively governed, consequently hiding these considerations within the invulnerable fortress of "epistemic privilege" (on "epistemic privilege" see Uma Narayam, 1988). An excellent exploration of the implications of competing claims to authority, those made on the basis of differing experience and those made on the basis of critical structural analyses, for pedagogy can be found in Razack's "Storytelling for Social Change", 1993.
and am intrigued by a reading of the quote below which substitutes 'race' or 'immigrant status' or 'cultural difference' for 'Sex':

"'Sex' is, thus, not simply what one has, or a static description of what one is: it will be one of the norms by which the 'one' becomes viable at all, that which qualifies a body for life within the domain of cultural intelligibility ... To claim that discourse is formative is not to claim that it originates, causes or exhaustively composes that which it concedes; rather, it is to claim that there is no reference to a pure body which is not at the same time a further formation of that body"

(Butler, 1993, pp. 2, 10)

At the same time her theory of performativity centres very much on the possibilities for resistant agency and change:

"That this [repeated] reiteration [of discursive categories and regulatory norms] is necessary is a sign that materialization is never quite complete, that bodies never quite comply with the norms by which their materialization is impelled. Indeed, it is the instabilities, the possibilities for re-materialization, opened up by this process that mark domain in which the force of the regulatory law can be turned against itself to spawn re-articulations that call into question the hegemonic force of that very regulatory law"

(Butler, 1993, p. 2)

This tension Butler strikes in her theorization of discursive regulation and subversive performativity help me to think about the impact of marginalizing discourses of social difference on teachers' and students' relations in a way that does not fall into locating the cause either in monolithic subjects or in totalizing ideologies and inequity of resources. At the same time, it also enriches my attempts to imagine how pedagogy might create the conditions for insurgent learning.
These, then, are the bodies of theory that informed my methodology and my formulation of the central problematicss of my research. In the actual research, I used a range of approaches rather than specific formal methods. My data consists primarily of a survey of published literature on ESL teaching, as I explain below.

Mindful of Corrigan's (1987) suggestion that schools function most importantly to reproduce discursive relations of power through the production of social identities, I turned to the published literature of English as second language teaching to identify the social categories within which ESL students were being framed, understood and theorised there. While a multitude of factors influence classroom practice, board policies and programmes - factors such as individual leadership and commitment, government policy and guidelines and parent-group pressure - I based my research focus on published academic discussions because I see them playing a significant role in the establishment of authoritative regimes of truth and conceptual vocabularies in the field of pedagogy. I would argue that academic literature informs how pedagogical goals and formulations of relative roles within the learning/teaching process are conceived and made intelligible among the university professors who teach future teachers, write text books on pedagogy, and are often consulted in projects of new curriculum development. Furthermore, TESL and TESOL journals are published by associations of teachers which sponsor annual conferences in
which the discussions and presentations can be seen, to a certain extent, as being in dialogue with published articles.

I established the range of TESL published materials my research would encompass: all the articles in the three major journals available on TESL theory in Ontario (TESOL Quarterly out of the U.S.; TESL Canada; and TESL Talk, produced by the Ontario Ministry of Education) since 1986.

Having reframed the industry of ESL in terms of its historical roots in European and especially British imperialism, racism and 'first world' neocolonialism, I was surprised to find no mention of 'race' in my first visit to the literature. Articles on 'complex speech act behaviour', 'task-based methods of vocabulary development' and 'cultural sensitivity' held forth eloquently in arenas in which 'race', class, sexuality or ability appeared to be simply not relevant. I puzzled over what might be the frames within which these issues should be irrelevant.

I returned to the journal articles with the following questions:

1. How are students and teachers being imagined?
2. If social difference as 'coupled' with domination is being theorized or named as other than 'race' how is it being named?
3. If racial difference is not being named, what are the theoretical 'moves' which effectively render it 'irrelevant' to the practice being described or theorized?
4. Finally, what are the consequences of ‘race’ not being named? (for example, what does this mean for understandings of the teacher-student relation?)

In response to these questions, it seemed ESL students were being imagined either as abstract language learners (undifferentiated except in terms of personality, psychology and ability) or as culturally different learners.

These initial findings became salient when reframed in terms of my explorations of the complex and contextually informed ways discourses of racial, cultural and linguistic difference and national identity intertwine to differentially marginalize and in/exclude ESL students. If the prevalent approach in ESL pedagogical theory seemed to be to privilege language or culture in framing immigrant English learners it seemed crucial to attempt to understand the implications of this selectivity.

My research, then, consisted in bringing my framework of the complex relations between ‘race’, culture, language and nation, developed in chapter II, to explore the implications of how students are imagined as subjects of difference in the academic literature on ESL. The data included the articles published in the above-mentioned journals since 1986 as well as certain books and anthologies which either seemed highly influential in the field (repeatedly cited in the journal articles), particularly relevant to the context of ESL teaching in Canada, or which seemed to address or offer valuable illustrations of the ways
issues of cultural, racial, linguistic or national difference were being framed.

Being, then, that my data consisted of a review of published scholarly articles and publications of the last decade, I have chosen in my thesis to avoid the redundancy of a separate literature review.

One final tension, indicated in my discussion so far and the four questions outlined above, which needs to be addressed is the status of 'race' within my analysis, particularly in relation to other discursive categories of social difference. Part of the unconscious of this thesis is my desire to challenge the violent denial of this nation's and the inter/national TESL project's racist and colonialist histories which are re-enacted and re-narrated variously in the experience of each new student. My struggle throughout this research has been with the tension between the specificity and metaphoricity of racialized practices of exclusion in relation to immigrant language learners in Canada. My Polish ESL students can some day become white; my Somalian students will not. Does that mean the othering which occurs through social relations of language, accent, national or ethnic difference should be understood as forms of racialization? If these markers of difference are recruited to discourses of racism, to what degree should we as teachers and researchers understand our students, our relations with students through the lens of 'race'? To what degree would this lead to a dilution and essentialization of this analytical category? How can I
understand the various discursive constructs of social difference and mechanisms of marginalization in their specificity as well as their intersection? I return yet again to the line that has haunted my writing throughout this project: that the discursive categories of social difference "come into existence in and through relation to each other" (McClintock, 1995, p. 5) and I worry over the violence and exclusions I am enacting in narrowing my focus to a few. Thus, the reader will witness my wrestling with an ongoing tendency in my writing to centre 'race' in the analysis of how various relations of social othering converge on the bodies of ESL students. I submit this as part of the message of this thesis: that the various discourses of social difference intertwine in ways so complex as to demand a constant attention to each as part of the context of our work.

My methodology also included qualitative interviews for anecdotal corroboration from daily practice of the issues I was exploring in the TESL literature. I conducted interviews of up to one hour with ESL teachers and consultants self-identified as interested or active in antiracist initiatives in their classrooms, schools or boards. I was able to find and get in touch with these practitioners through university contacts, networks of teaching colleagues and organizers of antiracism programmes in which teachers and students participate. The stated purpose of the interviews was to gather anecdotes and reflections on the implications of integrative antiracist education for ESL
practice. These reflections were gathered for the purpose of introducing other practitioners' perspectives and reflections into my thesis, and not for systematic analysis.

These interviews were invaluable to my research in numerous ways. My first response to most was a tremendous feeling of excitement and relief: the excitement that comes from finding others equally committed to challenging hegemonic practices; and the relief arising from the reassurance that one is not crazy, not simply talking to a very small circle of peers. I had the good fortune to meet people for whom I have tremendous respect and from whom I learned an enormous amount as a teacher in terms of conceptualizations, practices and materials of antiracist pedagogy. Most importantly, these conversations raised, again and again, and reframed crucial questions with which I grappled throughout my back-and-forth travelling between various bodies of theory, my classroom practice, re-memberings of my teaching experience, TESL journals, and these dialogues with other pedagogues. I call this "travelling" in my attempt to trace how I have positioned myself, as a student, teacher, peer, reader, writer and researcher - searching for points/lines of mutual insight and illumination between these. In trying to 'take seriously' the implications of feminist standpoint epistemology (Harding, 1993) that emphasizes the connection between knowledge, subject positioning and desire, I hope to think about the implications that these positionings might have on the "knowledge" I am producing in this research.
The final approach through which I asked my research questions was autobiographical critical interrogation of white teacher subjectivity and desire. In the final chapter, I bring the insights and conceptual frames developed in the first three chapters to my classroom practice, as recorded in a journal maintained throughout one summer. I teach an intermediate ESL credit course to students aged fifteen through twenty, with some adult students in their twenties and thirties. These classes are part of the high school summer credit programme offered by the Toronto Board of Education. Toronto is a large multicultural and multiracial anglophone Canadian city: it has been estimated that over 50% of the student population in our city speaks neither English nor French as a mother tongue. The teaching of ESL needs to be understood within the discursive context of almost a quarter century of official multiculturalism in education, a school board outstanding for its commitment to equity and anti-oppression education, a mainly white and largely female teacher population, alarming government cutbacks and popular (government-supported) rhetoric of anti-immigrant backlash and ‘back to basics’ education.

Quoted excerpts from both the interviews and my journal appear throughout the thesis: these were placed so as to highlight resonances and tensions with points of my analysis.

I offer my research as a qualitative reflection on the
implications for ESL pedagogy of more complex and power-sensitive notions of cultural difference than currently inform academic discourses that I analyze. I explore what a pedagogy of ESL might look like if one began by imagining ESL students as subjects of social difference - racial as well as gender, class, sexuality, ability - considering the implications of an integrated race analysis for:

1. how the social relations of 'race' combine uniquely with other discourses of social difference to play out in ESL students' negotiations of belonging through language
2. how teachers think about their pedagogical practices in relation to the discursive effects of dominant notions of 'race', culture and other categories of social difference
3. how to work toward pedagogies that reflexively seek to create learning conditions that challenge the workings of intersecting subordinating discourses of social difference.
"I carry a Canadian passport: I, therefore, am Canadian. How am I Canadian, though, above and beyond the narrow legalistic definition of being the bearer of a Canadian passport; and does the racism of Canadian society present an absolute barrier to those of us who are differently coloured ever belonging? Because that is, in fact, what we are speaking about - how to belong - not only in the legal and civic sense of carrying a Canadian passport but also in another sense of feeling at "home" and at ease. It is only in belonging that we will eventually become Canadian."

Marlene Nourbese Philip

Belonging, though so often associated with sameness, is crossed, and not only circumscribed, by difference. In the public school ESL classroom of concern to me in this thesis, learning English is very much about negotiating relations of belonging. Of the discourses of social difference refereeing these relations, there are four in particular I want to hold in tension: cultural difference, racialized difference, linguistic difference and nation. While all four converge in the ESL classroom, I will argue that they work differently to position 'English as a second identity' students in various relations and degrees of belonging.

Discourses of nation and national difference saturate the ESL classroom. Except in the case of monolingual Franco-
Canadians, ESL students in Anglo-Canadian public schools are newcomers to this country, whether immigrants, permanent residents, refugee applicants or VISA students (and many of the latter attend Canadian schools as a first step to immigrating). In response to this situation, it is not uncommon that the curricula for ESL courses include the goal of providing some orientation to Canada in order to assist students in navigating a new life in a new country. This "settlement education" (Sauve, 1996, p. 20) aspect of the ESL curricula is particularly noticeable in adult education and in citizenship classes, and can be seen as the product of pressure both from above (the 'Canadian content' of the curriculum) and below (grassroots initiatives in critical pedagogy based in students' experience and concerns).

Following Peirce's thesis (1993), that learning language is inseparable from the negotiation of social identities, I argue that ESL students' identifications as new Canadians form the subtext of the multiple relations of belonging they negotiate through language. In this ongoing process discourses of cultural, racialized and linguistic difference intersect and diverge to offer sites of identification which position ESL students differently within their new 'home' society.

One of the assumptions I make, then, is that for ESL students in Anglo-Canada, the experience of becoming Canadian,

---

11 See, for example, student-generated materials published by East End Literacy in Toronto and by St Stephen's Community House; Mohamid, 1989.
inseparable from the process of learning English, varies widely and is conditioned by discourses of social difference. While this implies that a more thorough study would consider the intersection of normalizing discourses of sexuality, class, ability and education, I narrow my focus in this study to those of cultural, racial, linguistic difference and nation.

The second assumption which guides my research is that these discourses of social difference cannot be equated, but work differently in terms of how they regulate relations of differential belonging. Positioned as immigrants, for example, ESL students are defined as subjects of national difference: however, the dimensions, conditions, and significance of the subject positions opened to them as hyphenated Canadians are continuously redefined and qualified in relation to how other discourses - of culture, language and 'race' (as well as gender, education and class) - are organizing the specific context.

For immigrants of colour and visible minorities - especially but not exclusively as mediated by gender, class, education, and language - discourses of racialized difference work to place their hyphenated citizenship on permanent probation, to turn the hyphen into an incessant question mark. The tensions of non/belonging for ethnicized and racialized immigrants are illustrated by asking who gets hyphenated when. Whereas Anglo-Saxon immigrants are rarely hyphenated as groups but generally join the ranks of un-hyphenated Canadians, many Canadians of colour are entirely accustomed to being asked where they come
from or where they were born, regardless of whether they are first, third or twentieth generation Canadian. Citizens of colour are often left asking, as did Jan Wong, "Just how long does it take to become a full-blooded Canadian, anyway?" (Globe and Mail, August 10, 1996). Wong had been singled out from a group of Canadian journalists returning to Canada to go through a lengthy and unsettling investigation of the authenticity of her Canadian passport. While a flood of letters from European-descended Canadians assured Wong that her unusual treatment at passport control was, contrary to her highly sensitive impression, entirely usual and necessary (August 17, 1996), they all missed the point: that is, dominant racialized discourses of who is and isn't Canadian are a pervasive part of daily experience for Canadians of colour. To put it another way: how often do white Anglo-Saxons find themselves scanning newspaper headlines or wincing at radio news reports, worrying that the perpetrators of the latest publicized crime will turn out to be white and trigger a flurry of references to culturally specific pathologies and calls to 'send them back where they came from'?¹²

¹² Witness the media attention and public responses to black crime in Toronto, Asian crime in Vancouver and the massacre in Vernon, B.C. of April 1996. Young black men were particularly harassed by the police and general public after the 'Just Desserts' killing when blurry video stills were published in newspapers of the suspects being sought, stills which revealed little more about them than their being young, black and male.
H: ... because racism is a personal thing as well. It always hits personally, even if it is OJ Simpson, it's a personal thing that focuses down - I mean, OJ is a black man and he is being tried, guilty or not, but the whole thing of the feeling of black men, the feeling of responsibility that they are given, or they are made to feel by society for this black man's actions is dramatically different than my feelings towards Paul Bernardo: I have no feelings of responsibility whatsoever towards that man ... but I think black men are made to and feel regularly that way. Like you get comments by perfectly intelligent people: 'this must be a very difficult time for you, with the OJ Simpson trial' 'Well, in a way you're right, but in what sense, that I feel ashamed, or that your comment is part of this crap?'

Furthermore, these racialized discourses of non/belonging mediate relations in ways that incite and adjudicate which side of the hyphen an individual lands on at any one point. By the term 'incite' I wish to avoid a mechanical portrayal of this process: commonly among first-generation Canadians I know, coded in-member terminology functions to position different groups quite clearly in degrees of relative legitimacy and belonging. Among members of the same ethno-racial community, reference to in-members is usually the nation of origin or common culture, language or 'race' (for example, "los Latinos" or "Hua ren") while reference to white native-born Canadians is simply the term 'Canadian' (see also Peirce, 1993, p. 122).

Clearly, however, the racialization of groups of people recruits a complex range of markers, taking advantage of blurred 13 "Hua" is the second character in the Chinese term for China/ese ("Zhong Hua") and together with "ren" (meaning 'person') refers to anyone of Chinese descent.
distinctions between categories such as 'culture', 'heritage', 'ethnicity' and 'race'. English as a second language students from multiracial nations of the Middle East or Latin America, for example, may have belonged to social classes self-identified as 'white' or of European heritage, only to discover through interactions in Canada that here their ESL status, accent, religion or the popular representations of their cultural traditions function to racialize and Other them. For Muslim Canadians in particular, the experience during the Gulf War and after the Oklahoma bombing of a form of racism which targeted their culture, moral character and spiritual beliefs clearly broke the hyphen and positioned 'Muslim' and 'Canadian' on opposite poles of a Manichean axis.

The discussion above suggests that understanding the different experiences of ESL students navigating their new language, society and sense of identity, will require a careful examination of how the discourses of cultural, racialized and linguistic difference circulating within the Canadian national narration condition the subject positions negotiated in daily interactions. It will involve asking when the distinctions between the categories of culture, 'race' and language are blurred in dominant representations, when they are reinforced,

---

14 For the purposes of this thesis I do not address the distinctions and relations between the terms 'ethnicity' and cultural difference: I focus deliberately on the latter, and recognize without considering the unique history of usage of the former. For discussions of the relation between the concepts of 'ethnicity' and 'race', see Hall, 1988; Donald and Rattansi, 1992; Anthias and Yuval Davis, 1992; Gilroy, 1993.
and what is secured by these discursive intersections and divergences. For example, it will be important to address the paradox of Canadian society which defines itself as multicultural even while systemic privilege, differential representation and discrimination continue along racialized lines.

Furthermore, following my second assumption that the discourses of cultural, racial, national and linguistic difference can neither be assumed to work similarly nor simply arithmetically, I will try below to explore how each operates differently through different tropes and historically sedimented associations to organize and qualify relations of non/belonging. I will trace some of the particular tropes and discursive dynamics of the Canadian context. Finally, I'll consider what such an analysis implies for a transformational pedagogy of ESL committed to social equity.

---

Constructions of Nation

My understanding of nationalism and the modern notion of nation is tremendously indebted to Homi Bhabha's theorization of the nation as site of continual narration. This concept builds upon Anderson's by now much familiar theory of nations as 'imagined communities' by focusing on the dynamic, never-ending process by which this imagining is discursively carried out and secures naturalized authority. In doing so, Bhabha has theorized the discursive construction of nation in two ground-breaking ways.

First of all, he makes an important distinction between the twin temporalities of "the narrative address of the nation": the "performative" aspect, referring to the daily unfolding of events and cultural practices by which "newness enters the world"; and the "pedagogical aspect", which recaptures and re-enunciates this newness in the language of national tradition and history. This narration, however, is never complete but is continuously contested and contradicted by the vicissitudes, the social contestations and transgressive expressions of everyday. The pedagogical narration of nation, then is a continuous iteration through which "the scraps, patches and rags of daily life must be repeatedly turned into the signs of a coherent national culture". This "double narrative movement" traces an ambivalent vacillation of representation, so that it is the semantic slippage between these twin aspects which Bhabha identifies as a site of potential
Bhabha's concept of the pedagogical aspect of the national narration develops Anderson's crucial discussion, in the final pages of *Imagined Communities*, of how national biographies are written. It is worth returning to Anderson to retrieve a concept which will prove valuable for my exploration, at the end of this chapter, of how Canadian re/memberings of this country's violent origins intersect with constructs of erased/excluded racialized difference. Anderson quotes Renan from *Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?*, "Or, l’essence d’une nation est que ... tout citoyen ... doit avoir oublié ... bien des choses"\(^1\), in order to argue that narratives of nation presuppose and incite amnesia of the very origins they reinterpret. According to Anderson, national identities are produced through "[a] vast pedagogical industry [which] works ceaselessly ... to remind one of something which it is immediately obligatory to forget" or to have forgotten (Anderson, 1983, p. 201). I will argue that certain narratives of Canadian identity effect a similar remembering-forgetting, through which certain non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants and citizens are re-imagined as narrowly included subjects of cultural difference and others are produced as erased subjects of racialized difference.

\(^{15}\) Bhabha, 1994, chapter 8. I will pick up this discussion in direct relation to the implications of different conceptions of culture in section III.3.

\(^{17}\) I translate this as: the essence of nation is that all citizens should have forgotten well/many things. Renan, quoted in Anderson, 1983, p. 199.
Secondly, Bhabha draws heavily from psychoanalytic theory in his understanding of the discursive strategy of the national narration as the subjective formation of self. That is, he applies psychoanalytic theories of subjectivity, abjection of difference and the Self/Other division to an understanding of the nation as a collective identity and process of identification. These concepts prove particularly intriguing and insightful in my explorations of nationalism, the erasures and exclusions of national histories and mythology (the discursively constructed collective memory) and the racist articulation of national identity through federal policies of immigration and multiculturalism.
Constructions of 'Race' and Racial Difference

The conception of 'race' with which I am working is drawn fundamentally from that developed by David Goldberg (1993). It is a conception of 'race', not as a single, fixed category of genetic or biological criteria, but as a "hybrid" discursively defined concept. It is fluid and "almost, but not quite, empty in its own connotive capacity, able to ... [adopt] ... prevailing conceptions of social group formation". At the same time the multivalent construct of 'race' and racialized difference bears the "sedimentary traces" of the histories of discourses on 'race', histories which reify and authorize the very notion of 'race' as a social category. It is through this citational authority that the notion of 'race' can naturalize the groupings identified in its name, "giv[ing] social relations the veneer of [fated, eternal, inherent] fixedness" (pp. 80-1).

Understanding the constructs of 'race' and racialized difference as "almost ... empty" opens up a possible analysis of how there might be "no generic racism, only historically specific racisms each with their own sociotemporally specific causes" (Goldberg, 1993, p. 90). Such an analysis might be able to address the widely ranging and even contradictory discourses of

---

18 I have chosen to place the term 'race' in 'scare quotes' throughout this thesis as a form of compromise in regards to this over-determined category one still 'cannot not use'. In repeatedly using parentheses I hope to badgeringly interrupt any seamless flow of meaning around the term and provoke a continual crisis in its signification.
racism that have arisen historically, even while the concept of 'race' has survived "as an organizing principle, a way of knowing and interpreting the social world" (Winant, 1994, p.2; Rattansi, 1992, p.1). Rattansi describes the complex relation between the twin aspects of continuation and adaptation in 'race' thinking:

"[R]acialized and ethnic discourses and encounters have a tendency to be contradictory and ambivalent in character. These internal complexities are contextually produced and differentially deployed in particular situations and institutional locations... The contradictoriness and ambivalence of racist discourses and interactions are produced by a complex combination of social and psychic structures and forces. For one thing, the sheer range and historical variation of the sites where the encounters between 'white' and 'other' have taken place and the immense variety of specialized and popular discourses that have operated in these encounters have by now put into circulation a multitude of selective images. These operate as discursive resources to be drawn upon and articulated in different combinations in particular contexts, thus constantly opening up the possibility of tension, inconsistency and contradiction within and between sites"

(Rattansi, 1992, p. 37)

In this thesis, then, I am conceiving of 'race' as an extremely flexible construct with tremendous reiterative normalizing potential and access to powerful accumulated representational resources.

This perspective allows an analysis of the articulation and impact of discourses of racism which may avoid popular conceptions of them as monolithic, static ideologies imposed by one group against another. What does seem consistent in discourses of racism is that they depend upon constructions of racial difference to naturalize social relations organized into systems of differentiation, classification, hierarchy, domination
and exclusion. Put differently, the selection of which aspects of human existence are to count as racial difference is fluid and parasitic, "overdetermined" by historically specific social or scientific discourse (Goldberg, 1994, p. 31). Common to these historically specific racisms, however, is the characterization of constituted sets of social, moral, physical, cultural and/or intellectual traits as inherited or transmitted through time and space to members of homogenized groups. These constructions of racial difference are recruited to the project of differential representation, social, economic, political and material exclusion.

Within discourses of racism, then, the construct of racialized difference tends to function as a marker of irreconcilable, static difference, "natural and heritable qualities" (Goldberg, 1994, p. 75) transmitted through relations of descent; most importantly it functions to naturalize relations of subordination and exclusion.

This biologizing function of the construct of racialized difference is illustrated in the racist trope of im/purity and degeneracy. According to McClintock (1995), the trope of degeneracy is the abject shadow of the modern colonial discourse of progress. Up until the early nineteenth century, European narratives of Creationism explained racial difference as an expression of the fall of "different races" from the "Edenic form incarnated in Adam" (p. 49). This trope survived the sweeping new theory of Evolutionism in such a way that certain species were
represented as having evolved to the highest degree of purity, the "pinnacle of evolution", while others had degenerated or languished in an atavistic state of primitivity. The English bourgeois male was held up as the "universal standard", while scientific racism eagerly took on the painstaking task of mapping the rest of humankind onto a "three-dimensional graph": comparing degrees of impurity, deviation and "Nigrescence" along the axes of 'race', gender and class (McClintock, 1995, pp. 49-53).

Discourses of racism, heterosexist morality and classism converged in racist "dreams of [racial degeneration as] eternal contaminations, transmitted from origins of time through an endless sequence of loathsome copulations" (Anderson, p. 149). Linking impurity to immoral sexuality, and contamination to miscegenation resulted in heightened anxiety over the reinforcement and policing of racialized and classed social divisions, and particularly women's sexuality.

The discursive construct of racial difference thus became a marker of impurity, immorality and atavism, which justified and naturalized relations of "hegemonic colonialism". McClintock illustrates this last point with the example of racialization of the Irish. The fact that, in the absence of identifiable physiological differences, the "barbaric" Irish accent (a form of linguistic degeneracy) of these "White Negroes" and "Celtic Calibans" became the basis of the racialization of England's first and oldest colonials, underlines the link between racialization and colonial relations of subjugation and abject
exclusion. Racialized difference functioned to rationalize or reconcile the unresolved contradiction between modern liberalism’s claims of democracy and universal rights on the one hand, and the despotic institutions of colonization and slavery on the other. It did this by defining the basis of in/ex/clusion from the realm of moral subjectivity and worthiness of these rights. (McClintock, pp. 52-3)

This discussion implies that racialized difference clearly must be understood as inseparable from sedimented discourses of hegemonic colonial relations: both signalled the abject exclusion of certain groups from membership and shared rights in a moral community embodying the ideals of modern liberalism (see in particular Goldberg chapter 2). I will pursue this point in relation to the position of First Nations Peoples within multiculturalist discourses of Canada in the last section of this chapter.

The trope of im/purity and degeneracy also illustrates how discourses of racism organize gradations of racialized difference onto graphs of purity, positioning different groups in terms of their distance from a standard (an aspect relevant to later considerations of linguistic metaphors for relations of difference). This consistent discursive structure is part of the "renewable currency" of ‘race’. I have emphasized, however, that the constitutive elements of racialized difference depend upon the contextual conditions. In this way discourses of racism normalize and are further reinforced by the array of
subordinating discourses of social difference at play in any historical juncture (Goldberg, 1994, p. 89). How these discourses interlock, **even while presenting the impression of disarticulation**, is shaped by the conditions and stakes under which the social subjects are negotiating relations of individual and collective identity, of inclusion and exclusion, of domination and resistance.

Here Goldberg's notion of *racial constitution* facilitates a more complex understanding of not only the *structural* dimension of 'racial formation' theorized by Omi and Winant (1987:64-8?) but also the *subjective* process of the constitution of the racialized subject through self/other binaries, psychic dynamics of identification, disavowal and ambivalence. (Goldberg, pp. 82-3; Rattansi, 1992, p. 38). An excellent example of such a complex analysis is Philip Cohen's (1992) investigation of how racist utterances by British working class male youth combine contradictory themes of sportsmanship and fair play, nostalgic utopianism, colonialism, heterosexist machismo, classed marginalization, individualism, vigilante justice, resistant anti-authoritarianism, Thatcherite anti-immigration rhetoric, and grudging envy (pp. 86-94).

This example also illustrates the importance of bringing an integrated 'race' analysis to discussions of ESL pedagogy. This is because 'race', ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality and other discursive constructs of social difference are not "distinct realms of experience, existing in splendid isolation from each
other; nor can they be yoked together respectively like armatures of Lego. Rather they come into existence in and through relation to each other" (McClintock, 1995, p. 5). How, then, might it be possible in an integrated analysis to challenge the impression of disarticulation in an analysis of the impact of these different narratives? Razack has suggested that the different systems of oppression may be analyzed as simultaneous and interlocking and not "additive" through an analysis of "the spaciality of social life" (Soja, in Razack, 1995, unpublished) and the social organization of space. In other words, she suggests examining how spaces are constituted by discourses of social difference at the same time that they secure the materialization of these discourses, classifying and keeping bodies and activities in their places.

In one example of such an analysis, Razack illustrates the inter-relation between racism, Europeans imperialism, nationalism, gender oppression and class exploitation in the constitution of Vancouver's early Chinatown as a space of criminality and violence. Describing Chinatown as a space in which "whites constituted and reproduced their ideas of Europeaness and Chineseness through racialized and colonialist discourses of hygiene", white slavery, barbarism and immorality", Razack (p. 8) traces how these imaginings were legislated:

19 On the colonialist trope of hygiene, see McClintock, pp. 32-6, 207-231.
"Various [Canadian immigration] exclusion acts strengthened organized prostitution rings while low wages [as well as a head tax] ensured that men could not bring in their wives legally."  

This latter point ensured "[t]he failure of Chinese to form families that would reproduce the work force locally", prolonging the exploitation by capitalists of Chinese as a foreign and immigrant labour force (Cheng in Razack, 1995, unpublished).

Precisely because of the disarticulation of discourses, I am able in my integrative analysis to focus on only two or three discourses of social difference at one time. Below, I trace how discourses of racism and nationalism can interlock to constitute and enforce nations as racially exclusive spaces.

Goldberg (1994) has argued that there is considerable overlap between 'race' and nation, both in the abstract and in historical practice: "As concepts [both] race and nation are largely empty receptacles through and in the names of which population groups may be invented, interpreted and imagined as communities or societies" (p. 79). The two concepts converge, then, where 'nation' serves as a basis for racialization.

Goldberg's argument supports Miles' view (1993) of each of the two discourses as recruited to the cause of the other as need be: "[r]acism is the lining of the cloak of nationalism which surrounds and defines the boundaries of England as an imagined community" (p. 11). In the case of Canada, Shields (1991) has traced the racially exclusive and gendered discursive

20 This anti-Chinese sentiment culminated in the riot of 1907 in which whites rampaged through Vancouver's Chinatown.
constitution of Canadian space: "bracing northern winters ... preserve us from the effeminacy which naturally steals over the most vigorous races when long under the relaxing influence of tropical or even generally mild and genial skies" (Toronto Globe 2, quoted on p. 178).

Most importantly, as a community not only imagined but also legislated and policed, the nation state opens powerful means of enforcing racialized divisions of humanity. Just as Noam Chomsky has called a language 'a dialect with an army and a navy', immigration policy might be called racism with a border patrol. It is in the territoriality, the spatial physicality and 'factness' of the nation-state that it represents a "crucial locus for the articulation of racist ideologies" since it can "embody" and authorize the idea of 'race' through its powers to grant or withhold citizenship and the right of entry/exit (Jackson and Penrose, 1993, pp. 7-8). The 'empty' construct of 'race' is materialized in the embodied experience of non/belonging at Passport Control: as Dionne Brand has remarked, the experience of cross-border shopping is distinctively different for whites and blacks (1994, p. 157).

Furthermore, Carter, Green and Halpern (1996) argue that through immigration and nationality controls, states legitimize notions of racial difference by using 'race' as a marker of static, essentialized traits which are used to rank and select
racialized and spatialized\textsuperscript{21} human populations in terms of immigrant "hierarchies of assimilability"\textsuperscript{22}. In this process, national identities are reconstituted as everything racialized potential immigrant groups are not (pp. 135-40). How, for example are whiteness, Americanness and the social space within U.S. borders constituted in the binary articulated by presidential candidate Pat Buchanan: "If we had to take a million immigrants in, say, Zulus, next year, or Englishmen, and put them in Virginia, what group would be easier to assimilate?" (emphasis mine) (quoted in Singh, March 11, 1996).

In constituting notions of assimilability and desirability, racism interlocks with other discourses of social difference to adjudicate who is and isn't fit to become Canadian. As immigration policy of this century has generally claimed to serve the twin priorities of the country's economy and labour needs, single immigrants and refugees have tended to be men of working age without physical or mental disabilities, while women, children and seniors have more often entered under the 'family class' category as 'dependents'. Rockhill and Tomic (1995) have

\textsuperscript{21} "Country of origin" was a formal criteria in Canadian immigration policy until 1962 (Smith, 1993, p. 57).

\textsuperscript{22} The authors report that in U.S. Congressional debates reviewed "even those opposed to immigration restriction utilized a similar logic ... Regardless of one's position, the discourse about the desirability of migrants was overt racist, with colour, religion, language and country of origin the signifiers of 'race' membership. To these attributes were attached judgements about the likely adoption of an American identity, proclivity towards criminality, fitness to labour and cultural proximity to the alleged Anglo-Saxon foundation upon which the nation was built" (p. 141).
described the second class status this imposes on the latter: as 'dependents', wives can not, for example, receive subsidized English training; nor do they have as open access to knowledge of their rights as their husbands. The category of disability is further constructed as undesirable in the exclusion of people with disabilities from eligibility to enter as immigrants. Other categories of social difference get re-articulated through refugee law in ways that deny agency and resistance: to a significant extent, women, homosexuals, religious minorities (and persons with disabilities? check refugee law) are reproduced - and must perform themselves in front of refugee boards - as victims when these identities become the basis of their refugee claims. In this way these categories are reproduced as undesirable but worthy of Canadians' pity and generosity.

The construct of worthiness illustrates the complex, exclusionist ways discourses of 'race', nation and morality intersect in discussions of citizenship. According to Goldberg (1994), the nation, as a liberal community, is constituted through the circular logic of racialized codes of morality and rights:

"[s]ubjects assume value ... only in so far as they are the bearers of rights; and they are properly vested with rights only in so far as they are imbued with value. The rights others as a matter of course enjoy are yet denied people of colour because black, brown, red, and yellow subjectivities continue to be disvalued; and the devaluation of these subjectivities delimits at least the applicability of rights or restricts their scope of application that people of
This is illustrated in Arat-Koc's research (1992) into how, in the case of policies and bureaucratic attitudes regarding foreign domestic workers, discourses of racism, sexism and classism inform notions of "'deserving' and 'undeserving' immigrants ... not just based on what people do and how they contribute to Canadian society, but on where they come from". Arat-Koc argues that within discourses of 'opportunity' (which clearly differentiate between domestic workers from Western Europe and low-income nations) the conditions of work for foreign domestic workers - severely restricted rights and criteria for landed immigrant status - are described as "privileged" and the exploitation of 'Third World' female labour is reconfigured as "charity". She concludes that this is possible specifically because of explicit claims that these women "would otherwise not qualify under the point system" (despite statistical evidence of stable, high levels of demand for their labour) and implicit comparisons with the conditions these women would face in their own countries.

---

I would like to suggest that it is specifically this exclusivist intersection of discourses of 'race', nation and morality that fan the flames of righteous outrage whenever immigrants and crime are linked in popular media. Stymeist (1975) also notes the use of moral judgements in justification of the racialized exclusion of First Nations people - specifically, accusations of alcoholism and laziness.

Finally, Wells and Serna's (1996) study of how white elite parents argue against detracking in schools documents how the trope of worthiness informs these arguments: language such as 'deserving'/'undeserving', 'gifted' and 'talented' justify these parents' sense of entitlement while euphemistically referencing white privilege.
In conclusion, in addressing the construct of racialized difference it is essential to recognize how discourses of racism tend to signal and constitute relations of static, inherited difference, of moral exclusion and naturalized domination. This point will be pursued particularly in relation to different discourses of racism in Canada in the final section of this chapter.

Furthermore, as they have been commonly articulated in connection with discourses of nation, notions of 'race' and racial difference have tended to serve essentialist and exclusionary ends. This suggests that to a certain extent, all ESL immigrant students will experience othering through mechanisms of racialized marginalization in their relations with Canadian-born citizens. There are other racist discourses circulating in Canadian society, however - discourses of Eurocentrism, for example - upon which certain groups can draw in order to counter this othering and re-assert their legitimacy while others can not. The next section suggests that there are also discourses of cultural difference within the narration of the Canadian nation which European groups can 'cite' in similar defence.

---

I use this term to signal discursive interpellation into subject positions of alterity or Otherness.

In this regard, see my comparison of Katarina and Mai's positioning in Peirce's research, Chapter III.
Constructions of Culture and Cultural Difference

Attempting to develop a working concept of culture and cultural difference in some distinction from 'race' and racial difference may seem abstract and arbitrary and yet, as I explore later in the case of culturalized racism or 'the new racism', failing to outline a strategic clarity in the distinction between the two concepts can allow an insidious and resilient form of discrimination to flourish unchallenged.

Rattansi (1992) describes the concept of culture as involving, more than simply questions of "shared descent", "inherited authority" or even "shared socio-economic location and history": central to the notion of culture are issues of "representation, symbolic boundary formation and identification". Drawing from the work of Raymond Williams, Rattansi further characterizes culture as "signifying practices" which contribute to and authorize "processes, categories and knowledges through which communities are imagined and defined as such: that is, how they are rendered specific and differentiated". In this sense, cultural practices signify particular and bounded ranges of identificatory sites, engaging in questions of community, difference and dialogue (pp. 4-5).

According to Rattansi, then, there exist different conceptions of the term 'culture' which incorporate very different elements. I will argue in this section that certain discourses of cultural difference in circulation are able to
selectively recruit these various elements to projects of including or excluding specific groups, and that these discourses impact tremendously upon how ESL students are viewed and positioned in Canadian society. I turn first to several other authors who attempt to distinguish and trace the play of very different interpretations and constitutive aspects of 'culture'.

James Clifford (1988) traces the concept from its organicist roots in the 19th century when, according to Raymond Williams, "culture designated a tendency to natural growth" (in its sense as a verb) and in its capitalized singular noun form represented "what was most elevated, sensitive, essential, precious - most uncommon - in [European] society" (Williams in Clifford, p. 233). It is important to note that this notion of culture, which was very much classed-based, interlocked with the racialized marker of civilization in colonialist discourses. Clifford continues that even in its twentieth century liberal, globally relativist anthropological incarnation "the term ['cultures'] retained its [organicist] bias toward wholeness, continuity and growth ... it had in the last analysis to cohere" (p. 338). In this conception "[c]ultural systems hold together; and they change more or less continuously, anchored primarily by language and place" (emphasis mine)(p. 273).

This understanding recruited notions both of seamless community and unbreachable difference: "as a coherent body that lives and dies, ... [c]ulture is enduring, traditional, structural (rather than contingent, syncretic, historical), ... a
process of ordering, not of disruption" (p. 234-5). Quoting Said, Clifford points to "'the notion that there are geographical spaces with indigenous, radically 'different' inhabitants who can be defined on the basis of some religion, culture or racial essence proper to that geographical space'" (p. 274).

An "organicist" conception of cultural difference such as that described above echoes the rhetoric of descent and origins evident in discourses of racialized difference. In its elitism, this notion also carries an intrinsic connotation of hierarchy and exclusion. Defining culture in terms of wholeness, linear growth, temporal continuity, geographical and linguistic separation, discrete boundaries, radical essential difference and a "backward-looking sense of authenticity" (pp. 344, 341), this definition has tremendous implications for immigrant ESL learners. According to this perspective, immigration from any other than the original or established ethnic groups could only threaten the integrity and survival of Canadian cultural traditions.

This is the view within which Bissoondath (1994) locates his critique of multiculturalism in Selling Illusions, claiming that the policy produces a "heightened sense of ethnicity", "harden[ed] hatreds" and "divided loyalty". Contending that multiculturalism "highlight[s] the differences that divide Canadians rather than the similarities that unite them", Bissoondath recommends a return to Canada's "own traditions, ideals and attitudes". In terms of my discussion, Bissoondath's
argument represents an absolutist concept of cultural difference and 'zero-sum' model of national culture. He extrapolates these notions to argue that Canadian national culture and identity are under seige and disintegrating under the centrifugal vectors of too many inherently belligerent multi-cultures. In reducing complex power relations to expressions of a naturalized ethnocentric malignity, his logic contains but one solution: the denial of difference in a return to an imagined, unified, dominant Canadian culture and ethnicity (Li, Xiao Ping, 1995). This back-to-our-roots talk abounds in Canadian popular media, establishing a hierarchy of legitimacy:

"English Canadians: a silent nation awakes

The contributions of francophones, of native people, of immigrants, have all been significant, of course. But what we are now is mostly what English Canadians, Anglo-Celts to use the more accurate term, once were. They 'set down the tramlines' of the Canada of today ... It was English Canadians who explored the greater part of the country, cleared it, and settled it. It was they who contributed the overwhelming majority of the men who died fighting in wars for democracy and freedom. It was they who created almost all of the country's political and legal infrastructure ... it was they who developed the prevailing mores of civility and tolerance towards pluralism and diversity that makes this country unlike any other in the world."  

Within schooling, this view of culture promotes debates, hotly argued by the back-to-basics camp, over which cultures will be included in the curriculum. The zero-sum trope activates the

---

authoritative logic of limited resources: there are only so many teaching hours but so much to cover and why should minority cultures crowd out the classics? This argument reflects how notions of culture as accumulated tradition and as 'the most elevated' reinforce each other, and are both organicism and elitism are reinforced when the purpose of education is understood to be the distillation and transmission of a society's cultural inheritance. Within this view, English as a second language students are threatening to the integrity of hegemonic ethnic cultures, and marked by the very 'foreign' nature of their language, culture and very essence. By logical extension, this threat can be mitigated most effectively by programmes of assimilation - instruction in Canadian traditions and institutions, first language replacement - although this burden of assimilation would naturally be greater for those groups culturally more distant than others.

On the other hand, James Clifford speculates on the possibilities which are opened up by conceptions of culture which begin from "a standpoint not of finality but of emergence" (p. 342). He proposes an understanding of culture not as essence but as ongoing processes of syncretic re/invention, as "future-oriented appropriations" of past in response to present conditions, relations and political purposes (pp. 247, 273, 319). Clifford explains:

"Groups negotiating their identity in contexts of domination and exchange persist, patch themselves together in ways different from a living organism ... existing discontinuously, keeping open multiple paths"
or identities ... Metaphors of continuity and 'survival' do not account for complex, historical processes of appropriation, compromise, subversion, masking, invention and revival" (pp. 338, 341).

This is a concept of cultural identity defined less by "boundar[ies] to be maintained" than by the "nexus of relations [conversations] and transactions" in which subjects or groups are actively engaged (p. 274). It emphasizes elements of syncretic innovation, rupture and negotiation. Applied to the Canadian context, this perspective is particularly useful in that it avoids reducing multiculturalism to "little more than a collision between fully formed and mutually exclusive cultural communities" (Gilroy, 1993a, p.7). Rather, it encourages a view of Canadian culture as a fertile experiment, a fascinating crucible of cosmopolitan encounter and post-colonial re-encounter of histories and counter-histories27, of popular memories from both sides of the "activated imperial divide" (Said on contrapuntal reading practices, 1994, pp. 66-7).

The writings of Paul Gilroy also support a concept of culture as scavenging and improvisational. In his study of "the rhizomatic, fractal structure" (1993a, p. 5) of the diasporic

---

27 Bhabha has described the post-colonial perspective as one in which, among other elements, the physical presence of colonialism's others in the metropolitan centre spotlights and contradicts the repressions and exclusions upon which colonialist narratives were founded. In Canada this increasingly vociferous contestatory tradition has resulted, for example, in the disruption of official Columbus Quintecentennial celebrations with celebrations of 500 years of resistance, histories of Chinese railway workers and Black communities in Upper Canada and Acadia. See, for example, (Li), (We're Rooted Here), Stolen Continents.
'black Atlantic', Gilroy has developed an intriguing model of culture which disrupts and exceeds exclusionary definitions rooted in geography, language, descent or linear continuity. Understood as "something intrinsically fluid, changing, unstable and ... syncretic ... not ... as flowing into neat ethnic parcels but as a radically unfinished social process of self-definition and transformation", 'culture' comes to resemble "a relational field in which [social groups] encounter one another and live out social, historical relationships" (1993a, p. 24, 61).

Gilroy offers this reconceptualization of culture in an effort to displace hegemonic notions of "supposedly authentic, natural, and stable 'rooted' identit[ies]", "discrete [absolute] cultures" and unified, homogenous nations which are the intellectual legacy of Euro-American modernity. He notes that this more reductionist interpretation tends to come to the forefront "when culture is brought into contact with 'race'" as if "through its proximity to the concept of race ['culture'] ... is transformed into a pseudo-biological property of communal life [and of social groups]" (1993b, p. 57, 61). When such an essentialized view of cultural difference interlocks with xenophobic cultural nationalism, homogenous national culture comes to seen as a "naturally" inherited characteristic, transmitted through a collectivity of homogenous family units (1993b, p. 64). Of note in this conception of culture is the modernist notion of individual and collective identity as unitary, stable and monolithic. Individuals and nations are
framed as decontextualized black boxes, internally coherent and externally impermeable. One person's or one nation's culture is an expression of essence marked indelibly on bodies. According to Gilroy, then, this concept of cultural difference fuses the construct of culture to that of nation to cement relations of exclusion.

In order to pursue this exploration of the conceptions of collectivity and difference produced at the intersection of discourses of culture difference and nation, I turn to the work of Benedict Anderson: "Seen as both a historical fatality and as a community imagined through language, the nation presents itself as simultaneously open and closed" (1983, p. 146). Arguing that culture is one of the means by which nations are imagined, Anderson identifies two contradictory constructions of cultural community circulating in discussions of nation. He characterizes them as: community based upon kinship and home/place versus that based upon communication and relationality; a primordial or ancestral sense of community "across homogenous, empty [serial] time" versus "an experience of simultaneity" or "joinable" "unisonance" across space. This points to an ambivalence in the incongruity between the conceptions of more closed, diachronic and naturalized form of cultural comm/unity (p. 143) and a more permeable, synchronic form (p. 145-6).

I would complicate Anderson's binary of communal aperture / impermeability, arguing that each of the two conceptions of cultural collectivity assumes and tolerates different
understandings of commonality and difference. While a conception of an historically descended community could serve to foreclose tolerance of any diversity of 'race' or place of birth while simultaneously eliding class difference (as in the case of the discourses promoted by the British Conservative party in the 1980's: see Gilroy, 1993a, 1993b; Rattansi, 1992) it is not necessarily true that a linguistic or communicative model of community is always less exclusive. For example, a conception of culture as a communicative form of social organization may tolerate national, racial, and ethnic difference - to a point - while requiring conformity to communicative / contractual rules. As is illustrated through media representation/images of the humble, back-breaking industriously grateful refugee (good immigrants) and urban crime (bad immigrants), new members of Canadian multicultural society are to a significant degree expected to conform to the positions offered to them within multiculturalism.

An individual's acceptance into a "communicative community", a 'community imagined through language', is subject to the structure and gradational values of that language.

---

28 I hasten here to emphasize the way discourses of race, class, education, and gender mediate the positions of qualified and contingent 'Canadianness' into which immigrant / non-Anglo communities are discursively interpellated within this society and popular media.

29 This term is developed by Deutsch and Schlesinger to describe the concept of culture as a shared worldview based on shared positioning (in relation to other groups) and resources of self-representation. (Yuval Davis, p. 411)
It was in recognition of this colonizing potential of standardized language that "Antonio de Nebrija armed Isabella of Spain with the first grammar of a modern European language, expressly as an 'instrument of empire', the very mark of civilization" (Goldberg, p. 25). The anecdote of a Turkish gastarbeiter ('guest worker') finding out that the word that is supposed to mean 'girl', out of his mouth means "that he is a randy dog", illustrates the differential terms upon which languages accept new speakers (Berger in Bhabha, 1994, p. 165). Relevant here is my discussion below of the way that standardized language differentiates between speakers by measuring individuals' deviation from the standard, as well as the ways notions of purity link discourses of linguistic/grammatical correctness and those of social difference. Joining a linguistic community means buying into the concentric structures which map newcomers onto geographies of authenticity; joining means negotiating power and identity in lingua franca.

I pursue this discussion in attempt to sketch how language, and the marker of linguistic difference tend to function quite distinctly from the discursive constructs of cultural and racial difference, through particular tropes and mechanisms of regulation. As coherent, standardized systems of meaning and social organization, languages reference notions of purity, authenticity and integrity which I would argue can intersect both

---

30 See below, Chapter III.1, The Applied Linguistics Paradigm.
with 'organicist' discourses of culture identified by Clifford, and with racisms based in hierarchical gradations of purity and deviation. In this sense, then, the construct of linguistic difference can be seen as functioning to constitute very exclusionary and assimilationist relations of difference. One of the implications of this for ESL pedagogy, as I explore in the next chapter, is that for ESL teachers to understand their students and pedagogical goals strictly in terms of language learning and linguistic difference is to adopt from square one a highly discriminatory and dangerous orientation to their students as social beings. Even where language difference is not primary, teachers need to consider how these tropes of purity and elitism are operating.

I would qualify Anderson's binary, then, by pointing to the limits of linguistic metaphors of culture and cultural community. I would suggest that the concept of culture as communicative community, of culture as a standardized grammar of semantic, representational or relational practices that constitute non/belonging demonstrates the limits of aperture of a consensual and contractual model of community. In that all languages construct their own systems of meaning and social relations by which they define collective identity, these communicative systems function to position individuals in relation to these shared standards, both outside and within the boundaries of those systems. In other words, standardized systems of meaning and social organization necessarily construct collective identity on
the basis of sameness\textsuperscript{31} to the exclusion or repression of difference.

This distinction is particularly important in the field of ESL pedagogy, so saturated with linguistic theory that linguistic metaphors of culture and acculturation might transparently suggest that all students need to do is learn the content and rules of the new culture in order to be accepted. However, for ESL teachers to assume that language and cultural difference are the factors most relevant to their students' experiences of becoming Canadian is to fail to ask \textit{who} becomes Canadian on \textit{what} terms and who \textit{doesn't}. For ESL teachers to assume that mastery of English and the subtleties of Canadian cultural norms is sufficient to assure students' successful integration into Canadian society is to \textit{erase} students' experiences as racialized social subjects, is to fail to open discussions that might identify and challenge the invisible centre, the dominant discourses of social difference circulating in Canadian society that position ESL students differently as Canadians.

In his work, Bhabha traces the interplay of different definitional elements in conceptions of culture set against the backdrop of the nation in terms of contrasting \textit{temporalities}. He characterises national culture as always just emerging, a performative, 'cutting edge' temporality of popular signifying

\textsuperscript{31} For discussions of the problems of constructing collective identities of sameness raised by perspectives informed by a politics of difference, as well as the crisis of representation, see Todd, forthcoming; Walcott, 1995; Britzman, forthcoming.
practices:

"'Culture abhors simplification' Fanon writes, as he tries to locate the people in a performative time: 'the fluctuating movement that the people are just giving shape to'. The present of the people's history, then, is a practice that destroys the constant principles of the national culture that attempt to hark back to a 'true' national past, which is often represented in the reified forms of realism and stereotype. Such pedagogical knowledges and continuist national narratives miss the 'zone of occult instability where the people dwell' (Fanon's phrase)" (1994, p. 152)

Bhabha maps a complex relation between this aspect of culture as a contentious performative space of "the perplexity of the living" (Benjamin in Bhabha, 1994, p. 161), with the continuist pedagogical narration of national culture as a coherent elaboration of archaic tradition. He describes this relation in terms of "chiasmatic intersections of time and place (p. 141), spaces of semantic vacillation in which the performative aspect of culture is always both in danger of subsumption by and potentially disruptive of the pedagogical.

Bhabha's point that representations and practices of culture are pedagogical\textsuperscript{11}, that they intersect with discourses of nationalism to translate the enunciative present to the containing rhetoric of a homogenous past (pp. 142-7), is crucial to my thesis. While recognizing the multiplicity of articulatory sites, forms and specific contents in enunciatory practices, his theory offers insight into how these myriad cultural expressions intersect with discourses of nationalism. It underlines the need

\textsuperscript{11} This thesis was documented and argued in masterful detail in relation to European projects of colonialism by Said in \textit{Culture and Imperialism}.
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to work with several models of culture: to understand, for example, how multiculturalism can overlap with ethnic absolutism to reduce culture to an inherited repository of artifacts and curios; to trace how cultural elitism recruits racialized colonialist tropes to raise the stakes in discussions of, for example, national curriculum. It also highlights the discursive manoeuvres through which discussions of culture become discussions of authority and identity.

At the same time, Bhabha’s theory offers antiracist pedagogues a powerful notion of culture disruptive of these discursive moves. His notion of culture offers antiracists a framework for understanding how racist and nationalist exclusions are not completely determined structurally but are effected discursively, as actions upon actions. This goes beyond a notion of ethnocentrism as anti-immigration lobbying and name-calling, to the ways daily life, inter- and intra-personal relations are re-membered/forgotten and naturalized around divisions of self/other. As Goldberg proposed a theory which enabled more complex understandings of racisms, so Bhabha offers a framework for more complex understandings of the articulation of culture, nation, language and ‘race’.

Furthermore, Bhabha’s notion of the performative aspect of

\[\text{While not wishing to trivialize these expressions of ethnocentrism, I wish to push myself and my readers to think through this discourse to its capillary tendrils.}\]

\[\text{My thinking in this discussion bears a tremendous debt to conversations with Prof. Daniel Yon around antiracism and notions of culture.}\]
culture is valuable for transformative pedagogy in that opens up understandings of culture as always potentially subversive, as never pure or originary but "continually in a process of hybridity". Here 'hybridity' refers to the notion of cultural translation:

"[T]ranslation is also a way of imitating, but in a mischievous, displacing sense - imitating an original in such a way that the priority of the original is not reinforced but by the very fact that it can be simulated, copied, transferred, transformed ... the original is never finished or complete in itself. The 'originary' is always open to translation so that it can never be said to have a totalised prior moment of being or meaning - an essence. What this really means is that cultures are only constituted in relation to that otherness internal to their own symbol-forming activity which makes them de-centred structures - through that displacement or liminality [which] opens up the possibility of articulating different, even incommensurable cultural practices and priorities".15

The conceptual shift effected by the notion of cultural hybridity creates lies in focusing transformative intentions on the displacement in the very pith of culture. This opens strategies of resistance which might unsettle polarities of dominant versus oppositionary culture; of either reinforcing or refusing hegemonic (racist, xenophobic, nationalist) discourses of identity and difference; of either equating or opposing supposedly distinct cultures; of either reproducing or inverting identities and relations as presently imagined.

This is a powerful perspective which looks not so much to the past as to the present and future in trying to understand culture, and locates difference at the heart of culture. It is

15 Bhabha, 1990, pp. 210-11.
particularly relevant to the context of ESL in that it displaces narrations of an 'original' or 'true' Canadian culture threatened with dilution or erasure by foreign cultures. It reframes the myriad cultural practices imagining this nation, as an ongoing process of contention, scavenging and innovation, and welcomes ESL immigrant students as complex new participants expanding the range of possibility.

What emerges from these discussions of various authors is that there do seem to exist contesting conceptions of cultural difference: some which emphasize fluidity / flux, contention and innovation while others tend to essentialize and stabilize borders of identity and difference. It is important to note how 'culture' and 'cultural difference' can be constructed so as to naturalize exclusion. This happens when culture is reified as a definable entity, reduced to fixed ingredients - such as language, place, religion, customs, institutions - essentialized traits or properties that can be attached to bodies or express homogenized essence. It happens when cultures are reduced to coherent wholes outside history or articulated in the rhetoric of descent, distinct origins and authenticity. As I discuss in the next section, the trope of cultural authenticity can achieve similar exclusionary effects as the racist trope of purity.

At the same time, while it is important to pay attention to how certain discourses of cultural difference incite a closing of ranks, a transformative pedagogy should also concern itself with how the contradictory notions of culture and narrations of
difference are in a permanent tug-of-war - with each other and with the very act of enunciation - such that the space of potential change lies in their gaps and incomplete mastery. I will further pursue this line of thought in specific reference to pedagogy in the next chapter.

One of the most important implications of my discussion above is that it matters how culture is represented and how students are understood as culturally different in ESL theory and practice, for these imaginings circumscribe the terms under which students negotiate relations of legitimacy and inclusion as new Canadians and new speakers of English.

For example, in reference to students' home cultures, teachers need to respect that these are living, changing and complex entities. Students have not left their cultures behind in their native countries nor at home, nor do they practice them the same way in Canada as in their native countries, at school as at home. Their cultural identities are not defined by archaic traditions. Similarly, their first language may not be simply part of their 'heritage' but a part of their daily life, intimate relations and identifications / self-concept. First and second cultures need not be positioned as mutually opposed or contradictory: for example, ESL students need not automatically be positioned as suffering from a cultural tug-of-war (and female ESL students need not be immediately framed as crushed by antediluvian, sexist home cultures and in need of some Western feminism). At the same time, cultures need to be understood as
the expression or enunciation of historical, social and political relations among and between groups of people, relations of both colonialism and resistance.

Another implication for ESL pedagogy is the importance of understanding and teaching ‘Canadian culture’, less as what it has been than as what it has become (and why). In his excellent critique of Bissoondath’s Selling Illusions, Xiao Ping Li (1995) suggests that multiculturalism, as an ideal as well as an imperfect policy and practice, might be the most appropriate frame for understanding Canadian culture and society.

A further important implication of these discussion for ESL pedagogy is that racialized difference obviously can not be collapsed into cultural difference. Enid Lee has described in depth, for example, the various ways racisms can impact on ESL students of colour and has emphasized the importance of teachers introducing vocabulary that names and challenges these effects (Lee, 1993). Put differently, issues of racism are not ‘covered’ by a multiculturalist orientation and ESL students are not adequately understood if only framed as culturally different. While I certainly don’t propose that an antiracist agenda dominate the cultural component of ESL pedagogy, nor that issues of race are somehow more important than other categories of social exclusion, the discussions in this section certainly suggest that culture is neither neutral, transparent nor benign. As such, an awareness of how different orientations to culture activate logics and practices of racialized othering should at
least inform thinking about what is taught in the name of culture in ESL pedagogy.

L: So, do you see that there is a 'Canadian content' to teaching ESL? What do you see as important in teaching 'Canadian culture'?

B: Yes there's certainly a component of Canadian content in ESL. ... For example, [knowing about] the degree to which punctuality is valued, and some of the stereotypes around which ethnicities and races aren't punctual, can go a long way in helping [ESL students] avoid being stereotyped at least in that way, as well as helping them start out on the right foot with people. ... I suppose for me that means teaching students about things like how to use the TTC, the government resources they can access, tenant rights, and that there are means of protecting your rights. I mean in one case a student successfully brought a claim of sexual harassment against an employer. And teaching about the principles our society is based upon, like multiculturalism, multiracialism, equity, mutual respect and tolerance.
Constructions of 'Race' and Racial Difference
Meet Constructions of Culture and Cultural Difference

In the two sections above I tried to sketch various tensions and relations invoked in popular discourses of 'race' and racial difference, and culture and cultural difference in circulation in the context of immigration and language learning. I argued that racial difference, while extremely fluid and contextually specific in terms of content, has tended to function within discourses of racism as a marker of hegemonic colonialism and abject othering, of descent-based stable essence / fixed otherness that naturalizes relations of domination and exclusion. This is not to say that these are the only meanings possible for the sign of racial difference, as is evidenced in the tradition of writing and cultural production within the field of black- and Afro-Atlantic cultural studies. Work by bell hooks (1990, 1992), Lillian Allen (1993), Dionne Brand (1995), Makeda Silvera (1995), Kobena Mercer (1990a, 1990b), Stuart Hall (1988, 1990, 1992), Paul Gilroy (1987, 1993a, 1993b) and Rinaldo Walcott (1995), for example, struggles to maintain "blackness as an open signifier" by foregrounding "the processes of cultural mutation and restless (dis)continuity that exceed racial discourse and avoid capture by its agents" (Gilroy, 1993a, pp. 32, 2).

In terms of notions of culture, an exploration of different authors' work suggested a range of conflicting discourses in circulation within which the construct of cultural difference hosts a range of images, resonances and relations. Within certain discourses of culture, cultural difference may function as a
marker of distinct, generationally-transmitted and organically growing entities: these integral accumulations of tradition are generally affixed to place and language. Within other understandings the concept of cultural difference may serve to highlight the performative nature of culture as re/signifying practices of hybridity, re/appropriation, innovation, transformation and/or negotiation: central to these processes are rupture and discontinuity, be it in time, place, language or formal structures of collectivity. Narratives of cultural difference may incorporate elements of descent, invoking the image of homogenous communities travelling through time together from misty origins; other narratives may reference unfinished projects continuously redefined as participants negotiate meaning and relations. Boundaries may be represented as unbreachable chasms between discrete, authentic essences; they may also be seen as unstable, contended and strategically deployed within relations of domination and exclusion.

This discussion suggests that the discursive constructs of racial and cultural difference can incite very different relations of in/exclusion. I began the exploration of the various constructs of cultural difference by suggesting that there are important reasons for distinguishing between culture and 'race', and concluded with the statement that it matters very much how we speak of different cultures and cultural difference in ESL pedagogy. In this section I will trace one way discourses of racism intersect with certain conceptions of cultural
difference within the discursive frame of nationalism, and the implications of this for ESL pedagogy.

As is clear from the discussions above of conceptions of 'race' and racial difference, and of culture and cultural difference, there is ample overlap between the two. Goldberg argues: "In it's non-biological interpretation ... race stands for historically specific forms of cultural connectedness and solidarity"; 'culture' can tend "to facilitate the naturalization of the group formation and internalization by ethnic [or racial group] members of their group identity" (Goldberg, 1994, pp. 73, 76) In this definition, 'culture' refers to those processes by which a group identity is established and internalized by designated members. 'Race' is also portrayed as a social construction evolving from historically-specific conditions.

Yet Goldberg acknowledges that the designation of groups as racial or cultural also depends on "the politics of general group reference at the time in question" (p. 75) In other words, groups at one time designated as genetically inferior may later be discursively reclassified as a cultural or ethnic group. Here Goldberg is alluding to a noted shift in the popular articulations of racism during this century: a shift from a discourse that asserted the biological and genetic difference between certain groups, to one "which has as its objects not individual human beings but 'a certain form of existing'" (the inherent cultural and moral essence of certain groups of people) (Fanon in Miles, 1993, p. 62). I would argue that the shifting
designation of certain groups as racial or cultural others also reflects the discursive dynamics invoked by the two terms: for example, McClintock described the racialization of the Irish, England's earliest colony, as "white negroes and Celtic Calibans" (pp. 52-3). On the other hand, in North America the Irish were at first racialized and later ethnicized as they became just one of a growing number of European ethnic groups (as opposed to Aboriginal, African and Asian racial groups). This supports my assertion that the discursive construct of racial difference functions within discourses of racism to mark relations of hegemonic colonialism and abject otherness thus naturalizing exclusion from modern liberal communities.

Goldberg (1994) refers to this racialized interpretation of ethnicity, "ethnorace" and locates it at the convergence of the criteria upon which some conceptions of 'race' and some of ethnicity are based. He explains that the boundary construction, naturalization of inter-group differences and internalization of ascribed collective identity (ie. the criteria for group membership) involved in ethnic, racial or national group formation, may be based upon cultural, social, political, kinship, linguistic, and/or territorial criteria. As I have explored above, Goldberg suggests that conceptions of 'race' tend to rely more often upon descent and naturalized relations of exclusion, and those of ethnicity upon culture. At the same time, some interpretations of ethnicity and some of 'race' depend equally upon the same criteria (p. 75). For example, a relatively
closed, exclusionist understanding of ethnicity may cast ethnic identity as deeply inherent to its members, a product of shared history, descent and tradition. The coincidence of these criteria for both ethnic and racial group membership enables the elision of 'culture' and 'race', commonly based in "sedimented and immutable differences" (p. 76). The exclusion naturalized by this elision may have particularly devastating effects in situations such as that of racially diverse immigration to nations self-defined as racially-homogenous.

This latter example has been extensively explored by British 'race' theorists to explain the resilient form of racism deployed by the Conservative party during the 1980's (Barker, 1981; Balibar, 1991; Reeves, 1983, 1989; Miles, 1989; Gilroy, 1993b; Rattansi, 1992; Cohen, 1992). Coining the term 'the new racism', Barker first described this as "a theory of human nature" which employs cultural relativism and 'ignorance' of power differences to maintain a face of neutrality and innocence in claiming the absolute "incompatibility of cultural traditions" while naturalizing ethnocentrism/xenophobia in any ethnic group (including 'white' ethnic groups) (Barker in Miles, 1993, p. 62). Gilroy has suggested that this culturally-targeted form of racial exclusion may best be understood as one example of "ethnic absolutism ... a reductive essentialist understanding of ethnic and national difference which operates through an absolute sense of culture so powerful that it is capable of separating people off from each other and diverting them into social and historical
locations that are understood to be mutually impermeable and incommensurable ... It's popularity lies in its visage of egalitarianism, its success in evading "the [discredited] idea of race as hierarchy in favour of a pseudopluralism which is only betrayed in the end by its steely lack of tolerance" (italics mine) (1993b, p. 64-5)

Explained in terms of my discussion above, this 'culturalized racism' is able to frame culture as the basis of racialization by summoning a selective, exclusionary definition of 'culture'. This definition includes the elements of shared descent, historical 'roots' and continuity; it describes an homogenous, determinist set of values and behaviours based in inherited archaic tradition. An illuminating example from outside Canada lies in the opposition expressed by Afrikaner parents to the desegregation of a racially exclusive school: claiming to be protecting the "character and ethos" of their children's school, the white parents argued: "We feel the character of the school will be changed if it is flooded by another culture. The school will be completely black in one or two years ... Others call it racism ... We call it culture" (The Toronto Star, Feb 22, 1996).

This example corroborates my discussion of discourses of racism, in which historically specific conditions decide the social, moral, physical or cultural ingredients/elements of racial difference, which then becomes the marker of static, absolute and abject difference and naturalized moral exclusion. This is further underscored by other examples: Goldberg (1994)
describes that in 19th century linguistic racism, linguists classified human populations into 'races' by language group. For example, German, Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit were defined as descended from the Aryan 'race' (separated then, one would assume, only by cultural and geographical difference): among other groups, this seems to leave most notably Africans and Aboriginals (enslaved and almost annihilated) as racialized linguistic and cultural others. To each 'race' was assigned different levels of civilization, sophistication and intellectual habits "relayed via linguistic acquisition" (p. 71). Another illustration of the contextually conditioned selection of the markers of culturalized racial difference is Philip Cohen's outline (1992) of the changing characterizations by which Jews have been historically portrayed as culturally different. They were represented as the pariah murderers of Christ in the Middle Ages; unscrupulous capitalists with "dirty money" during Industrialization; unorthodox religious and political infiltrators during the Enlightenment; and powerful, greedy, treasonous conspirators in Nazi Germany (pp. 16-21).

Invoking the term 'culture', however, discourses of culturalized racism are able to summon up notions of pluralist difference located outside historical relations of domination and denigration. These latter notions are drawn from reductive, relativist discourses of multiculturalism, examined in the next section. Here it is important to note that this move does not simply replace discredited notions of biological racial
hierarchies with a more palatable and apoliticized terminology. I would suggest that this invocation is particularly powerful when those narratives of relativist cultural difference referenced are also central to discourses of national identity, as is the case in countries such as Canada. As the site of intense emotional investment, identificatory desire and pride, these cited constructs carry a heightened degree of legitimacy and transparency. Recruited to discourses of culturalized racism, they can work to naturalize cultural stereotypes which perpetuate the exclusion of certain groups from representational and material resources, all the while denying accusations of subordination and discrimination. Daniel Stoffman’s article on the Somali community in Toronto, for example, praises Canadian traditions of tolerance, generosity and cultural pluralism as often as it insinuates the factious, corrupt nature of Somali society (Stoffman, 1995; see also Sharrif, 1995).

Gilroy points out a final source of strength of Britain’s ‘new racism’: by assembling a construct of nation such that “the limits of [culturalized] race have come to coincide ... precisely with national frontiers, ... discourses of patriotism, ... xenophobia, Englishness, Britishness, militarism and gender difference” are recruited to the anti-immigration cause (pp. 43,46). Again, Stoffman’s article illustrates the intersection of discourses of cultural absolutism, Orientalism, as well as the tropes - particularly popular and powerful in the context of a rising campaign of the Ontario Conservative Party scapegoating
'welfare bums' for sky-rocketing government debt - of welfare fraud and bloated, inefficient government agencies.

While the anti-immigration lobby may not yet be as strong in Canada as in Britain, ethnocentric longings for recovery abound, particularly in the wake\(^36\) of the 1995 Quebec referendum. Discourses of new racism recruit tropes of nostalgia and loss to incite identification with a desire for the recuperation of imagined innocence, authenticity and organic community based on sameness (Britzman, 1995), as is attested to in Walcott's review of the 'Oh! Canada' exhibit at the Art Gallery of Ontario in 1996 (Walcott, 1996). As the nation state, in this case Canada, finds itself increasingly destabilized and beleaguered by the assaults of neoliberal transnationalism, cuts to government operations and services, as well as by its inability to come to terms with questions of difference, the arena of popular culture witnesses a flourishing of attempts to return to and reassert "nationalism and national cultural identity in a highly defensive way and try to build barriers around it before it is eroded" (Hall, 1991, p.33).

Walcott's account of constructed melancholia in the Oh! Canada exhibit suggests that ethnic absolutist representations of racialized cultures function not only to entrench boundaries along intersecting discursive axes of 'race', culture and nation, but also to recuperate and reinforce dominant definitions of

\(^{36}\) I want to cite here both the ideas of 'aftermath' and 'mourning of loss', as discussed in Walcott, p. 16.
'Canadian' cultural identity. Understood in this light, Stoffman's references to Canadian high standards of living and "wide-open-spaces" take on an enhanced preciousness when juxtaposed with affirmations that people in cramped refugee camps halfway around the world are scheming to get here. Another example is the RCMP statement condemning as "unacceptable and intolerable" a Sikh-Canadian group's plans to honour a community member suspected by the RCMP in the 1985 Air India bombing. Stating, "To recognize a terrorist as a hero in this country defies the established principles and standards recognized by Canadian society", the RCMP both reminded this community of their contingent legitimacy and belonging in Canada and redefined 'Canadian' (read, white Anglo-Saxon) society through this oppositional binary (The Toronto Star, June 13, 1996). The subtext and often blatant text of such media coverage is an emphasis on the violent 'foreign' nature of these immigrant cultures in sharp contrast to the honest, pacific nature of 'our' culture.

This discussion has many implications for the teaching of ESL: it suggests the need for an understanding of how culturalized racism works discursively, as a less easily recognizable - and quite probably more prevalent - form of racism in Canada than expressions of biological or 'scientific racism'. This discussion also suggests the importance of how

---

37 This may be particularly relevant in a country one of whose national myths is that of being 'less racist than the U.S.' Witness, for the example, the anxiety and furor triggered
different cultures are conceived within teaching and how ESL students are understood as subjects of cultural difference. The case of culturalized racism suggests that reductive, pluralist ahistorical discourses of multiculturalism can be more than simply non-conducive to ESL students’ self-concept as valuable Canadian cultural innovators. That is, these discourses not only summon discursive notions of cultural authenticity which marginalize and fix students’ cultural identities as threatening to the integrity of prior national tradition. Furthermore, these discourses draw upon conceptions of culture as essentialised, discrete and relativist, constructs highly susceptible to discourses of culturalized racism. Thus, in certain ways a pedagogy of ESL which reinforces perceptions of Muslim culture as totalized, foreign/exotic and essentially based in ancient traditions plays right into the sort of culturalized racism which has stigmatized and pathologized Muslim Canadians so disgracefully, especially during the CNN-led vilification campaign during the Gulf War. At least, reductive discourses of multiculturalism offered no traditions of critical thinking with which Canadians might have identified and disassembled the plethora of vicious, colonialist stereotypes circulating in popular culture.

by Donovan Bailey’s misquoted comparison of Canada as being ‘just as racist as the U.S.’ (The Toronto Star, July 17, 1996; The Globe and Mail, August 17, 1996).
For example, it was a real battle, but we established a prayer room for Muslim students to pray on Friday //

L: there was bitterness that they would use school time to pray?

B: Oh yes, this was the most bitter debates in the staff of all time, that you would permit a space for Muslims to pray. And there's the race card, too, because most of the students wanting to pray on Friday are Somalian, so they're African and dressed in full hijab and people were just so adamant. And I pointed out that other school boards allow Jewish students to take Jewish holidays. And over the years, Muslim students have invited staff in to see it's nothing to be frightened about, I mean, it's just 10 minutes! but the .. racism that surrounded that by staff was absolutely unbelievable //

L: and the way the racism is hidden in this, this treatment of students as 'they're just here to learn not to pray, this denial that students are social and cultural beings (well, it only becomes an issue when it's other cultures)

B: and what about teachers that would hold tests on Friday so they'd miss half the test!
The Case of Canada

Having outlined some of the elements and tensions in discursive conceptions of culture, cultural difference, 'race' and racial difference, exploring how these tensions can play out when these discursive constructs intersect with each other inside the frame of nationalism, I would like to turn to a more sustained focus on the context of Canada. To this end, I propose to sketch an exploration, an invitation to further discussion and not an exhaustive nor final summary, of the policy and discourses of immigration and multiculturalism in Canada.

One of the main points I will argue is that, in this country, the constructs of cultural and racial difference differ in important ways in how they have been taken up within discourses of Canadianness to organize relations of belonging and exclusion, identity and difference. I will propose that while cultural difference signals distinct historical traditions, experiences and worldviews, an enriching cosmopolitan palette/palate of customs, aesthetics and institutions, and even relations of social, economic and political inequality, these usages generally reference manageable degrees of 'diversity' posing no intolerable threat of disturbing the national narration. On the other hand, the discursive construct of

Bhabha (1995) has used the term 'cultural diversity' to specifically denote pluralist paradigms "of comparative ethics, aesthetics or ethnology ... a recognition of pre-given cultural 'contents' and customs, held in a time-frame of relativism ... [giving] rise to anodyne liberal notions of multiculturalism, cultural exchange, or the culture of humanity" (p. 206). See my discussion below, chapter III.3
racial difference has tended to mark excess, perilous degrees of
foreignness, abject otherness and disruption: repeatedly it has
signalled relations of denied colonialism as well as exclusion
from the realm of moral subjectivity and shared rights.

I begin by emphasizing that narrations of culture, 'race'
and nation are already inscribed with other discourses of social
difference, that they are always articulated in and through a
social context defined by domination along the lines of gender,
sexuality, class, ability, age and education. I hope, therefore,
to pay attention to this context in my exploration.

As a nation founded through European imperialism, certain
conceptions of cultural and racial difference have always been
crucial to maintaining the legitimacy of Canada as a 'white
settler colony'. These depended upon the organicist and
elitist underpinnings of imperialist social and cultural
Darwinism. The discourse of imperialist Europe's 'civilizing
mission' depended upon "claims for cultural supremacy and
historical priority" which in turn were based in "genealogies of
'origin'" and "hierarchical claims to the inherent originality or
'purity' of cultures" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 157; 1995, p. 208). As

39 On the history of the 'white settler colony' construct
and the violent racialized and gendered erasures it discursively
effects, see: Abele and Stasiulus, 1989, pp. 243-245; Stasiulus,

40 Please refer to my discussion of Clifford in section
II.3.

41 This genealogical notion of culture as linearly
traceable to an origin in another time and place persists in
reductive discourses of multiculturalism today, as I discuss
Cohen argues, colonialism intertwined selective notions of cultural and racial difference: while pre-existing discourses of Orientalism defined Asian culture as a space of sensual lasciviousness, decadence and violence inviting rape (Said, 1979; Goldberg, 1994, 29), the peoples of Africa and, differently, the Americas (characterized respectively by tropes of apes and noble savages) were defined by the natural sciences as being of the same species as Europeans but without the "civilised faculties" (such as "reason, morality, law") necessary to develop culture (Cohen 1988, pp. 18-20). Recruiting the fields of the social and natural sciences to its self-justification, then, the colonialis project depended upon the constructs of both racial and racialized cultural difference as markers of European superiority.

'Race' and racialized culture, or inherited imperial civilization, were also central concepts to immigration policy for the first century of Canadian history. Palmer reports that until the mid-twentieth century "... a group’s desirability as potential immigrants varied almost directly with its members’ physical and cultural distance from London (England), and the degree to which their skin pigmentation conformed to Anglo-Saxon White" based on the assumption that those "who were culturally

---

42 The only countries on the list of preferred nations of origin until 1949 were Britain and the U.S.A., with a very strong emphasis on the former. Only in 1949 were South Europeans allowed for the first time, and some Asian men, permitted in earlier strictly for the purposes of labour, were allowed to sponsor
and racially inferior and incapable of being assimilated either culturally or biologically [climatically] would have to be excluded" (Palmer, in Jackson, p. 55). Stasiulus (1995) affirms that "[i]n the disposition of matters such as immigration and the franchise rights of Asians and blacks, the imperial philosophy of race-blind justice and equality before the law gave way to the sense of racial superiority of all things Anglo-Saxon" (p. 112; see also Satzewich, 1991).

That the nascent 'ethnic' communities which did develop were often spatially contained is illustrated by Razack's analysis of the racialized, gendered and classed constitution of Vancouver's Chinatown. Similarly, in Toronto, Spadina Avenue developed as the city's first 'immigrant quarter', home to the first Chinatown and first Jewish open-air market (Kensington). As the social division of labour was gendered as well as ethnicized and raced, it is hardly surprising that Spadina was also home to Toronto's small garment industry where mostly immigrant women worked on sewing machines. The classed division of space is still evident when one drives or rides down Spadina today jostling from pothole to pothole.

Until the mid-twentieth century, then, discourses of both cultural and racial difference were used to define and police an exclusive and normative formulation of Canadian identity. What of the constructs of cultural and racial difference developed through immigration policy in the 1960's? After 1960, four

family members. (Smith, 1993, p.55)
specific steps were taken by the Canadian government to redress explicitly the racism of previous public policy. The Bill of Rights of 1960 prohibited discrimination on the basis of "race", national origin, religion or sex. In 1962, ethnicity and country of origin were replaced by 'education' and 'training' as immigration criteria, a step taken further by the introduction of the 'points system' in 1967 (Smith, 1993, pp. 56-58).

These changes should be understood as framed by the then prevailing political philosophy of liberalism, which assumed a world composed of 'free', autonomous and 'equal' citizens, with equal access to education and training. In this definition the assumption of 'equality' translates into non-recognition of any systemically marginalized particularity and, hence, a default identity of white, male, Anglo-Saxon, middle class, heterosexual and able. In other words, 'race' and country of origin were no longer acceptable grounds of overt exclusion; neither were they grounds for redress or compensation. These changes can be seen, then, as effecting a delegitimation of cultural and racial difference as a basis for political claims (of privilege or discrimination), even while the criteria of education and training, health examinations and DNA testing continued to discourage the entry of poor applicants (the majority of whom tend to be non-white, non-Anglo women, children and those differently abled) (see Bolaria and Li, 1988; Law Union of

\[43\] DNA testing is an extremely expensive procedure demanded most notably of Somalian applicants for family sponsorship who lack documentation because of the civil war.
Ontario, 1981). Racialized difference, then, while no longer explicitly identified as a criteria of exclusion, continued to function as a hidden partial barrier to acceptance, disqualified from recognition by a liberal articulation of the principle of 'equality'.

The policy of multiculturalism (the fourth step), announced by prime minister Trudeau on October 8, 1971, expressed the government's commitment to three major objectives. It aimed to "promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to such participation"; "ensure that Canadians of all origins have an equal opportunity to obtain employment"; and "preserve and enhance" languages and cultures other than English and French.  

According to the formulation above, multiculturalism might be interpreted within a liberal paradigm which recognizes no systemic "barrier[s] to participation"; it could also be interpreted within a frame which recognizes racism, the ethnicized and gendered division of labour, widening gaps in the social distribution of wealth and access to resources as very significant barriers. What the policy has meant in practice, then, has varied according to contextual discursive conditions and sociopolitical relations, and has been the subject of intense

---

See sections 1.c), 1.i) and 2.a) of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, quoted in Penthes Rubrecht et al., March 1990, p. 96.
struggle. This fact is emphasized in Xiao Ping Li's response (1995) to Neil Bissoondath: Li contends that the former's assumption - that visible minorities were duped by the rhetoric of multiculturalism - underestimates people's agency and capacity to manipulate liberal policy for radical purposes. Li points out that a significant percent of the funding earmarked for multiculturalism goes to antiracist initiatives. One example of this is the recent establishment by the junior minister for multiculturalism and the status of women of the 'long-promised' Canadian Race Relations Institute (Cardozo, Nov. 18, 1996). Li's argument underlines my earlier point that hegemonic narrations of nation and culture are always agonistic - never in complete mastery, never vanquishing subversive contestation.

At the same time, as official federal policy and a regulative hegemonic structural framework which, along with official bilingualism/biculturalism and the Indian Act, addresses cultural and racial relations within Canadian society, it is important to examine how multiculturalism works to reinforce or shift prior discursive conceptions of cultural and racial difference. In this examination, I will draw upon writers discussing multiculturalism, not only strictly as it is articulated in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, but also as a discourse active in cultural and pedagogical contexts, in England as well as Canada. My selection is based on the fact that these writers discuss the implications of discourses of cultural difference in distinction from those of racial difference, a
question I have been trying to explore in this chapter. Here I want to pay particular attention to different conceptions of culture and ethnicity, their intersection with and divergence from discourses of racism. I also am specifically interested in asking which communities have been positioned as subjects of cultural and/or racial difference under what circumstances, and what the implications of this positioning might be.\textsuperscript{45}

Many of the more relativist forms of multiculturalism have been criticized for reifying the concept of cultural difference and naturalizing ethnocentrism as the key sources of conflict in ethnically heterogenous societies "even while erasing the systemic relations of domination which establish and adjudicate difference" (McClintock, 1995). Critics have argued that, first of all, these discourses of cultural pluralism ignore the differences in power that enable certain groups' ethnocentrism to be expressed in the representational delegitimation, denigration and the material exclusion of other groups through institutionalized systems of privilege and domination. These "radical rhetoric[s]" narrate "the separation of totalized cultures that live unsullied by the intertextuality of their historical locations, safe in the Utopianism of a mythic memory of a unique collective identity", reinforcing divisions of past and present, self and other, normative and deviant (Bhabha, 1995, \textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{45} A more careful, lengthy analysis would consider the specific historical context of different articulations of the policy of multiculturalism, in an attempt to understand what is at stake in the deployment of different notions of culture, particularly as they are deployed in reference to ESL immigrants.
Furthermore, the explanation of social conflict, as the result specifically of "ignorance and faulty or incomplete knowledge" of members of different ethnic groups in regards to each others' cultures, is problematic in its proffered solution to such conflict: in the provision for members of 'correct' information about 'other' cultures. In this educational project, there is often no interrogation of how 'culture' (or 'difference') is being defined, of what it might mean to understand any culture - one's own or an/other's - nor of how cultural understanding occurs. In the absence of questions around what happens when culture is commodified and packaged for the purpose of easy representation, instruction and consumption, there emerge various forms of cultural essentialism (Rattansi, 1992, pp. 28-41). Coupled with an ignorance of power inequalities, reductionist multicultural education can become a project of "teach[ing] whites ab:ut 'other' cultures" (Rockhill and Tomic, p. 12).

At stake here are reified vague and implicit notions of ethnicity which posit "bounded, nameable, individually homogenous and unmeltabe 'uni-cultures' or 'cultural communities' "pinned on to the back-drop of a similarly characterized majority uni-

---

46 Rattansi (1992) writes: "although the diverse bases of cultural differentiation - ethnicity, class, gender, region, etc. - are acknowledged, the primary emphasis in multiculturalist analysis is on ethnicity, such that economic and sexual differentiations within the minority communities, for example, continue to be ignored". (p.39)
culture" (Vertovec, 1996, p. 51). However, as Britzman (1995b, p. 158) has noted "[m]ore is required than simply a plea to add marginalized voices to an already overpopulated site ... [such that] arguments for inclusion produce the very exclusions they are meant to cure". Mechanical views of inclusion offer no response to mercantalist appropriations that would use the same arithmetic logic to claim there is no room left. Furthermore, when such 'culturalist' (Dirlik referenced in Vertovec, 1996, p. 51) understandings become the basis of government policy they can develop into a sort of "cultural corporatism" which reinforces administrative preferences for ethnic groups who can clearly demonstrate their collective identity with easily-distinguishable markers of stabilized difference. This is attested to in Ontario by Nourbese Philip's essay "Multicultural Whitewash" on the difficulties getting funding for any cultural work that might not fit the "heritage" model of ethnicity (Philip, 1992).

In certain ways, these 'culturalist' and 'cultural corporatist' formulations of ethnicity can be seen as intersecting with and building upon notions of culture already established through Canada's unique history. To begin, this country's bicultural and bilingual tradition of 'two founding nations' had already established an intimate and implicit discursive link between clearly delineated cultural, linguistic and religious difference, closely tied to geographical

---

47 It was only in 1986 that Mulroney expanded this narration to 'three founding nations'.
separation. I would argue that it had also effectively inscribed the construct of cultural difference within the national narration as a manageable form of social difference and even disparity. Furthermore, I would propose that discourses circulating in a colonial settler nation would work to raise the signifiers of culture and cultural difference to a cherished narration of ancestral lineage and archaic heritage\(^4\), constituting a fetishized link to a distant mother/fatherland and repository of originary civilization.

My first point, then, is that multiculturalism must be contextualized within the understandings of culture shaped by narrations of Canada's bicultural identity. To a significant extent, even the political birth of multiculturalism can be located in the tension of national biculturalism: it emerged as one of the recommendations of the Bilingualism & Biculturalism Commission, established to discuss possible solutions to the Quiet Revolution in Quebec. After two centuries of underdevelopment by Anglo-Canadian money, two centuries of representation as Protestant Anglo-Canada's Other, Franco-Canadian 'discontent' threatened to divide the nation and had resulted in a major loss of votes for the Liberal Party. If, however, Canada had two quarrelling founding nations, it certainly had a multitude of eager and grateful new European

\(^4\) I refer here to Raymond William's description of early 19th century discourses of 'Culture' as "what was most elevated, sensitive, essential, precious - most uncommon - in [European] society" (quoted in Clifford, 1988, p.233).
immigrant communities which under the revised immigration law would only continue to grow at much higher rates than original two populations. Immigration represented not only a potential source of new votes, but also a means of diverting Quebec’s nationalism and demands for higher status by diluting Canada’s bicultural identity into a pluralist one.

Multiculturalism emerged as a government policy focused on immigration - mainly European immigration, since this represented the overwhelming majority of immigrants since the second world war (Smith, 1993). It was therefore after the European experience of immigration to Canada that multicultural ethnicities were modeled. At the same time, it can be seen as elaborating notions of culture established by pre-existing narrations of a bicultural/bilingual settler colony. It reinforced neat formulations of ethnic identity which equated cultural difference to linguistic difference to country/nation of origin to localized/uncomplicated linear histories of descent and inherited tradition. Within this ‘heritage model of multiculturalism’, for example, an Italian-Canadian is someone who speaks Italian and/or looks Italian and/or traces their lineage from Italy (Walcott, 1995, p. 68). Within this model the discursive construct of cultural difference signifies a tolerable measure of pluralist ‘diversity’ and even justifiable disparity. That is, the model of European immigration experiences intersects with colonial settler discourses to enshrine the promise of the Canadian Dream: that in this virgin land of conquest and development (Shields, 1991),
hope and opportunity, the socio-politico-economic ladder is open to each new individual and community to start climbing, at the bottom where others have begun before them. Within this narration of Canada, certain groups 'naturally' occupy more established positions higher on the ladder, simply by merit of having been here longer than others. This model of European settler/immigrant ethnicity thus works to justify the hegemonic position and authority of Anglo-Canadian culture (as the first 'arrivals').

To varying degrees, then, and according to specific historical contexts in which were activated mitigating/mediating discourses of class, gender, education, liberalism, the "heritage" discourse of Eurocentric settler/immigrant multiculturalism has functioned as an "invitation ... narrowly proscribed through the textual narration of the nation" (Walcott, 1995, p. 70) to limit and qualify membership in relations of ethnicity. I will argue below that those groups who could not be assimilated into this model were excluded from universal rights to their own culture, language and home country, rights commonly enjoyed by other multicultural ethnicities in Canada. I will further argue that unassimilable groups tended to be racialized: thus, while the construct of cultural difference marked narrowly proscribed relativistic relations of difference and even disparity, racialized difference worked to signal excess and

---

49 See my discussion of the 'ethnicity paradigm,' chapter III.2.
incontainable difference, abject relations of colonialism, erasure and exclusion from cultural/ethnic membership.

Crucial to colonialisit discourses, however, are those excluded from the conquest: those groups who don’t ‘fit’ the trope of colonization and settlement are those who have been historically and discursively positioned as the objects of colonization. Within colonialisit discourses it was Europeans who conquered and Native Americans, Africans and Asians who were the conquered. According to McClintock (1995), racialization has tended to be a discursive expression of colonial relations: in this way, racialization of certain groups can be seen as an expression of how they - as former colonized peoples - don’t fit the Eurocentric settler-immigrant model of multicultural ethnic identity. In other words, to the extent that First Nations and diasporic formerly-colonized African, Asian and South American peoples have been discursively been represented as colonized and settled, they don’t fit images of settler Canadians.

50 It is worth noting immigration policies which specifically targeted former British colonials for exclusion: the Chinese Head Tax, the ‘continuous journey’ clause against East Indians, the ‘Gentleman’s Agreement’ with Japan and the "sex-race panic" and arguments of black non-adaptability that excluded U.S. former slaves from settling in Alberta (Stasiulus, 1995, pp. 111-114).

This racialization of non-European immigrants continues today even at the level of accent: Thuy has remarked that European accents function socially as symbols of prestige in North American society, while non-European non-English accents "lead to some sort of stigma" (Thuy in Rockhill and Tomic, p.19).

51 I'd argue this explains the unsettling effect of the image of a black canoeist paddling alone in the great Canadian wilderness, shown at the beginning of the film Out of the Blue (Fung, 1991).
Furthermore, as they live out the consequences of colonialism, and particularly slavery, in languages spoken and citizenships held, former colonials disrupt neat Eurocentric equations of heritage. In a model of multiculturalism based on the 'ethnicity paradigm' of an immigrant settler nation, these groups 'fall through the holes', albeit in different ways.

Of course, with multiple other conflicting discourses in circulation, the hypothesis outlined above doesn't translate neatly and unequivocally into lived relations. Walcott (1995, pp. 73-4) has identified a discursive usage of the word 'multicultural' as a cloaked reference to Canadians of colour. There is also a strong argument which could be made that 'multicultural' functions euphemistically to gesture to the idea of 'multiracial' similarly to the way the citation of 'cultural differences' can veil allusions to racialized differences.

Nevertheless, to the extent that 'common sense' discourses of multiculturalism parcel 'minority' ethnicity according to the neat equations of the 'heritage' (Walcott, 1995) formula, those groups for whom these tidy formulae have been unsettled by colonialism tend to be excluded for their disruptive potential. As populations whose histories of "contradictions, mutations ... emergences", subversion, re/invention, resistance and "hesitations" upset cultural metaphors of organic continuity, intact authenticity, geographical rootedness and linguistic
coherence\textsuperscript{52} their non-conformability raises troubling questions for innocent narratives of Canada. In many ways, they return the turbulence that shaped their historical formation. For example, Walcott (1995) has explored how the experiences of black diasporic peoples highlight the inability of this model to engage with cultural hybridity: neither can black diasporic Canadians be unified by a single marker such as language, nor can they be homogenized, given multiple and conflicting processes of identification, many of which "exceed the limits of national boundaries of belonging and easy notions of what 'home' is." (p. 71). "Such cultures of displacement and transplantation are inseparable form specific, often violent, histories of economic, political and cultural interaction, histories that generate what might be called discrepant cosmopolitanisms" (emphasis original; Clifford, 1992, p. 108). Furthermore, the refusal of syncretic black cultural practices to fit into stable, essentialized 'communities' exposes the cultural corporatism (discussed above) of governmental funding agencies which would reduce multiculturalism to a mosaic of contained, complete and mutually exclusive entities (Walcott, 1995, p. 70).

In a different way, First Nations peoples - as they have survived to this day, not as they are packaged by textbooks and literature as mythical, perished quasi-ancestors - embarrassingly explode the trope of Canada as a land of immigrants and thus

\textsuperscript{52} I refer here specifically to Clifford's discussion of culture in relation to national re-invention and 'extinct' indigenous groups (1988, esp. Introduction, chapters 11, 12).
represent a potent threat to the integrity of the 'ethnicity paradigm' of multiculturalist national narratives. The consequence has been that, as nationalism constructs belonging in both space and time, First Nations populations have been excluded from the Canadian nation both through spatial segregation (the reservations system) and temporal (through mediated representations of them as ancient Canadian forbearers, frozen in extinct noble savagery) (see Kathryn Joyce Moore, 1992; Crosby, 1989; Chater, 1995; Goldie, 1989).

The way that those groups not fitting into heritage models of ethnicity have tended to be excluded and erased in representations of Canadian identity can be insightfully explained drawing on Anderson's notion of remembering-forgetting. A vast cultural pedagogical industry narrates a national Canadian identity through Eurocentric heritage models of ethnicity which simultaneously remember and forget: while the experiences of ethnicity of all groups in Canadian society are re/membered as identical to that of European settler/immigrants, divergent experiences are forgotten. Chater (1995) has described how, for example, in literary narrations of Canada as a 'True North' virgin land and romanticized tropes of Aboriginals as the ancient forefathers of white Canadians today are made possible by the already-having-forgotten of conquest, colonization, genocide and continuing apartheid of native peoples.

The conspicuous exclusion of First Nations peoples from immigrant-ethnic relations of pluralism (Burnaby, 1987, p. 13) is
documented in a fascinating case study which contrasts the systems of immigrant multicultural ethnicity and racialized exclusion in a small Northern Ontarian town (Stymeist, 1975).

Stymeist argues that there are clearly two systems and orders of ethnicity in the town: the complex network among immigrant groups and the binary of Indian/White. Within the first, there appears a striking equation between ethnicity, nationality or country of origin, and 'culture'. For example, members of different ethnic categories are referred to as 'Englishmen', 'Frenchmen', 'Ukranians' and so on, gesturing to their status of "being from elsewhere". Each ethnic group's 'culture' seemed to consist of a stock of benign idiosyncracies and stereotypes, including customs, cuisine, tastes and mannerisms. As each category/group had associated to it a mix of both positive and negative characteristics, in practice there resulted a rough equivalence between groups and an even distribution of "insults and praise across a broad spectrum of ethnic affiliation". An individual's ethnic identity would generally only be raised in the context of ethnic jokes and bantering carried out in "a spirit of good-natured fun" among equals(56). Significantly, while ethnic categories had once been linked with class and occupation, the social mobility of individuals in different groups had raised the status of their ethnic categories such that, at this time, there was no longer a class dimension to ethnicity. (p. 59)

Stymeist noted that ethnic identifications seemed understood
to be "at once both real and spurious": individuals even shifted identifications freely even in the course of a conversation. There seemed to be not only a great flexibility but also broad variety of identifications: degrees of ethnicity were divided among 'core', 'peripheral' and 'name' ethnics. Furthermore, multiple identifications were possible as members of one group might on occasion identify with a larger umbrella ethnic category.

There also seemed to exist a complex network of "multi-stranded relationships" between ethnic groups in a variety of contexts (p. 90). The penetrability of inter-ethnic boundaries is illustrated by a high degree of camaraderie, cooperation and inter-marriage (p. 61). Thus, ethnicity constituted only one of many complex social networks, categories of identification and aspects of an individual's identity.

One the other hand, the racialized binary of 'Indian'/'non-Indian represented an all-subsuming identity category: while Natives distinguished among themselves between their different cultures, ethnicities, and nations or "countries", none of these distinctions were recognized by non-Natives. All other aspects of Native identities were collapsed into the racialized binary: "Indians in Crow Lake [the town] may be 'good' or 'bad' but are Indians nonetheless" (p. 73). On the other hand, all non-Natives were referred to as "white men" in relation to Natives, even if they were Chinese, Pakistanis or West Indians. This corroborates the distinction made by Ogbu between 'caste and non-caste
minorities' (Ogbu, 1978): while the experiences of non-caste minorities were simply erased and collapsed into the model of European immigrant relations, those of internally colonized, caste minorities were excluded entirely.

Even more striking is the absolute non-equivalence of the two categories: Natives' racialized identity signals overwhelming exclusion - from social, economic, or political relations, from job opportunities, from de facto legal rights, from the physical space of the non-Native town, from the recognition of having their own cultures, country(ies), even from the shared level of humanity in many cases (p. 75).

The absolute, rigid impenetrability of the Native/non-Native boundary is reflected in the class-dimension, the lack of social mobility and the limitation of trans-racial contact to isolated encounters characterized by 'white' hostility. Moreover, the category of 'Indian' allows for no flexibility, complexity or individual distinctions, resulting in a fixed, homogenized social identity: "Indians in relation to whites are first and always Indians".

This study seems to suggest strongly that multiculturalism, as a policy and discourse, tends to reference shared relations of cultural diversity within a liberal model of consensual community which positions European ethnicities as the standard or centre (in which culture is linked to linguistic and national identities). This narration of multicultural identity is founded upon the amnesia of the experiences of those racialized groups
denied member status in that community.

While I don’t propose to generalize from this one study, it did suggest my emerging hypothesis that while the construct of cultural difference has tended in Canada to function discursively to signal shared cultural rights and manageable degrees of ‘diversity’ and even disparity, racialized difference has more often referenced discourses of abject excess and exclusion from the status of having culture, nationality, language, shared rights and moral subjectivity, particularly in relation to First Nations peoples (and, differently, illegals and refugee applicants) (Bhabha, 1990).

The importance of this distinction is that, while underlining the specificity of different racisms and particularly racisms against First Nations groups, the construct of racialized difference has often functioned to signal irreconcilable, excessive or unmanageable difference. This seems especially true when racialized groups living the effects of colonialism call into question the neat definitions of multicultural ethnicity based on the European immigrant experience. This irreconcilability has tended to be resolved in the exclusion and erasure of racialized difference through policies of immigration, reservations and ethnocidal and linguicidal assimilationist education (Wotherspoon, Hesch Anderson in Satzewich, 1991; Burnaby; Rubrecht et. al., 1990).

While I emphasize the non-equivalence of racisms directed at First Nations peoples and various immigrant groups of colour, I
still argue for the need to consider discourses of racialized difference and racism separately from those of cultural difference in relation to ESL students. It isn't enough to talk about culture and cultural differences in ESL pedagogy: at worst it can silently condone and perpetuate racialized exclusion; at best it can erase the experiences of students of colour by collapsing them into the model of white/ned European ethnicity.

These exclusionary discursive distinctions between the constructs / relations of cultural difference and racialized difference within Canadian narrations of normalcy and national identity need to be opened up for discussion / deconstruction, and to be challenged so that a broader range of identificatory sites for multiracial Canadian-ness can be developed. This last point came up strongly in several interviews in ways which suggest that one form of culturalized racism prevalent in Canada is the dearth of complex images - or any images beyond negative or fetishizing stereotypes - with which Canadians of colour might identify and be identified with, especially in comparison with the broader range of popular images of Anglo-Saxon and European Canadians.

########################################################

(next quote is paraphrased)

B: Yes, and so I make the comparison for white friends by saying, imagine you’re in an all-black country and the only way people knew anything about white people was through one TV show of Jerry Springer and a few books written by the Ku Klux Klan

So there are certainly issues in the classroom with stereotypes
L: and how certain groups, especially non-European, have fewer non-stereotypical popular images to be pigeon-holed into, and that the fewer stereotypes that do circulate about them are more harmful //

B: Well, when people ask 'what is the black community going to do about crime amongst their youth?' and I say 'Well, I guess you didn't sleep well, since Paul Bernardo is a serial killer?'

More progressive interpretations of multiculturalism might conceive of culture as highly complex strategic practices of identification and struggles over representation and claims to resources, inseparable from historically specific contexts of discursively regulated power inequalities. For example, Rattansi (1992) describes culture as the "contextually variable and economically and politically influenced drawing and redrawing of boundaries ... shifting forms of boundary maintenance, division and alliance that emerge in relation to local politics" and racialized, gendered and classed discursive tropes (p. 39).

An excellent Canadian example of such a non-reductive antiracist, feminist and class-conscious interpretation of multiculturalism can be found in the anthology Breaking the Mosaic (Young, 1987). Nancy Jackson's research, for example, attempts to explore the implications of a conceptual shift from an understanding of ethnicity and culture as socialization to "a concept of ethnic organization as a constitutive feature of the relations of class". In other words, she bases her research in an understanding of ethnic subjectivity as expressive of the ethnicized, racialized, gendered and classed social division of
labour in Canada (p. 167).

Jackson's research corroborates her argument that much of what are called 'cultural differences' as expressed in ethnic subjectivities "are not cultural traditions but economic ones, the vestiges of the historical organization of immigrant labour in Canada ... [which] are sustained through economic networks of family and community, tied to geographically and ethnically defined neighbourhoods, such as Chinatown and the Italian district." (p. 172). Furthermore, she finds that one of the most important ways this ethnicized, racialized, gendered and classed social division of labour, expressed in individual identifications and subjectivities, is reproduced is through schools. Jackson documents how well-meaning attempts by counsellors and school administration to help ESL students 'get through' high school as successfully and socially comfortably as possible, end up directing them into predictable (non-university track) courses and second class career paths. She concludes that it is when "counselling becomes routine and unreflective" that this practice can become discriminatory, since 'laziness' can lead to treating students as members of specific ethnic groups rather than as unique individuals (p. 178). She also concludes that:

"this process of differentiation of ethnic minority students in the vocational processes of the high school remains unnamed for analytical purposes and thus unexamined as a mechanism of ethnic inequality. It is not adequately accounted for by the notion of prejudice and discrimination, in as much as these terms are taken to
identify the attitudes and actions of individuals as the locus of the problem." (p. 181)

Simon and Corrigan (in Young, 1987) also propose an understanding of the discursive constructs of culture and ethnicity as representative practices, through which regions of time/space are segregated, exotified/commodified and organized into a social map drawn according to the view of the dominant norm. The 'residents' of these regions of time/space become subjects of this cultural and ethnic difference (Simon gives the example of a 'yuppie' magazine's map of ethnic dining in Toronto).

At the same time, Simon challenges this commodified notion of ethnicity, arguing that

"there are historically and structurally organized practices that do produce positions in subjectivity. Positions from which practices are articulated as a lived culture of the Other grounded not in food, ritual, .... all spatialized practices ... but in a continually lived experience of a personal living relation to the past, the history that one (yes, through spatialized practices) has come to own." (p. 39) (italics mine)

This analysis opens up an understanding of cultural difference and ethnicity as a tension between discursively regulated totalizing sites of identification, and negotiated embodied subjectivities, a tension traversed by unequal relations of power organized around axes of 'race', gender and class.

If, as teachers and theorists of ESL, we accept the premise that ethnicity is a dialogue between the social and the psychic, and the past and the present, then the distinct sedimented meanings which have accrued to the constructs of cultural,
linguistic and racialized difference through the course of European colonialism, the conquest and settlement of Canada, and the federal policies of immigration and multiculturalism need to contextualize our understandings of the relations within and without the English as a second language classroom. In the next chapter I bring this perspective to a reading of the academic literature on TESL.
CHAPTER III: READING THE TESL LITERATURE

R: Well, I think it’s a reflection of how absolutely entrenched dominant society is and how efforts to bring something that’s more representative is so on a fringe, is so seen as shit disturbing, ‘making demands’ and ‘interest groups’: all these sort of labels get attached to people who are saying, simply, ‘I want to be able to live, and go to school in my daily life in a way that’s me, and to see my life experiences reflected’. I mean people like my great-grandfather came in the 1890’s, he was one of the coolie men who came to work on the railway. As it turns out he committed suicide and he died a very tragic death. And you know, he was completely exploited, wasn’t allowed to return home for many years. Because even after Chinese people were given citizenship rights, there were such unrealistic demands to prove citizenship that he couldn’t bring his family over: they didn’t have birth certificates, they didn’t have marriage licences, passports, and all these sort of things. So he was a very sad and defeated person. And he had spent his entire adult life in Canada: he died in 1954. And for me as a Chinese-Canadian, I feel like, when for crying out loud? I mean is that not a symbol of contribution? This man died working on the railway, not literally, but that’s what his adult years were spent doing. And when is it that I’m considered Canadian enough so that my lived experiences here in Canada - not my lived experiences as they think I am as a Chinese person in China or something like that, because these were the experiences of my people here in Canada, these are Canadian experiences - when are they going to be talked about and included as they would be if we were talking about, you know ... the pioneers that first came here and settled the farmlands in Alberta that we learn in high school??
As I tried to articulate in the last chapter, the importance of attempting a sketch of how this nation dreams cultural and racial difference is that non-white non-Anglo students, and particularly immigrant ESL students, live the effects of this dreaming. Corrigan has suggested that while schooling has been theorised as repressive of the 'authentic' personalities and selves children bring in with them, it can alternatively be thought of as "culturally productive": as productive of difference and non/belonging, social identities, races, sexualities, ethnicities, class and gender. In other words, in the process of becoming active subjects of social difference, much must be left at the door, and much of what is brought in must somehow fit the space allotted.

It is with discursive dreams of 'race', ethnicity and social difference - dreamt not only by the Ministry of Education and Citizenship and Prentice Hall, but also MuchMusic and "Who's the Boss?" - that ESL students are engaging in dialogue as they negotiate relational identifications in their daily interactions. As schools write letters of support to Canadian soldiers in the Gulf War, as 'unity clubs' spring up throughout small- and big-town Canada (Globe and Mail, March 30, 1996), as the Art Gallery of Ontario resurrects the Group of Seven, as the CBC battles NAFTA enthusiasts to make the case for a unique Canadian cultural

---

51 In an informal survey of one ESL class I have taught, 'watching TV' ranked as the most popular leisure activity, with the above two the most-watched programmes.
identity, as celebrations are mounted on the five hundredth anniversary of John Cabot’s landing, Canadian racialized ethnicity is redefined and reproduced.

ESL students are also imagined by ministry and board programmes, policies and classroom curriculum. While these are products of complicated political battles in Queen’s Park, the Ministry of Education, the staff and trustees of school boards, teacher federations, parents’ or community groups, ESL departments and teachers (not in descending order of influence), I have chosen to examine how ESL students are imagined in the published ‘academic discourse of TESL’. As it provides the categories and discursive frames for cartographies of learning processes, this literature can be seen as informing ESL teacher training, classroom texts and educational policy. Witness, for example, the extent to which theoretical literature has been recruited to - and theorists have collaborated with - the community and teacher-driven cause of bilingual and heritage language education54.

My interrogation of how ESL students are conceived as subjects of linguistic and cultural difference in the TESL literature I am reading, will seek to apply the theoretical framework developed in the last chapter to very pointed

---

questions: how are 'culture' and 'cultural difference' being understood? What are the consequences of these understandings for how language learners and learning are discussed, especially in regards to addressing the experiences of students of colour? What would be the implications of different conceptions of culture: ones which locate culture at the inter-axial hub of subordinating relations of social difference continuously reiterated and reinscribed through daily interactions? What might TESL research and ESL pedagogy look like if one started from these questions?

Most articles published during the last ten years in the two most established TESL journals in North America can be seen to be organized around three trends or paradigms, each of which conceives of ESL learners very differently. While I make no claims as to the comprehensiveness of these three rough\textsuperscript{55} divisions of ESL pedagogical thought, I argue that developing an analysis of their respective conceptual bases in light of the historically specific discourses of culture and 'race' explored in the previous chapter suggests important implications for ESL practitioners working for social change.

The first pattern imagines the student strictly as a subject of abstract linguistic difference, in relation either to a process of cognitive and linguistic skill development, or to

\textsuperscript{55} In my use of the term "rough" I wish to signal both the breadth of variety contained within each pattern and the 'violent' manipulation of meaning I felt myself wreaking in constructing these three categories to do this organizational work of containment. Unfortunately, such are the perils of theorising.
individual psychological factors (Stevick, 1989, pp. 103-5). The second, multiculturalist orientation theorises learners as subjects of social difference. However, this difference is named as cultural difference (while racial, or other lines of social difference are never mentioned) and is not a site of domination. The teacher is imagined as a culturally sensitive neutral representative of the Canadian culture of pluralism, an "intercultural communication" expert (Elver, Goldstein and McDonald 1989, p. 55-8). The third, "cultural domination" paradigm also describes students as subjects of cultural difference but, in contrast to multiculturalism, identifies difference as the site of social domination. Drawing upon models such as Freirean critical pedagogy or feminist pedagogy, theorists in this paradigm postulate pedagogical principles and practices that might challenge this cultural domination. I will argue, however, that the analysis of 'domination' and pedagogical recommendations in these texts would benefit from: a more complex understanding of 'culture' and 'cultural difference'; a continual and reflexive suspicion in regards to how that difference is being constructed through student-student and teacher-student interactions as well as teaching materials and methods; and a preoccupation with the workings and effects of discourses of 'race', culture, language and nation which inscribe dominant models of ethnicity in Canada.
III.1 The "Applied Linguistics" Paradigm

T: in terms of resistance, one of the most common and strongest objections I’ve heard from teachers, and this is especially ESL teachers, is that they don’t want the students spending school time speaking their first languages. Like one teacher, quite progressive generally, asked before sending students even to [a limited programme]: "They will be speaking English, won’t they?". It seems as if as soon as you set linguistic proficiency as the sole or over-riding goal of ESL teaching, there’s no escaping an assimilationist frame, that defines their first language (and culture) as wrong and English as good.

The first of the three patterns I’ve identified demonstrates the continued predominance of the tradition out of which TESL theory developed, that is, the field of applied linguistics. Examples of this paradigm are too numerous to recount in the body of this thesis: they form the majority of articles published in the two journals I examined, distinguishable by a common focus on cognitive processes of language acquisition and pedagogical interventions aimed at enhancing these processes.

While I do not wish to diminish the importance of the study of cognitive aspects of language learning for pedagogy, I do want to engage in a discussion of the discursive dynamics and moves always at play when ESL students are framed as subjects of language difference. My purpose in this section, then, is less to examine a series of articles than to interrogate some of the fundamental premises of a pedagogical focus on linguistic processes. I wish to explore how questions of ‘race’, class, gender, sexuality or other discourses of social difference are
rendered irrelevant, erased and perpetuated when ESL students are theorized as isolated, autonomous individual language learners.

My analytical focus on the predominant principles and orientations which characterize the field of linguistics as applied to second language acquisition (SLA) theory is also crucial to contextualize my concerns with individual articles. That is, I will argue that, while I recognize the validity and value of linguistic, cognitive and psychological approaches to SLA inquiry, work in these areas which does not recognize the political nature of the assumptions upon which these disciplines have tended to depend runs the risk of perpetuating these assumptions. I do not wish to imply an 'either/or' logic, in which any piece of work which does not discuss issues of race is consequently invalid or racist. In mapping how the modern liberalist and positivist regimes of truth to which the fields of linguistic, cognitive and psychological science have tended to adhere activate racialized discourses of deficiency, I offer a cautionary note that research in these areas which ignores these dynamics risks reinforcing discriminatory structures under the guise of liberalizing. In this sense, I hope that my discussions point to possibilities for a more complex frame of analysis in these fields.

Of most concern to me are the limits of the model of an idealized language learner in accounting for differences in students' learning. When there is no space in which to consider the implications of the social construction of social difference
along axes of 'race', ethnicity, class and education, gender, ability, and sexuality, what tends to be the explanatory recourse? In the literature I have read, differences in language learning are interpreted by reference to "diversity of learning styles", individual psychology, personality types, "affective filter" and motivation (see for example, Early, 1992; Stevick, 1989; Krashen 1981, 1982; Ellis, 1989).

How this erasure is enabled, and the implications of this move for the perpetuation of racism in particular can be understood through reference to David Goldberg's theory (1994) of the insinuation of racist discourse into the foundational concepts of modernist liberalism:

"Basic to modernity's self-conception, then, is a notion ... of a Subject that is abstract and atomistic, general and universal, divorced from the contingencies of historicity as it is from the particularities of social and political relations and identities ... Liberal modernity denies its racialized history and attendant histories of racist exclusions, hiding them behind some idealized self-promoting, yet practically ineffectual, dismissal of race as a morally irrelevant category" (original emphasis) (pp. 4-7).

In that ESL students are imagined only as abstract, autonomous learners and not in terms of 'race', they are, in effect, positioned within the applied linguistics paradigm as

56 This section expands upon the discussion of the tropes and mechanisms associated with the discursive construct of linguistic difference. Please refer back to chapter II.3., the discussion of Anderson.
raceless (in other words as white). A parallel argument has been made by feminists that the unmarked abstract subject of modern liberalist discourse is positioned as male, heterosexual, middle class and able, functioning to exclude other locations outside the limits of its empty universalism. (Razack, 1990) This has the effect of 'blaming the victim' in terms of the disqualifying systemic discrimination and marginalization as factors in explaining the academic experiences of ESL students: "In a phrase, individuals fail schools but schools do not fail individuals" (Razack, 1995, p. 70).

In Margaret Early's study (1992), for example, the factors contributing to ESL students' academic success were identified as: "time" (age of arrival in Canada, time committed to study etc.); "help" (drawing upon teachers' assistance and inner resources of courage); learning strategies; and sense of purpose and control in one's life. The very construction of these factors reveals the conceptual limits of the paradigm upon which the research was based. That is, even in the evident intention to expand discussion in TESL beyond linguistic and cognitive explanations, the persisting focus upon the individual learner

I have suggested elsewhere (Taylor, unpublished, 1996) that a perspective informed of ESL pedagogy's historical context of colonialism and racist immigration policy might theorize ESL learners as raced rather than as raceless: that is, as sharing a common experience of being racialized. While this perspective is problematic in its exclusive privileging of race above all other analytical frames, it deserves certain consideration in light of the fact that virtually every non-English speaking immigrant group to Canada has at some point been racialized, even blonde Ukrainians (Ken Osborne in Young (ed.) 1987, p. 71).
limits attention and consideration to factors which begin and end in the individual. While valuable and insightful, the liberal frame of this analysis renders irrelevant contextual conditions such as classed, racialized and ethnicized relations of power. A conception of ESL students as autonomous learners in isolation of socially constructed categories thus psychologizes and reduces the explanation of individuals' access to factors for success to applause for valorous determination and achievement (without examining the costs of this achievements) or calls on teachers to "foster students' [deficient] self-confidence, self-esteem and belief in their own capabilities" (p. 274). By naming complex negotiations of discursive relations of subordination in terms of categories such as 'courage' and self-confidence, the impact of these dynamics is reframed as an innate property of the autonomous self which any individual either possesses or lacks. Consequently, ESL students are portrayed as a group needing extra teacherly attention in overcoming their deficiencies, and the blame for failure is located safely outside the educational institution (including teachers). This point has been convincing argued with reference to specific SLA theorists by Peirce (1995, pp. 10-13).

Trying to understand how this universalist model of language learning perpetuates power asymmetries raises two points which need to be elaborated. The first is the paradox of liberal modernism: "[t]he more explicitly universal modernity's [and liberalism's] commitments, the more open [they are] to and the
more determined [they are] by the likes of racial specificity and racist exclusivity". (Goldberg, 1994, p. 48). Goldberg illustrates this in his theory of how racialized discourse is enabled by and insinuates itself into the foundational orders of scientific and academic disciplines such as linguistics: he calls these orders "preconceptual elements" which "generate the concepts and categories in terms of which racism is actually expressed and comprehended". At the same time they achieve the effect of normalizing these racialized expressions and racist exclusions by virtue of the "embedding of their conditions deep in modernity's formative sociodiscursive structures and scientific vision" (pp. 48-9).

In terms of the discussion of racisms in chapter II, Goldberg's theory of the racialization of liberal modernity suggests that the pre-conceptual orders of modernity are recruited to mark racialized difference such that racisms are naturalized: these racialized stamps of difference function to police and enforce the borders of liberal communities and universalist commitments. This is particularly important in relation to the model of language learning I am discussing in this section. Potentially racialized preconceptual elements common to both liberal modernity and applied linguistics include: the articulation of difference and consequent principles of classification, order, gradation, value, and hierarchy (p. 50). When these principles are viewed as suspect and not neutral, it becomes possible to theorize how racialized disparities might be
naturalized in this first paradigm of TESL theory. Based upon a static, abstract model of a discrete standard language (langue) with universal rules of grammar, the applied linguistics paradigm of ESL pedagogy maps individual learners' speech (parole) onto an inflexible structure (theorised by Chomsky as "native speaker competence", or, the ability to produce infinite set of grammatically correct utterances\(^58\)). This achieves the result of reducing individual speech to quantitatively assessed degrees of deviation or difference\(^59\). These systematized gradations of deviance are ordered into a curriculum of hierarchical grades or levels, thereby scheduling learners onto an infinite "chronolog[y] of acquisition" (Giltrow and Colhoun, 1992, pp. 55-6) and normalization that stretches to the invisible horizon of native speaker performance, of perfect mimicry.

The second issue that needs elaboration in relation to the applied linguistics paradigm of ESL pedagogy is the colonialist history of the English language. Commenting on the role of mimicry\(^60\) in colonialist discourse, Homi Bhabha identifies its central dynamic: the "strategic failure" that fixes the

---

\(^58\) See Thompson, Bourdieu.

\(^59\) "In [ESL] research, error [or deviation] is a principle resource, a main article of exchange, a highly traded commodity" sometimes "harvested in its raw form", others "manipulated to a high degree of refinement", Giltrow & Colhoun, 1992, p. 56.

\(^60\) It bears mention here that I am citing here only one model of 'mimicry' while there exist a range of insightful discussions of the subversive potential of mimicry. See, for example, Taussig (1995) as well as Bhabha's concept of 'translation' as applied to the notion of hybridity (1995, pp. 208-9)
colonialist subject in the repeated image of a "reformed, recognizable Other ... that is almost the same but not quite".\footnote{Bhabha (1994) explains that the colonial "is the effect of a flawed colonial mimesis, in which to be Anglicized is emphatically not to be English" (pp. 86-87).}

The importance of this dynamic in the process of subordination has been identified by Bourdieu, Crowley and Illich in the violent origins of the movements for linguistic standardization in emergent European nations: the ranking of the speech of the ruling classes as standard allowed the forming nation state to colonize and pathologize\footnote{Crowley reports that under the standardization of English the speech of the lower classes was even described as "diseased or afflicted" (in Giltrow and Colhoun, 1992, p. 58). This seems less surprising when one recalls the coincidence of the height of this movement with the emergence of eugenics in the 1880's, the 'science' of racial betterment which envisioned the nation as a "body politic" requiring the definition and fortification of the normal and the institutionalization and eradication of the defective burdens to the social body: inferior races, classes, divergent sexualities, the physically and developmentally disabled. See McClaren, 1990.} its poor and marginalized classes (in addition to centralizing the media of governance and control over new colonies).\footnote{See Bourdieu, 1991; Thompson, 1991; Crowley; Giltrow & Colhoun, 1992, pp. 58-9; Illich in Penneycook, 1989, pp. 592; and Goldberg, 1994, p. 25. Please see also footnote 38.} The "coercive irony" at the heart of these self-proclaimed unifying projects of linguistic standardization consisted in the impossibility of the deepest errors and accents ever being truly erased (Giltrow, 1992, p. 58). This irony is echoed in the frustrations voiced by Giltrow and Colhoun's Mayan students of ESL, who sense that their endlessly assessed and prescribed perambulations through verb drills and grammar tests
will never necessarily lead to more control in their lives (54).4

Bhabha’s theory of colonialist mimicry suggests that this coercive irony was never meant to be resolved: the process of unification is the same process of recruiting excluded others to positions of regulated subordination. Furthermore, Cairns and Richard (1995) illustrate that this process is intimately linked to nationalism and state formation. In an excellent deconstruction of Shakespeare’s Henry V as an idealization of "the process of colonial discourse at the moment of its mobilization to deal with Ireland", they examine the role of language in nationalist colonization. Citing the caricatured English spoken by Henry’s Welsh, Scot and Irish captains, they argue that it is the English language which simultaneously unites and distinguishes between them, bringing them together under the English king’s flag while demonstrating their status as second-class, less competent citizens. Thus the domesticated citizens’ non-standard grammar and accent were recruited to "the maintenance of subtle points of differentiation from the colonizer [which] would continue to reproduce, not only the subordination of the colonized, but the superordination of the colonizer" (pp. 179-80).

The issue of accent suggests a further preconceptual element

---

of liberal modernity susceptible to racialization: the principle of purity. I have already discussed the exclusionary and disciplinary function potentially served by this principle within the field of applied linguistics and second language acquisition theory (see chapter II.3, in regards to Anderson). Homi Bhabha has also pointed out the racialized concepts of culture deployed in Europe’s justification of imperialism through "hierarchical claims to the inherent originality or ‘purity’ of cultures" and cultural Darwinist invocations of a ‘civilizing mission’. These culturalist colonial mythologies survive today: South American friends have repeatedly emphasized to me the ‘impure’ and ‘degenerate’ nature of their Spanish ‘dialect’ in comparison to continental Castilian, often blaming this linguistic degeneration on mestisaje, or miscegenation. Furthermore, in common parlance among non-Anglo immigrant communities, the category of "Canadians" clearly refers to WASP native-born and native speakers, and carries strong undertones of purity (according to my experience, and to an analysis of Mai’s discussions in Peirce, 1993, p. 223). I would argue that ESL students’ experiences as English learners and hyphenated Canadians (as opposed to ‘real Canadians’) often reflect the centrality of notions of purity and impurity/deviation to discourses of national and cultural authenticity in this paradoxical society which names itself ‘multicultural’.

While I have attempted above to explore some of the analyses a perspective informed by ‘race’ and colonial theory enables when
brought to a pedagogical approach that frames ESL students as subjects of linguistic difference, I am not the first to locate my analysis at the intersection of linguistic and racialized difference.

Tollefson (1986), Auerbach (1986) and Benesch (1993) have illustrated the racism and classism deeply embedded in self-proclaimed "neutral" 'pragmatist' and 'competency-based' models of language instruction, such as that in the U.S. refugee programme. For example, Tollefson documents the attitudes and values inculcated through content and instruction style which teach refugees to take the first entry-level job they can find, avoid welfare at all costs and become "passive citizens [and exploitable workers] who comply rather than complain, accept rather than resist, and apologize rather than disagree" (pp. 656-7). Penneycook (1989) also critiques positivist and progressivist discourses which would reduce the complex and political practice of ESL pedagogy to 'objective' and instrumentalist methods and perpetuate "inequities between, on the one hand, predominantly male [Western] academics and, on the other, female teachers and language classrooms on the international power periphery" (p. 12).

Giltrow and Colhoun (1992) also explore the way discourses linguistic difference or deviance are raced, colonized and classed. Furthermore, they investigate how the very acquisition of English effects a certain submission to neo-colonialist discourses of devaluation, marginalization and silencing,
discursive regimes which let new speakers in the door but seat them at the very back.

Cummins (1992) attests to the purposes discursive categories of deviance (such as "learning disabled") serve in terms of diverting blame for student failure from the educational system and streaming student bodies along lines which perpetuate systems of linguistic, cultural, racial and class marginalization.

Finally Cartagena (1991), Burnaby (1987), Cummins (1986, 1989, 1992), Auerbach (1993) and authors on Native education in Canada have explored the discourses of racism fundamental to 'English-Only' movements and policies of linguistic assimilationism or 'linguicism'. In these cases, a more rigorous theorization of the discursive workings of racisms would bring to light valuable insights and a more complex analysis. For example, in reading Cummins' extremely important work (1986, pp. 35-7), which argues for bilingual education and deconstructs the assumptions underlying arguments for immersion ESL, there appears a strong similarity between these assumptions - the "linguistic mismatch" and "insufficient exposure" hypotheses - and those fundamental to 'ethnic absolutism'. Cummins' names these assimilationist assumptions - that non-English speaking home cultures provide practice of the 'wrong' language, or that this hampers the development of English proficiency - as racist (pp. 52-7). I would expand upon this to argue, in reference to my discussion above of culturalized racism (see chapter II.3 and this chapter III.2), that these assumptions reductively elide
linguistic and cultural difference, activating discourses of 'cultural deficiency', which rewrite the construct of linguistic difference as relativist, absolute and unbreachable. As with the construct of cultural difference within discourses of 'ethnic absolutism', linguistic difference is held up as the sole source of irreconcilable social conflict and segregation. Linguistic difference is authorized as an absolute, unquestioned category of explanation of essentialized differences and inequality: framed as the cause of inequality, it precludes examination of the discursive process through which this framing takes places and the stakes therein.

This discussion illustrates how an understanding of the racist sedimentary traces and discursive associations carried by the social and analytical construct of linguistic difference is crucial for ESL teachers. It indicates the danger that indiscriminate adoption and use of this construct can condone or activate hierarchical and exclusionist discourses of deviance, impurity and non-belonging. Furthermore, this exploration suggests that a critical pedagogy of ESL would address the histories and manifestations of this discursive racialization of language in order to initiate conversations with students which

---

65 Norman Black wrote in 1914 in criticism of Ukrainian bilingual schools: "It became evident that in hundreds of Canadian schools ... children of non-English speaking parents are wasting precious months and years; that ignorance is blossoming into stupidity and will bear fruit in social incompetence and perhaps in crime" (quoted in Ashworth, 1992a, pp. 122-3)

66 A similar critique has also been effectively argued by Miles (1993) in regards to the discourse of 'race relations'.
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allow them to deconstruct past and future experiences of racialization as ESL learners.
III.2 The "Multiculturalism Paradigm"

The second paradigm of ESL pedagogy identifiable in my survey of the TESL literature can be seen as having emerged somewhat oppositionally to the first, in an attempt to broaden the theorisation of ESL students from subjects of linguistic difference to subjects of particular cultural difference. While this allows for the discussion of social relations and of particularity of speakers, the way culture and cultural difference are understood within this model needs to be interrogated, particularly in relation to the explanations of differential student learning, and in terms of how immigrant language learners, teachers, and Canadian ethnicity are conceived.

I have divided the articles gathered under this paradigm into two sub-paradigms. The first comprises numerous articles which have been published in TESL and applied linguistics journals on the subject of "cross-cultural communication", "intercultural education" or "cultural sensitivity training" (or any combination thereof).

"Intercultural Sensitivity" Sub-Paradigm

I include in this section articles proposing "cross-cultural communication" as an alternative to an assimilationist orientation identified as prevalent in ESL materials and teaching practices. This oppositionary stance is evident in articles that ask of ESL: "Is it assimilation or multiculturalism? ... If a teacher is teaching English, does the teacher also support
assimilation in doing so?" (emphasis original, Derwing and Munroe, p. 53). Elver, Goldstein and McDonald (1989), for example, suggest that intercultural education might 'go beyond' most adult ESL materials in which "[c]ulture learning is viewed as a one-way, static process" (p. 60) to "identify [the] conflicting cultural viewpoints" that act as barriers to "effective communication".

Elver, Goldstein and McDonald offer a subtle definition of culture as "ways of looking at the world, acting and expressing ourselves [through which] [w]e also learn what we should value and what we should despise or avoid, what is expected of us and what we may expect of others" (p. 57). Despite the complexity of this definition, however, within the framework of cross-cultural training, 'culture' becomes something to be understood, identified and accounted for (Elver, Goldstein and McDonald, 1989, p. 58). Irving (1986) defines "cross-cultural awareness" as: "the ability to understand cultures - your own and others - by means of objective, non-judgemental comparisons. It is an appreciation for, an understanding of, cultural pluralism - the ability to get rid of our ethnocentric tendencies" (in Krasnick, 1988, pp. 319-320). While I would applaud the goal of challenging ethnic elitism, a troubling assumption in this orientation, is that it is possible to get outside of ethnocentrist discourses to a realm of objectivity, and the location of this 'neutral' viewpoint in what I would characterize as the intercultural communication expert's "god's-eye view from nowhere" (Haraway
The fact that the overwhelming majority of writers on this topic are white European-descended first-world intellectuals raises for me the issue of whether discourses of whiteness are working to naturalize these claims to transcendent authority. Intercultural communication resembles a transcendence of both culture and body: there is no consideration of how it might be structured differently and mean differently for individuals or identities differently positioned within power relations.

This disembodied relativism highlights the way in which cultural difference is presented as uncoupled from relations of domination within this paradigm. That is, the unfavourable representation of other cultures and cultural others are aspects of every group's ethnocentrism. There is furthermore an analytical dis-articulation of discourses of cultural difference from those of racialized, gendered, classed difference and so on. This is evident in Elver, Goldstein and McDonald's first goal in the intercultural workshop they describe: "to explore cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society" (taken from the Canadian Multiculturalism Policy of 1971). The activity designed to allow the ESL instructors in the workshop to fulfil this objective - a simulation in which they imagined themselves immigrating to another country - unfortunately glossed over the racialized and classed specificities of the participants' immigration 'experiences', imagined from secure subject positions of educated professionals with internationally-recognized
This same disjuncture of cultural 'differences' and 'barriers' from systemic domination is evident in other authors' failure to distinguish between the position of, on the one hand, ESL immigrants, refugees or foreign students in North America and, on the other, German students on an exchange in France, or an American working in Japan for a year (Tickoo in Gardner, 1996, p. 57); Johnson, 1995, p. 59).

I turn to the work of Razack in order to explore what is effected by this relativist and decontextualized notion of culture. To begin with, it activates modernist liberal notions of 'equality' and relativist constructions of difference. This frame positions ESL students as subjects of cultural difference while erasing the systemic relations of domination which

---

67 In most non-English-speaking countries, simply being a college-educated native speaker is sufficient to find a relatively well-paid job tutoring.

68 This latter example illustrates another strong tendency of intercultural training: that is, the transparent and naturalized intrinsic link presumed between language, culture and nation. The relativism and reductionism of cross-cultural education might be explained by Kramsch's identification of this field as arising out of European foreign language training and exchange programmes and 'behavioural training' for free-trading corporate executives (Kramsch, 1995, p. 88). Recalling the discussions of cultural and racialized difference from chapter two it seems unsurprising that the recent popularity of this pedagogical approach to language learning should roughly coincide with the rise of cultural nationalism or 'new racism' in Europe (Barker, 1981; Miles, 1989).

69 Razack describes classical Rawlsian liberal discourse, centred on principles of "equality" and "fairness", as one which positions citizens as autonomous, uncompromised individual actors pursuing selfish interests in level competition with each other, and recognizes no systemic patterns of social inequality between social actors. See Razack, 1990, pp. 398-400.
establish and adjudicate difference (McClintock, 1995, p. 8).

The troubling consequences of theorising ESL students as subjects of cultural difference, but difference as uncoupled from domination, is the limitations this places on attempts to explain variation in student experiences and success at school. Dis-articulated from intersecting systems of social discrimination, the concept of cultural difference assumes a pre-existent and naturalized, circular explanatory status, in ways reminiscent of Gilroy's descriptions of ethnic absolutism (see chapter II.3). Razack argues that within discourses of relativist cultural pluralism students' academic and social advancement or failure tend to be explained and predicted exclusively in terms of the special characteristics or needs arising from their essentialized cultural differences.6. Within the "cultural difference" paradigm, they may be described in terms of students' need for special knowledge or sensitivity on the part of the teacher, or their need to assimilate and "internalize school cultural values" (Flaherty and Woods, 1990, p. 188).7 Within the "cultural deficit" paradigm, "minority" students' needs may further be explained as deficiencies: low achievement is ascribed to selected aspects of students' different cultures that are assumed

6 On the ambivalence of the culturalist explanation of the performance of Asian students see Razack, 1995, p. 78.

7 Toohey (1990, pp. 87-89) notes that although 1981 British Columbia resource guides describe students such as gifted children in terms of "capabilities", "talents" and "potential 'contribution to self and society'. ESL/D students are consistently described only in terms of deficiency.
to result in a lack of the values, attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, positive home life or upbringing by educated parents deemed necessary for academic success (Sleeter, 1992, p. 15). What these discourses exclude from the discussions of student progress, however, is any structural analysis of racism in Canadian society except as isolated incidents of individual prejudice.

Tracing this discourse of "culturalized racism" in liberal modernist educational research on "minority" groups, Razack (1995, 1994) proposes that it works to further pathologize and marginalize its objects of theorization. That is, within this discourse as she theorises it, the concept of cultural difference becomes "the explanation of choice for the underachievement and 'overachievement' of racial minorities." The explanatory status of cultural difference qualifies it as an uninterrogable

---

72 Even in studies of ESL students' performance that focus on contextual factors beyond the classroom (such as Watt and Roessingh, 1994) the frame is individualist and avoids any structural analysis, least of all systemic racism. Watt and Roessingh, for example, present stories of "remarkable" students who are "an inspiration to their teachers and their classmates" without consideration of the costs and structural barriers these students had to overcome (on this point in reference to model minority students see MacClear, 1994). For a comparative analysis of student success that is grounded in different minority groups' various historical experiences of racialized, ethnicized and classed marginalization through educational policy, see Ashworth (1992a).

73 See Razack, 1995, p.78. She also points out that where culture is treated as something essentialized and static, it develops "a superautonomy that reduces all facets of social experience to issues of culture" (Calmore quoted in Razack, 1994, p. 896).
given, without examining how the characteristics mapped onto different cultures are produced and enforced through interlocking systems of racism, colonialism, hetero/sexism, classism and ablism (Razack, 1995, pp. 72-3). "Culture" replaces biologically-defined "race" as an essentialist category denoting objectively observable behaviour (Abu-Lughod, 1991, p. 143). This enables white "pluralistic ignorance" and innocence of racist subordination and exclusion (Razack, 1994, p. 898); it also offers the nondisruptive solution of the anthropological mapping of and tolerant sensitivity to the essentialized peculiarities of the ethnic Other's behaviour. However, the sign of essentialized cultural difference still marks subjects as inferior and as objects of aggression through the use of the euphemistic concept of unbroachable "foreignness" (Razack, 1995, p. 68). In this way the source of the conflict or threat is

---

74 Goldberg (1994) identifies the notion and establishment of the articulation of difference as one of the preconceptual elements through which racist discourse insinuates itself into the foundational structures of modernist philosophical and academic discourses (p. 51) and emphasizes that racial differentiation, in defining unity, belonging, and otherness, enables racist exclusion (pp. 51-2). He illustrates this through the example of national immigration policy (pp. 55-6).

75 For examples of this, see Watt (1994), Early (1992).

76 Abu-Lughod (1991) points out that anthropology owes its existence to the concept of cultural difference: a concept it helps construct, produce and maintain with "the air of the self-evident"; a concept which functions as anthropology's "essential tool" upon which "the distinction between self and other rests". (p. 143)

located in the object of aggression and discrimination.

The same discursive mechanisms can be seen at work in 'cross-cultural communication' literature. Proponents of "intercultural training" and "cross-cultural" psychology emphasize 'cultural difference' as the cause of potential friction and "misunderstandings" (a nice euphemism for relations which are always constructed through white racism, classism, colonialism, hetero/sexism etc.) and assert that knowing certain traits and idiosyncracies of different cultures will help ESL instructors to "determine the effect [of these cultural peculiarities] ... on classroom interaction" (Johnson, p. 60) and to teach more sensitively. This, premise authorizes endless studies into: the in-group rivalry among Nigerians (Johnson, p. 60); sexual taboos of Muslim cultures; proclivity toward haggling in Arab cultures; Confucian values of respect for authority, 'face', collectivism and self-deprecating humour among "ethnic Chinese", (Flowerdew and Miller, 1995, p. 356-9); or East Asian cultural values which inform the use of modal verbs (Hinkel, 1995) to name a few examples. These 'cultural traits' are inventoried without the least investigation into how racialized, colonialist, hetero/sexist and classed discursive systems of subordination and divisions of labour work to construct and reproduce these "behaviours" (see MacClear, 1994b).

---

I would suggest here that this interest by dominant subjects to know the subordinate subject in detail might be reframed as fetish. Walkerdine has also argued for an understanding of the 'will to know' as desire and mechanism to exert social control over subordinate populations (Walkerdine,
Returning to Elver, Goldstein and McDonald's article, this discussion suggests a limitation in their very objective in intercultural education to increase students' "ability to identify conflicting cultural viewpoints which are barriers to effective communication ... [and to all Canadians'] full participation in Canadian society" (p. 58) First of all, without a critical analysis it is the mutually incompatible differences between every group's 'cultural viewpoints' that are obstructing ESL students' communication and participation, and not the Anglo- and Eurocentric construction of them as cultural, racialized, linguicized and/or classed others. Secondly, as Gilroy and Razack have emphasized, it is the uninterrogated 'factness' of cultural boundaries as a category of explanation which reinforces latent discourses of culturalized racism (see also Elver, Goldstein and McDonald; Deena, et al., 1989; Krasnick, 1988; Brislin and Yoshida in Titone, 1994; Tickoo in Gardner, 1996; Flowerdew and Miller, 1995; Hinkel, 1995). After all, "communication across cultural boundaries" (Titone, 1994, p. 268) would not be intelligible without the shared assumption that these boundaries exist, that they constitute defiantly stable, absolute chasms of understanding between distinct groups of people, dividing profound alterity in predictable ways.

This ethnic absolutism has particular significance for ESL students as it echoes and potentially reinforces exclusionary nationalist discourses. Goldberg has argued that it is precisely
the articulation of forms of difference that is one of the preconceptual elements that enable racist and colonialist discourse (Goldberg, 1994, pp. 52-3, 55-6 and Bhabha, 1994, pp. 67-8), much the same way they enable nationalist discourse. Through the identification and establishment of "the 'fact' of differences that may assume any combination of identifiable forms" between groups of people, boundaries are constructed on the site of these differences, and the social subjects designated within these boundaries undergo internalisation and naturalization of their respective outlined social identities (Goldberg, 1994, pp. 75-6).

Most troubling, however, are the uses to which this relativism can be put. It naturalizes, for example, claims by a white, educated, professional, North American male professor of insufficient cross-cultural sensitivity and reverse discrimination on the part of his students in a U.S.-funded programme in the Pacific islands. In this case, power blindness facilitated personal axe-grinding through appropriation of anti-oppression terminology such as "blaming the victim" (Krasnick, 1991, p. 198). The author pathologized the Asian Pacific students' complaints of feeling disempowered and colonized as expressions of "enmity", "distortion" and ethnocentric "stereotypes" (Krasnick, 1991).

Another example of the perilous consequences of interculturalist relativism are the pedagogical methods and goals in cross-cultural training recommended by Ruth Johnson (1995).
Her training course aims for students to discover "what they can and can not tolerate"\textsuperscript{79}, and learn through contrived "discomfort" "to hold two apparently or really inimical viewpoints in mind at the same time, allowing both the right to exist" (emphasis mine). In the absence of reference to histories of European colonialism, white racism and Anglo-Celtic ethnocentrism, Johnson explains discomfort or conflict only in terms of a naturalized, universalized ethnocentrism\textsuperscript{80} and individual psychology (p. 60). Working within a modern liberal framework, then, Johnson renames expressions of discursive subordination and marginalization as individualized, personal "viewpoints", "attitudes" and "prejudices", be they utterances of racism, feminism, homophobia or belief in Elvis’ continued existence. Thus Johnson is able, in perfect oblivion of systemic hetero/sexism and discourses of white American racist ethnocentrism, to design an activity in which students simulate "behaviour that is inconsistent with [their] attitudes" (Mantle-Bromley quoted in Johnson, p. 62). Basing this role-play on a

\textsuperscript{79} A power analysis informed by awareness of systemic racism, hetero/sexism, classism and ablism would have suggested that similar circumstances may be very differently ‘in/tolerable’ for differently located subjects, and that an individual’s freedom to choose to tolerate something or not is to a large degree systemically structured.

\textsuperscript{80} Johnson quotes Brislin: "one of the most amazing facts about a culture is that it can socialize its members into believing that their culture has the one correct set of behaviours for all situations which a person is likely to encounter" (p. 60). This ignores histories of European colonialism justified by claims to a more highly-evolved civilization, to racist discourses of the superior morality, aesthetics and rationality of whiteness (Goldberg, 1994, chap.2).
decontextualized Yoruba 'custom' from Nigeria, students were to greet each other according to rules which established a clear hierarchy of male over female and age over youth. What Johnson did not notice in her pedagogical zeal was that women lost either way: older women had to admit and be reminded daily of their age despite dominant Western discourses of feminine beauty which exalt youth; on the other hand, younger women had to curtsey to men, even if the latter reminded them of their "authoritarian father[s]" (p. 64).

Furthermore, the simulation, being designed strictly for shock value and devoid of critical contextualization, actually worked to reinforce the impression of the 'fact of difference' (Goldberg, 1994, pp. 75-6), and racist, colonialist discourses of 'other' cultures as irrational, unjust, backward, arbitrary and nonsensical. It also worked to suggest that sensitivity to other cultures can be inherently inimical to progressive political movements such as feminism and anti-ageism. In this case, the 'intercultural communicative competence' students were supposed to learn reinforced discursive relations of subordination between dominant and marginalized cultural and racialized groups. This is confirmed by the stated goal of 'cross-cultural education': that of developing in ESL teachers greater "empathy" and "accept[ance] of "strange" behaviour (pp. 59, 66). This objective does nothing

---

61 Johnson writes: "... the particular behaviour to be performed by the students is not the important element ... The exercise can be adapted to include any type of behaviour" (p. 65).
to shift unjust and unequal power relations since "tolerance" always implies the recognition of an always/already intolerable, inferior and irreconcilably different Other (Britzman, 1995; Goldberg, 1994, p. 7).

Finally, the pedagogy of student simulations of strange behaviours exhibits a striking tendency towards a reductionist and reifying concept of culture. What concept of culture and cultural difference is demonstrated and taught/learned in classroom activities based on decontextualized, dehistoricized, exotified anthropological artifacts? How is 'Italian' culture fixed and essentialized, how is the 'Italian' subject gendered, raced, classed, sexualized and geographically located in Johnson's rhetorical question: "What has to happen in the mind of a boy from Kansas to make him react like an Italian when facing a teacher, a companion, or a girl?" (p. 59) What conceptions of culture as inert, disembodied, teachable content are constructed in the attempt to answer this question in a classroom setting?

This tendency toward cultural reification is not unique to Johnson's article. Running through many others can be perceived a preoccupation with contrastive cultural patterns of "use of time, space, gestures, touch, emotion, and eye contact", "verbal and non-verbal communication rules", (Elver, Goldstein and McDonald, 1989, pp. 57-8), taboos (Goldstein, 1995) and forms of complimenting (Holmes and Brown, 1987). While some articles on intercultural training profess a more complex definition of culture, the consistent recourse to customs, beliefs and
behaviours in designing simulations or explaining concepts suggest a practical reliance on this more reductive notion of culture. Furthermore, in discussions of its powerful "influence" on individuals' "[b]eliefs, values and behaviour" (Elver, Goldstein and McDonald, 1989, p. 58) 'culture' achieves an almost biological status. As a result, any attempt to promote harmony, to 'understand' and foster respect for Other cultures can only stigmatize and pathologize them (Vertovec, 1996, p. 57). This was illustrated in my discussion of Muslim stereotyping in chapter II.3.

Multiculturalism and Nation: the 'Ethnicity Paradigm' and ambivalent containment

In this section I explore how the cultural pluralist paradigm of relativist, uninterrogated cultural difference intersects conceptually within discussions of Canada's national identity.

The discussion in chapter II of the case of Canada suggested that dominant discourses of multiculturalism as they have intersected with narrations of this nation have tended to frame ethnic identity within the experience of European settler/immigrants. This discourse of the 'ethnicity paradigm', can also be traced through multiculturalist approaches to ESL pedagogy.

---

Given the status of multiculturalism as official policy in state institutions - and in schools in particular\(^{83}\) - its pedagogical implications for ESL students negotiating membership in Canadian society through language bear further exploration.

I return to Bhabha's notion (1994) of "the ambivalence of the nation as a narrative strategy" (p. 142). Central to nationalism's complex strategies of cultural identification and discursive address, is the articulation of forms of difference (p. 67-70)\(^{84}\): the erasure of difference internally in the process of imagining a community of commonality\(^{85}\); and the disavowal and abjection of difference onto excluded foreign Others. Bhabha's argument that this abjection is central to the process of gaining membership, of identifying with a subject position of belonging (Bhabha, 1994, p. 149), provokes the question: under what conditions, qualifications and costs do immigrant ESL students negotiate relations of belonging and legitimacy in multicultural Canada?

The discussion of Canada's colonial, immigration and multiculturalism policy at the end of chapter II would suggest

---

\(^{83}\) Prime Minister Trudeau's announcement on October 8, 1971 can be seen to have been maintained in provincial educational policy. See: Burnet in Wolfgang (ed.), 1975, pp. 205-6 and The Council of Ministers of Education Canada, 1986, pp. 11-12.

\(^{84}\) Bhabha refers to the nation as "the measure of the liminality of cultural modernity" (p. 140).

\(^{85}\) Britzman notes that, according to Maxine Greene, the discourses of nationalism and public education meet in the dream of community based on commonality. Britzman, 1995b, p. 2.
that the play of difference in the national narration is even more complex than Bhabha's representation. With this in mind, I approach multiculturalism in education as one of the discursive mechanisms through which commonality meets difference in the ESL classroom, through which the national narrative's pedagogical address offers the Other a circumscribed place in the Self. The discursive liminality - the borderland and threshold status - of the ESL classroom implied by this understanding suggests to me that it must be a site of tremendous productivity of the national symbolic.

The discourses of ESL teaching and learning and those of nationalism come together explicitly in the ESL citizenship classroom. In a special issue of TESL Talk (1989) dedicated to ESL and citizenship, the impression given by a focus on the facilitation of student knowledge, understanding, engagement with relevant topics, and familiarity with citizen rights and responsibilities, is that these are the most significant factors in students' successfully integrating and climbing the societal ladder like those who arrived before. A framework of individualist liberal pluralism and relativism prevails in almost all of the articles which allowed no space for serious exploration of and suggestions to challenge systemic discrimination (with the exceptions of Elson; Hernandez; Porter-Fantini; and Sauve).

Acosta, for example, provides lesson plan suggestion to make use of specific citizenship materials. Lesson plans are organized
around three categories: the knowledge, language skills and attitudes to be practised. In this third category, a recurrent teaching objective is for students to be able to "express" and "accept" "different personal opinions". The allowance for students to "agree or disagree based on their own experiences" without the provision of the conceptual framework or English vocabulary to contextualize experiences constructed through intersecting relations of discursive marginalization and subordination, works to delegitimize and isolate these experiences as "controversial" and aberrant from the implicit Eurocentric norm. Canada is repeatedly presented as a 'land of immigrants', a land whose history began in 1663 with French settlement, a land whose heritage includes both aboriginal artifacts and loyalty to the "Queen of Canada" (pp. 13-14). First Nations people 'enter the pictures' only in ancient buffalo hide-clad noble savagery and archeological terminology (pp. 101,4).

I want to turn now to a sustained reworking of the theoretical framework I developed in chapter II to explore how they might apply to certain assumptions I have identified in this paradigm of ESL literature. The representation I find in citizenship ESL materials of Canada as a land of immigrants and First Nations people as part of 'our' history reflects the continued prevalence of the multiculturalist 'ethnicity paradigm'. Christine Sleeter has noted that the ethnicity

---
86 There is a suggested expansion of discussing the "historical significance of this country's first people" (Acosta, 1989, p.11)
paradigm in education has the effect of limiting the discussion of social relations to those congruent with the experience of European ethnic groups, and positioning "majority" (Northern European) Canadians and "minorities" (racialized ethnic groups) at different points on the same model of settlement and assimilation. This serves three purposes: it justifies the imbalance in power and privilege between white Canadians and Canadians of colour, promoting a model of fairness in which second-generation immigrants reap the benefits of the "self-help, assimilation and perseverance" (Sleeter, 1993, p. 158)\textsuperscript{87} of the first generation\textsuperscript{88}. The ethnicity paradigm presents Canada as a just and non-racist society by preserving the myth of equal socio-economic mobility among all the "ethnic" minorities (Sleeter, 1992:27-8) and encouraging immigrants to postpone expectations for success until subsequent generations. Finally, it is founded upon the burial of Euro-Canadians' history of conquest, colonization, slavery, and virtual genocide of First Nations peoples (Sleeter, 1993, p. 161). I present as a prime example of these three points an excerpt from the provincial

\textsuperscript{87} Although Sleeter has done her research in the United States, I argue that the ethnicity paradigm is also alive and well in Canada, and that there exists in multiculturalism a dynamic of assimilationism, experienced differently by different groups according to intersecting discourses of subordination and exclusion.

\textsuperscript{88} Sleeter has argued that "the view of the U.S. as a nation of voluntary immigrants is consistent with the family histories of Euro-Americans, and affirms the desire of Whites to believe that our ancestors earned fairly what we have inherited" (unpublished draft, 1994, p. 11).
government publication Alberta’s Cultural Heritage: Building on Tradition (quoted in Corrigan, 1987, p. 25):

"We in Alberta are proud of our tradition of welcoming newcomers. Every cultural group has moved here from another place, with our Native Indians having been here beyond the span of our written history [but still being immigrants, all the same]. Each group has had to make its adjustments and sometimes has faced resistance from those who were here before; but overall, we can take pride in Alberta’s tradition of openness.

(Alberta Culture, 1984, p. 2)"

The consequences of the ethnicity paradigm for ESL pedagogy is particularly complex: to a significant extent, this ‘Canadian Dream’ is dreamt not only by Euro-Canadians, but is also taken up by hopeful immigrants across the world: Walcott (1995, pp. 77-80) has described the imagining within many black Atlantic discourses, of Canada as "promised land" and final stop on the Underground Railroad, "a place that treated you better than America" (Donald Byrd in Gilroy, 1993, p. 18). I have slowly learned, as an ESL teacher, to respect the potent concentration of desire this ideal incites and the tremendous sacrifices and efforts made by those willing to overcome overwhelming hardships, odds and distances in pursuit of it. I have learned to ask myself how my own secure positionality as Canadian-born allows me to deconstruct the discourse of multicultural ethnic mobility at minimal psychic cost.

Yet at the same time, I am conscious of the amnesia of this paradigm, and of the perilous artificiality of the community of undifferentiated immigrants it props up. The consequences of the erasure of racism and colonialism upon which this discourse is
founded become violently clear in attitudes of indignation by those (generally Caucasian)\textsuperscript{89} established immigrants who have 'made it' towards those (generally non-Caucasian) immigrants who still have not.

\textbf{B}: Well, the Empire teacher I can deal with, but the ones I have more problems with, who you may not have thought about yet, are teachers who came here as immigrants or children of immigrants who were treated like dirt and think 'the immigrant of today' is given a free ride. And their pain, the suffering they went through due to racism, is now translated into 'these people are getting a free ride: we didn't have ESL classes and antiracist education'. These [former immigrant teachers] are everywhere, and they now are of the age where they have acquired a certain amount of power. I have seen this throughout my teaching career: that those people who have had the most pain lack the compassion, and the kinds of things that were done to them - simple things like anglicizing names - now they're in their fifties doing the \textit{same} thing to recent immigrants. And their particular ethnic groups are now quite powerful in the Canadian structure: they have the special schools, the money to send their children to these special schools ...

\textbf{L}: So, they've bought into this 'ethnicity paradigm', this Canadian dream, where everyone who comes in has to suffer, it's part of becoming Canadian (yes), the price to pay because being Canadian is a privilege, and they accept that racism should be the sort of 'litmus test' of climbing up the social ladder?

\textbf{B}: and often enough, these people are blonde, blue-eyed people who have been able to kind of fade into the woodwork of what's perceived as being Canadian. And their very resentful of inclusive curriculum //

\textbf{L}: Well a lot of what inclusive curriculum is based in is challenging Eurocentrism, and a lot of early post-World War II immigration was \textit{European}, so as long as multiculturalism doesn't challenge Eurocentrism //

\textbf{B}: Yes, they've really bought into Eurocentric history ... often these people have erased any trace of their non-Anglo-Saxon

\textsuperscript{89} I should say: generally Caucasian but not exclusively. See Xiao Ping Li's critique of Bissoondath's \textit{Selling Illusions}.
heritage, they've Anglicized their names.

L: So if you're only **culturally** different you'll be able to become Canadian in a different way from if you're **racially** different.

It would seem than that in articles I've designated 'multiculturalist' the terms and conditions under which the nation accepts difference into commonality is within a liberal framework which buys cultural pluralism by collapsing all Canadians into the immigration experiences of Anglo and Franco settler groups. As a discursive strategy for accepting difference into the national community, multiculturalism has tended to be a rather selective, ambivalent one which does nothing to disturb the white centre.

I pause here in order to elaborate and re-interpret the ambivalent, limited acceptance of difference within this model of Euro-centred pluralism in terms of the colonialist discursive construct of **ambivalence**. In his critique of Edward Said's construction, in **Orientalism**, of a binary between the "content of Orientalism as an unconscious repository of fantasy and the form of it as material conquest" (Said in Bhabha, 1994, p. 71) Homi Bhabha suggests that this contradiction in Europe's relations with its Oriental subjugated Other be understood within the ambivalence of the colonial stereotype as both phobia and fetish. He explains that the colonial stereotype works to present the unfamiliar or "foreign" as a repetition, as contained in a difference that is defined and **predictable**: this allows for the threat of otherness to be muted and for familiar values to impose
themselves. "There is therefore a vacillation between recognition and disavowal of racial difference, between delight and fear" (Bhabha, pp. 71-5).

Bhabha explains this vacillation through the psychic mechanism of fetishism, theorised by Freud as the primal psychic desire for undifferentiation, a desire achieved through the disavowal of difference and the fixation on an object that restores commonality. While Freud developed the concept of fetishism in relation to sexual difference, Bhabha applies it to racial difference in order to explain the ambivalence in colonial discourse which inscribes the colonial other in both an economy of domination and one of pleasure, interpelling the colonial as both an object of odium and delight.

In the colonialist stereotype, then, the colonial is positioned as different ("foreign") yet with a similarity (predictability through repetition): s/he is interpelled into relations of colonialist mimicry (outlined above) which positions the object as the same ("Anglicized") yet with a difference ("emphatically not English"). Positioned as a subject of both limited sameness and limited difference, the colonial is "fixe[d] ... as a 'partial' presence." Bhabha notes that "partial" here refers to both the incompleteness of having to imitate a subject position the colonial can never inhabit and the virtuality of inhabiting a subject position that is erased (Bhabha, 1994, p.

---

90 "The fetish or stereotype gives access to an 'identity' which is predicated ... on mastery and pleasure", (Bhabha, 1994, p. 75).
I would argue that colonialist ambivalence is a central dynamic in liberal modern constructions of (collective) identity and belonging. As noted by Bhabha, the discursive construct activates and references an economy of both domination and pleasure as a psychic binary contradiction. There is an overwhelming dominant desire for undifferentiation (Goldberg, 1994, p. 7): that is, for the assimilation or recuperation of the Other into the Self (Young, 1987, p. 3), the absorption of alterity into the same (Levinas, p. 10). Young has interpreted Cixous as locating this mechanism within the grasping urge of Western knowledge "as a politics of arrogation" which "cannot tolerate otherness or leave it outside its economy of inclusion" (pp. 3-4). This "appropriation of the other as a form of knowledge within a totalizing system" is achieved through the prior disavowal of difference and reconstitution of the Other in accordance with the perspective of dominant selfhood. At the same time there is an establishment and systematic articulation of abject difference, which enables the insinuation of racist discursive differentiation that polices the borders of collective dominant selfhood and ensures erasure, marginalization and/or material exclusion.

Picking up the discussions in this and the last chapter of the construct of linguistic difference, I would propose that

---

91 See Young's critique of the Hegelian dialectic as the central logic of Western metaphysics and construction of knowledge, pp.3-6, especially chapter 1.
colonialist ambivalence represents a powerful concept through which to try to understand the potential for liberal portrayals of ESL students as abstract subjects of language difference to activate and reinforce racializing discourses of exclusion. First of all, within modern liberalism the proclaimed universal principle of equality between autonomous undifferentiated individuals is achieved through the dismissal of "historical particularities" (Goldberg, 1994, pp. 4-6) such as ‘race’ with the effect of positioning everyone as unraced, or white: at the same time liberal modernity’s preconceptual elements of gradation, valuation and the articulation of difference are colonized by racist discourse to ensure racial exclusion (pp. 5-7). Turning to the ‘sedimentary traces’ of discourses of language, in the movement for the standardization of English the unifying effect of establishing a common national language was made possible by the designation of the upper class dialect as standard92. Similarly, today international English unites the world with a common language of business, technology and tourism, while reinforcing the predominance of affluent English-speaking nations. The concomitant function of this universal standard English has been to map deviance and perpetuate the disenfranchisement of marginal classes: the poor, speakers of non-standard dialects and learners of English.

---

92 Similarly, international English unites the world with a common language of business, technology and tourism, while reinforcing the predominance of affluent English-speaking nations.
This theory of colonial ambivalence also lends rich insight into the discursive workings of the multiculturalist narration of Canada as a nation of immigrants and land of equal opportunity. This plots ESL students - those of colour in particular - onto trajectories of delight and fear. Certainly, the myth of immigrant diversity and mobility represents a site of intense affective investment and pride for a majority of Canadians, appearing again and again in surveys and polls of how Canadians define Canadian identity (see, for example, the Spicer Commission report, 1989; The Toronto Star, October 28, 1995). Yet these affirmations of celebratory multiculturalism are not without rumblings of misgiving. Racialized concepts of cultural difference can be effectively and euphemistically recruited whenever it becomes necessary to defend white "majority" dominance in social, political, representational and economic relations from the critical onslaughts of antiracists and other 'special interests'. This is evident, for example, in the many ominous predictions that have flourished in popular discourses since the failed Charlottetown Accord (1992) and Quebec referendum (1995) of the impending break-up of Canada. I would argue that laments that cultural pluralism has run rampant to the point of balkanization and disintegration of the (Anglo-Saxon) 'Canadian' core draw upon and activate racist discourses of abjection: "metaphors of siege ... images that reinforce the notion of an invasion, a flood of attackers, infiltrating and struggling for control of a public space" (Ware in Robertson,
1994, p. 220). More than evidence of a return of the repressed difference denied in reductive formulations of multiculturalism, these images invoke sedimented Eurocentric memories of barbarians over-running Rome and Constantinople. In this way, they activate Orientalist tropes which racialize certain cultures in specific ways. Moreover, these metaphors reinscribe cultural difference as pernicious and in need of firm regulation and containment, and call for a re-entrenchment of the dominant centre.

One need not even venture beyond discussions of ESL student education to encounter this ambivalence toward racialized cultural difference: Ashworth (1992) has remarked: "[i]t is somewhat ironic that people who ... speak with pride of Canada being a mosaic rather than a melting pot ... [also] oppose bilingual education and heritage language education" (p. 41). As Bhabha suggests, the response to the dilemma of desire/threat is a dominant impulse to contain the alterity of immigrants of colour to "an uninhabitable zone of ambivalence that grants [them] neither identity nor difference" (McClintock, 1995, p. 63). Writes one ESL student: "I repeated, 'Who am I?' Of course, I am not Canadian. But it seems I am no longer Chinese either. Then, who am I? Who will I be? I feel so confused" (Cen in Porter, 1991, p. 23).

I am arguing that the Eurocentric ethnicity paradigm is a key mechanism of this discursive work of containment. It does so by defining Canadian identity in such a way as to interpret the experiences of all Canadians of colour within the paradigm of
Canadian ethnicity based in European settler/immigrants' experiences of social mobility. Non-European racialized immigrants are included into this totalized selfhood through their selective reinscription and monolithic insertion. Simultaneously, this heritage model of ethnicity allows the comparative scheduling of subsequent ethnic minorities according to the recency of immigration, the size and establishment of the community. In absence of reference to the impact of colonialism and racism in Canadian immigration policy and society, this naturalizes representations of certain ethnic groups as founding nations, others as established minorities, others as 'recent waves' or inundations, others as poorly adjusted, 'unassimilable' or 'cliquish'.

At the same time, this myth is rendered intelligible only by forgetting the histories of European colonization and racist immigration policy. As I discussed at the end of chapter II, those groups who have had to innovate to survive historical relations and experiences of colonialism and who consequently either can't or won't 'fit' into this fetishized, essentialized and contained position of manageable diversity and qualified sameness have tended to be racialized and excluded or erased. Bhabha explains relativist multiculturalism thus: "A transparent norm is constituted, a norm given by the host society or dominant culture, which says that 'these other cultures are fine, but we must be able to locate them within our own grid'. This is what I mean by a creation of cultural diversity and a containment of
cultural difference. ... The universalism that paradoxically permits diversity masks ethnocentric norms, values and interests" (emphasis original, Bhabha, 1995, p. 208).

Corrigan identifies this same central mechanism of containment within institutionalized education, in that schools stand at the intersection of the nation’s performative and pedagogical aspects: "Multiculturalism works socially as I suggested schooling works: it offers an invitation to participate on particular terms which simultaneously confer a certain kind of legitimacy at the crippling cost of denying the pervasiveness of the difference that is being welcomed in" (1991, p. 24).

R: ... one of the things that really irks cultural minority students that I’ve seen, is that they just get really pissed off when they do multicultural week and all they include is like, these Imperial China outfits, and that’s not how Asian students [see themselves] ... it’s just as foreign to a Chinese student as it is to you! And it’s really insulting to be told that, I mean, that’s what’s in demand, that ‘oooh ahh, isn’t that beautiful’ //

R: You know, there are actual participants [of colour] in the perpetuation of those [multiculturalist] stereotypes but, I understand why they’re doing it. I mean (this is a weird sort of metaphor for what they’re doing but) in high school, contrary to what’s happening today, when I went to high school, being Asian was completely asexual. I was completely not in the circuit for dating: guys were not interested in me whatsoever, and it wasn’t even that there was any hostility, it was just I was ignored, I wasn’t there, I just wasn’t considered seriously for things like dating. And you know when you’re a young person, and you’re a teenager, those things are important to you, like being attractive is important, that other people think you’re attractive is important and I think that for me, for many immigrant students //

L: particularly immigrant students of colour!
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R: yeah, that’s almost in some respects the most hurtful experience that they have: just simply, being over-looked ... I remember right I after finished high school, that’s when there was this exoticization of Asian women and white men, generally, became quite interested in dating me, because I was an Asian woman. And I remember being in this weird position where I didn’t know, whether to participate in it, ‘cause it’s like ‘geez, finally somebody’s interested in me!’. But I could feel, where they were coming from, like, ‘I really like your long hair’ and ‘does your mother cook Chinese food?’ and, you know, these sort of questions that really belied ideas that they held, of why they were attracted to me, you know, out of these stereotypes about Asian women. And in that twisted way, you know, it was working in my favour and I could choose to say ‘well I’m going to get a piece of the action’ and go along with it, or just say ‘screw this’, you know. And as an adult I’ve turned my back to that and said ‘no, I will not be included in a way that compromises really who I am’. And I think that’s also what’s happening in these sort of situations where we see the eggrolls and the Imperial dress, is that, people know that that is what is in demand, that that is what’s expected, that that is what will please people in power. So that is what they’re going to offer up, because they want to be included..

L: it’s like this is the only currency accepted by the Bank of Canada?

R: and this is what will allow you to be included.

... 

R: But it’s only because those are the crumbs that are, that you’re dealing with. And I think that for minority groups that might be enforced to have to use false cries of racism, or using the sort of things that we’ve been talking about, using cultural stereotypes, is because it really indicates your lack of power. It’s that there are so few places in which they have to negotiate that, unfortunately that is what, right now, is what gives some people some power. And it’s really sad and, as a person of colour [it’s important] that we speak out against, those things happening. But I think I understand where it’s coming from, it’s really an indication of how powerless people feel. ... 

This discussion signals the importance for ESL teachers to be aware of the racialized ambivalence within discursive uses of multiculturalist understandings of Canadian society and of the positions of different groups within it. A reading of this
interview informed by the discussion in chapter II of how discourses of racialized and cultural difference intersect would suggest that culturalized racist discourses circulate within certain multiculturalist narratives to erase or reduce non-Caucasian identificatory images to static, totalized stereotypes. Recalling the ambivalence identified by Bhabha in colonialist stereotyping suggests that this process is hardly monolithic. A limited range of images racialize different groups differently: Portuguese differently from Latin Americans; fetishized model minorities differently from criminalized groups. The interviewee describes her limited 'choice' between identifying with images of the asexual Asian woman or the stigmatized sexualized Madame Butterfly/Miss Saigon\textsuperscript{93}. She also gestures to some of the costs for Canadians of colour of accepting this 'limited offer' of marginal and contingent belonging within multicultural dreams of Canada.

For teachers to embrace cultural pluralism uncritically is thus to run the risk of perpetuating its racialized structures, exclusions and erasures. I propose that multicultural concepts of inclusion could be reinterpreted in more critical ways: when inclusion disrupts shrink-wrapped culturalist stereotypes, when it involves the introduction of un-commodified cultural practices which will not neatly 'fit' and which raise important questions in their turbulent refusal to fit, perhaps it can escape

\textsuperscript{93} For an excellent analysis of Miss Saigon and other culturalized racist discourses of Amerasians, see MacLear, 1994a.
discourses of ambivalent containment and abjection of difference.

This suggests that how culture is understood is important: when cultural pluralism and inclusion is based upon an understanding of culture as contested, scavenging, instable and innovative, inclusion can constitute an ongoing process of displacing and critically interrogating established hubs and hierarchies of cultural authority, elitism and ‘authenticity’.

L: I’m thinking that an antiracist perspective of inclusion, of cultural inclusion, would include [others] in a way that disrupts stereotypes: so you invited Wasabi Daiko [a gay Asian women’s drumming group based in Toronto] instead of ordering in sushi and spring rolls, instead of including [non-WASP ethnicities] under certain terms that say ‘well we only want it if it looks like this’.

R: Right.
III.3 The "Cultural Domination" Paradigm

The third pattern of approaches to ESL pedagogy can be considered the most critical in that it locates the ESL learner in the context of societal relations and identifies these relations as founded upon the subjugation of difference. The crucial significance of this distinction is its break with the modernist liberal paradigm which reduces systemic oppression to isolated incidents of personalized 'prejudice' between 'equal' individuals. Writers in this paradigm have opened rich dialogues and alliances with theoretical and activist movements dedicated to challenging systemic marginalization along lines of class, 'race', and gender. It is in the recognition of the possibilities opened by these new dialogues that I bring the understandings of the discursive constructs of 'race' and culture developed in the last chapter to this work, in attempt to complicate the analyses and recommendations.

Many of the writers within this paradigm, for example, have been inspired by Freirean adult education and critical pedagogy\(^4\), traditions which argue that the education is never neutral, and needs to be accompanied by a critical perspective to counter the "colonizing effects" of learning (Rockhill, 1993, p. 336). These writers argue against theorists of applied linguistics that learners must be seen as social subjects negotiating relations of domination within societies that are

structured by inequality along systemic lines. It is at the site of these power struggles that ESL teachers are imagined as intervening to assist learners’ development of the communicative and critical tools to name their experience and challenge their subordination. (Peirce, 1995, pp. 9-13; Sauve, 1989, pp. 125-6; Cummins, 1986, 1988, 1989).

Like the multiculturalist paradigm, however, writers I have grouped into this paradigm tend to frame ESL students as ‘linguistic and cultural minorities’. In other words, ESL students are primarily theorized within social relations (of domination) as subjects of cultural difference. This raises two areas of interest for me as I examine specific examples of this work. I will, first of all, be asking how culture and ethnicity are being understood, how cultural difference is being constituted, and what this means for how ESL students, as subjects of cultural difference, are conceived. I will ask these questions in reference to the theoretical framework of the discursive relation between cultural, racial, language and national difference developed in chapter II with an interest in discovering how analyses and pedagogical recommendations might be enriched.

Secondly and in order to trouble the construct of cultural difference which occupies such a prominent position in this third paradigm, I will draw in my analysis upon Bhabha’s very complex reframings of this concept. Rather than introduce this theory at the outset, however, I prefer to describe and work with it in
direct application to various articles.

The implications for second language acquisition research of different conceptualizations of culture and cultural difference are illustrated in an extremely intriguing conversation between Robert Courchene and Virginia Sauve, published in the Summer 1996 issue of *TESL Canada Journal*. Responding to and expanding on Courchene's article on how 'Canadian culture' might be taught as a subject in ESL curriculum, Sauve states: "[C]ulture is not about content. It is about the making and remaking of relationships in our society." She discusses some of the pitfalls in trying to conceive of 'culture' as content: the impossibility of representing the specificity of culture according to "region, age, gender, ethnicity, class, race, rural versus urban locale, and work, to name some of the variables at play"; and the unavoidable flattening out of the discursive convergence of the psychic and the social at the heart of cultural practices, an erasure which tends to occur especially when cultural 'content' is taught in the 'delivery mode'.

Courchene argues in response to Sauve that he sees culture as consisting of both cultural knowledge and cultural behaviour: "[w]hen [cultural knowledge] becomes internalized, it becomes a force that shapes and guides the lives of the members of that culture, a force that is frequently exerted on the unconscious level. ... Although cultural knowledge may ultimately not be as important as cultural actions and cultural relationships, it remains an important aspect of any culture" (p. 24-5)
Upon revisiting the article my impression was that Courchene's argument, in his insistence on the value - however qualified - of a vision of culture as knowledge that can be taught, traced a cross-hatched seam along the tension between two distinct conceptual approaches to the question of culture. To elaborate these approaches I turn to Bhabha's (1988) discussion of 'cultural diversity and cultural difference'. Bhabha describes cultural diversity as an "epistemological object ... a [theoretical] category of comparative ethics, aesthetics or ethnology" which is used in order to examine, describe, compare, analyze, or organize totalized cultures according to their contents. Whether the relations between different cultures are understood as being outside power relations or within a hierarchy of power, little attention is paid to the preliminary process through which these contents were framed. Questions of framing and representation Bhabha sees as arising from the notion of cultural difference: one which founds a project of investigating how certain formulations of cultures accrue categorical status, come to function as authoritative frames of reference and incite identification. If the notion of cultural diversity inspires attempts to know different cultures, the notion of cultural difference asks how 'cultures' come to be know-able and known. (1995, pp. 206-7)

Of further note in the perspective of cultural diversity is how the fascination with cataloguing differences can end up
reinforcing both the impression of profound, stable difference between groups, and the affixing of this alterity onto the bodies of Others such that it comes to totalize their 'identity'. This is the danger of activities such as having student teachers interview newly-arrived immigrants of different cultures and filling out "culturegrams" on them (an example cited in Courchene). Even when relations of marginalization between these immigrant cultures and the dominant group (to which most students teachers belong) are named, without critical self-reflexivity, the experience of gaining knowledge of these 'other' cultures can end up reinforcing binaries of alterity versus normalcy. As Razack has observed: "[c]ulture talk is clearly a double-edged sword. It packages difference as inferiority [even as it] require[s] dominant groups to examine the invisible advantages they enjoy" (1994, p. 896). The perspective of cultural difference would encourage turning this interrogative focus on the Other and on differences back onto the Self, the systems and relations through which dominant gaze and identity are secured and the various investments which defend them (I explore what such a reflexivity might look like from my subject position in the next chapter).

I see Courchene’s argument alternating throughout the course of his article between these two approaches to the question of culture. Throughout the article he refers to "Canadian culture" in the singular form, while asserting that "we do not have a common culture shared by all" (p. 2). Referencing Giroux he
argues that culture "is not some reified body of knowledge transferred from one generation to another untouched by the forces of history" (pp. 4-6). At the same time, he insists that culture is learned and therefore teachable: teachers should be "trained to be more effective interpreters of cultural knowledge and, as a result, better prepared to help their students learn new cultural knowledge" (p. 10). His definition of culture as knowledge which shapes behaviour and relations leads to repeated attempts to describe, in a way which might be teachable, this body of knowledge which could be said to constitute 'Canadian culture'. He presents a list of selected responses to a survey of Canadian myths, traditions, norms and values, while pointing out the selectivity, reductivism, dominant normativity and erasures of this list. He argues that 'Canadian culture' is becoming more multicultural, although the examples of diversification he offers are those of sports, cuisine and tolerance of religious pluralism (pp. 7-8).

Incorporating both the views of culture as epistemological content and as struggles of representation, Courchene advocates a vision of 'Canadian culture' based in part upon universal legal rights and freedoms as well as certain shared social codes, traditions and symbols. The learning/teaching of this 'cultural knowledge' would also involve a critical examination of how certain traditions have come to be promoted as universal, how certain values and perceptions have come to be enshrined in law: this examination would address the ongoing history of erasures
and exclusions which falls within the territory of ‘Canadian culture’. In his proposal of the teaching of ‘cultural analysis’ in addition to ‘cultural knowledge’ Courchene attempts to bridge two very different understandings of ‘culture’.

What this attempt illustrates is the tendency, when transparent notions of culture as content are incorporated into curriculum and pedagogy, to produce reductive descriptions that fix ‘culture’ even while proclaiming its fluid nature. As a result, there emerges a structuralist division between an essentialist, selective freeze-frame of ‘cultural knowledge’ and the negotiated relations and practices of individuals which reflect and reproduce the former. Furthermore, if a particular ‘culture’ can be synecdochically represented by its artifacts, cultural difference becomes similarly commodified and naturalized. If cultures are understood as entities consisting of enumerable and teachable contents then it becomes possible for discussions of multicultural education to slide into zero-sum metaphors and mercantalist debates as to how much of which cultures to include in the curriculum.

Courchene’s discussion also suggests that there are radically different understandings of subjectivity at stake in the two conceptions of ‘culture’. The proposal for a pedagogy of ‘cultural knowledge’ suggests stable, coherent selves in dis/possession of articulable and transferable quantities of cultural knowledge or ‘capital’. It forgets how ‘cultural knowledge’ is always about value, legitimacy and morality, about
representational struggles and psychic identifications; how it is already organized by discourses of social difference and historical relations between shifting identities. As Sauve points out, 'cultural knowledge' is constituted and deployed differently depending upon the players and the stakes at any one point: in her example, the 'cultural knowledge' of successful boardroom conduct, when deployed by women, earns them the title "bitch" (the example of the Turkish Gastarbeiter cited in Bhabha illustrates the same point). Furthermore, this perspective does not reflect how culture is always about be/longing, strategic, shifting boundaries and constructions of 'I'/we'/them': how the very notion of culture is a discourse which "constitutes, even as it mobilizes and shuts out, imaginary communities, identity investments and discursive practices" (Britzman, 1995, p. 239).

Several important issues emerge from this discussion. Bhabha's notion of cultural difference is particularly of note in that it brings issues of representation to the forefront of TESL discussions, and cautions against reproducing the interests and discourses shaping the very categories of used in these discussions. Bringing to SLA research and debates more complex conceptualizations of 'culture' and a deep preoccupation for the politics of representation would encourage work that is less concerned with exploring differences than asking how they are constituted, what they do, how they do it and what is at stake for whom. This might involve paying attention to how the performative cutting-edge aspect of 'minority' cultures which
incorporate multiple temporalities (Bhabha, 1995) and locations in the strategic struggle to survive (Clifford, 1988; Gilroy, 1993b; Walcott, 1995), come to be re-iterated as the continuative past, in the language of long, long ago and far, far away. It might entail an integrative analysis which traces the intersection of contextually specific discourses and images of racialized, classed, gendered and ablist difference with an homogenizing, backward-gazing representation of ethnicity such that the latter accrues authority, inciting desire and identification. Finally, it might include planning pedagogy around ways that ESL students, negotiating relations of hybrid, multiple belonging, might begin to re/signify heritage models of multicultural ethnicity and re/member these models' omissions.

The paragraph above describes my approach in this section to considering examples of this 'cultural domination' paradigm. I'll ask not only how culture is being conceived, but what insights are enabled by an integrated analysis of how culture is woven with the threads of specific discursive relations of 'race' and other social difference. I am also concerned with what this perspective would imply for transformative pedagogy.

One of the most influential and oft cited pieces of work among the publications I am grouping within this paradigm of cultural domination is Cummins' "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention" (1986, 1989). Working with Freirean concepts of empowerment and dialogue, Ogbu’s research on the impact of colonization and institutionalized racism on minority
student achievement, as well as research on bilingual education, Cummins proposed a model framework for an empowering pedagogy for language and cultural minority students (figure 1). According to this model, ESL students are 'disempowered' by the fact that they, their culture and language are not valued by the dominant culture (Cummins 1994, p. 40), are forced by "dominant group institutions and representatives (e.g. teachers)" to deny their cultural identities and first languages (Cummins 1994, p. 46), and internalize the "inherently inferior" status attributed to them (Cummins, 1986, p. 22; see also Flaherty, 1992; McKeon, 1994).
I want to emphasize, first of all, the significance of Cummins' having been one of the few to first open discussions of ESL student achievement and TESL pedagogy in terms of relations of systemic racialized and ethnicized discrimination. I would suggest that this framework of domination as cultural devaluation

---

95 Please note that this model from Cummins (1989) is missing the row:

"Community Participation Collaborative .............. Exclusionary"

after the row on Cultural/linguistic incorporation.
may tend towards cultural determinism because of the way it conceives of culture and the subjects of cultural difference. That is, because culture is understood as something that can be possessed, devaluated and denied, a basis of social division, it follows that domination consists in an ideological offensive which appropriates and misrepresents a group’s culture, while institutionally marginalizing them. While this model can be strategic, particularly for rallying collective defiance, it may encourage the essentialization of this thing to be reclaimed. I would contend that this framework would be enriched by questions of what comes to count as this culture that is at stake. If specific practices of resistance were understood as ‘culture’, this would open contextually sensitive ways of understanding the different members of this monolithic ‘culture’ as variously engaged as resistant cultural agents.

I would also argue that the "theoretical framework [which] is required to document the ways in which institutionalized racism manifests itself in the educational system" (1988, p. 128) proposed by Cummins would benefit from a more complex and historically specific analysis. This would involve paying attention to the particular mechanisms, tropes, and sedimented historical associations of different racisms, ethnicisms and linguicisms rather than collapsing them into a parallel binarist model of structural and attitudinal devaluation (1988, p. 131; see figure 1). I would argue that it is not only that

---

This has also been argued by Walsh (1991, pp. 11-12.)
discriminatory ideologies organize institutions and constitute implicit assumptions held by individuals (1988, p. 131). As I tried to indicate in the last chapter, discourses of social difference intersect to incite unending processes of representational struggle, strategic psychic identification and relational negotiation over boundaries of alterity and positions of relative authority. Moreover, as I explored in my examination of the case of Canada, it is not simply that linguistic, culturalized, racialized and sexualized students are forced to deny distinct cultural identities and melt into an homogenous American or Canadian identity. Discourses of linguicism, culturalized and gendered racism and reified multiculturalism can work to condition their inclusion within static identities of narrowly circumscribed, essentialized, backward-gazing ethnicity and fetishized sub-categories of multicultural Canadianness:

"This paradox of identity is part of what it means to be an 'immigrant woman'. Nowhere is there more dramatic evidence of change, as the new arrival suddenly becomes a minority, a target of racism, class dislocation, cultural and family upheaval, which are accompanied by complex changes in sexual identities. At the same time 'immigrant woman' carries with it a fixed, enduring and totalizing quality, a means of racializing and othering those who do not match the Canadian norm. (Moussa, 1993) As a woman becomes socially constructed as an 'immigrant' or 'refugee' it becomes the totality of her identity in the dominant society, the only way in which she will be seen, however long she resides in Canada, as long as she speaks with an accent, or her difference is marked by skin colour or other physical signifiers that deviate from the norm of white (fe)maleness" (Rockhill and Tomic, 1995, p. 21)

I am suggesting incorporating into Cummins' model of
cultural devaluation/empowerment an understanding of domination, informed by 'race' theory, as a dynamic and agonistic pedagogical process of narration. The theory I explored in the last chapter proposed that subordinating discourses draw upon accumulated representational authority and reiterative normalization in order to naturalize social relations organized into systems of differentiation, pathologization, hierarchy and exclusion. This would complicate reductive notions of cultural domination as the imposition of monolithic, static ideologies by one group against another. It may also avoid reproducing the very representations through which ESL students are marginalized.

The integrative analysis I am proposing would focus attention on the particularities of dominant representations and structural relations which position 'minority' groups as cultural, racial, linguistic, national, gendered or disabled Others. In this sense, Catherine Walsh' work (1991) expands and complicates the model of domination elaborated by Cummins. In Pedagogy and the struggle for voice she examines how, for Puerto Rican students, values, meanings, identifications, relations of legitimacy and interest are shaped through "linguistic forms and discursive practices", through the meanings and use of language. Most significantly, she contextualizes this study in an in-depth analysis of the historical and ongoing U.S. colonization of Puerto Ricans. In her research she strives to understand issues of cultural, linguistic, racialized, gendered and classed difference not as pre-existing, matter-of-fact causes but lived

Certain other writers in the field of TESL also attempt in their work to investigate the particularities of how the processes of representation, socialization and divisions of labour and space work to produce diverse practices as markers of racialized, ethnicized, classed or gendered difference. Mary Ashworth's (1979, 1988, 1992a, 1992b, 1993) complex, historically grounded research into the racialized and culturalized experiences of different ethnic 'minorities' has been an important contribution to discussions in the Canadian context. In relation to North America, the work of Cartagena, Fouron and Tajitsu Nash (all in Benesch, 1991) is also invaluable in contextualizing colonialist and racist myths about specific immigrant groups by deconstructing the historical and socio-politico-economic roots of these subordinating relations and policies.

Finally, Canagarajah has crafted a critical ethnographic deconstruction of the complex responses of Sri Lankan university students learning English as a powerful alien discourse. Attempting to sketch the dimensions of their ambivalence, Canagarajah describes threats of cultural colonization, marginalization and alienation students "experienced intuitively" learning English from highly ethnocentric U.S. texts. He also considers factors motivating students to learn English: the imperialist discourses glorifying Anglophone culture, the
institutional importance placed on English proficiency, promises of socio-economic mobility, and "the uses of English as a buffer against Sinhalese nationalism and passport for exodus as political or economic refugees abroad". While thus contextualizing students' learning strategies of both accommodation and opposition, Canagarajah goes on to problematize various pedagogical directions suggested by these. He troubles the "narrowly conceived egalitarianism" and culturalized racism of anthropological approaches, and the oppositional essentialism of manifestos, both of which recommend unproblematically adopting indigenous pedagogical traditions. He sketches subtle, critical considerations which might inform a pedagogical frame aimed at equipping students to interrogate discursive systems of domination both in foreign and their own culture, and to improve their own marginalized positions.

What becomes clear reading this work is that this situated analysis opens up complex understandings of the different experiences of ESL students, and also points to valuable directions for pedagogy. Walsh (1991) concludes from her analysis of the historical material and discursive subordination of Puerto Ricans that students' silence and non-participation need to be reframed as potential resistance to discursive interpellation and regulation which happens in large part through language (p. 114). She suggests learning activities which create opportunities for students to identify and examine these discourses of social difference as they structure dominant society and position them
differently within it, as well as to strategize resistance (pp. 114-126). Rockhill's thought-provoking exploration (1993) of the links between language, literacy, racism, classism and heterosexism reaches the conclusion: if illiteracy and ignorance of English have functioned to reinforce white and, differently, racialized/ethnicized and lower-class women's subordination to men and sexual objectification, then critical literacy and ESL are always about threat/desire and the discursive construction of self. Pursuing some of the pedagogical implications of this, Rockhill emphasizes the need for teacher awareness of the potential violence of education, the unlearning inseparable from the process of learning, the power inequalities among learners, the conflictual disunity of learner subjectivity and identifications, and the way power works through bodies. Finally, Rockhill and Tomic (1994, p. 3) focus their analysis on the "paradox of ESL". The latter refers to the fact that English, while constituting the medium of inclusion and access to societal membership, also colonizes the subjectivities of learners: all that one can speak must fit discursive structures of racialized difference; all one can not speak is invalidated. This analysis leads to their argument that framing of ESL learners must be shifted from that of deficient whiteness to "the situated, 'self-defined' standpoints of transcultural

97 I have explored this paradox above as the racialized exclusionary mechanisms of liberal notions of linguistic community. See chapter II.3 on Anderson and chapter III.1 on the 'Applied Linguistics' paradigm.
identities", from that of subjects "lacking in communication ability [to subjects] rich in knowledge and experience" (pp. 4, 22). Furthermore, they argue that a critical deconstruction of the colonizing effects of English acquisition must accompany learning in order to address and resist these effects. They recommend the use of "mixed codes" as a method of foregrounding the linguistic dominance of English in the many struggles over linguistic/cultural rights in this country (pp. 4-6).

This critical work cautions against an oblique and single-dimensional model of ESL students as culturally dominated. It demonstrates how paying attention to the simultaneous workings of other discursive relations of marginalized social difference transforms one’s understanding of the very notion of domination. This testifies to the value of Bhabha’s notion of cultural difference: rather than remaining within the logic of cultural domination, it focuses attention on how the very construct of cultural difference hides interlocking discursively and historically specific relations of exclusion; how the very concept of culturally different Others is raced, classed, sexualized, gendered, linguicized, abilized and nationalized. It demands that researchers and practitioners draw from theories of the specific histories and grammars of racism, linguicism, heterosexism, classism, nationalism, imperialism and abilism in trying to critically analyze the complexity of how these

---

98 A similar argument has been made by Fairclough (1990, 1991) in terms of the need to teach "critical language awareness".
discourses intersect to fix and circumscribe different ESL students as heterogeneously Other. 99

R: I mean in fact what I see is that a lot of ESL students, as immigrants, are posed as weak in this society: as taking up social services, that they’re on the 'fringe of society', that they’re poor. There’s some sort of idea that 'we need to help them'. But it’s awful, because a lot of the students I’ve worked with are amongst the very few that have survived and made it to Canada. They are in fact the strong ones: the way they see themselves is that they’re the few that made it here, work here and are able to support a whole family that’s waiting in a refugee camp, or still back in the home country. So they see themselves, and their family sees them, as survivors, as strong people and that really flies in the face of the treatment they receive sometimes in schools, in ESL situations where they’re seen as helpless. And that, for me, is really, hurtful: ... to not acknowledge the strength of the students that are here, often, as refugees, who might be here living on their own, who have seen and survived just, atrocious things that I think most people in Canadian society can’t even begin to think about.

This critical reflexivity and suspicion in regards to how domination is named, anatomized and how ESL students are framed as subjects of social difference and domination, is particularly crucial to Freirean-inspired approaches to teaching. The questions arising from Bhabha’s notion of cultural difference need to inform how teachers plan for, invite, listen to and interrogate students’ discussions of "generative themes" (Freire; Auerbach and McGrail, 1991; Moriarty, 1979) in their lives.

The authors above also suggest that an integrated critical

99 I will explore the implications of bringing this critical analysis to the specific subject position of a white researcher at the end of this chapter, and to my position as a white ESL teacher in the next chapter.
analysis, beyond informing how teachers frame their students and understand the social relations and learning processes these students are negotiating, needs to be incorporated into the very curriculum of their pedagogy. As ESL students are imagined through lenses of racism, culturalism, colonialism, and so on, a pedagogy of integrative antiracism would ask them to identify and understand these relations in order to challenge them. This latter term refers to "a proactive approach which challenges the systemic subordination of all categories of social difference while emphasizing the salience of 'race' as an entry point into these "interlocking systems" (Razack). An explicit pedagogical commitment to integrative antiracism would aim to provide students with the conceptual and literal vocabulary with which to discuss together the similarities and differences in ESL students' experiences of cultural translation, of immigration as an experience of interpellation into Otherness; it would also open up critical conversations about Canadian society.

T: One of the first things that ESL teachers have to realize is that ESL students are not just learning language, but also they're learning 'race'. They start looking around the classroom

100 While an integrative anti-racist pedagogy emphasizes the salience of race, it is founded upon the recognition of the inseparability and interdependence of systemic oppressive relations organized around multiple discourses of social difference. From this recognition emerges the equally strong commitment to fight homophobia, heterosexism, classed-based division of labour and resources, ethnocentrism and ablism. On integrative anti-racist pedagogy, see Dei, 1993, and Walcott, 1992.
and seeing each other through new eyes: 'OK, you’re Chinese, OK, you’re black, and I’m South Asian' which start to mean new things. This affects the way they learn to think about themselves, as well as other students. ... I guess it would be better to say they’re learning society and 'race' is a part of it. But the racial categories that we have here are fairly unique, or they’re certainly culturally and regionally specific and so when kids arrive and begin to learn the language and begin to learn the society that they’re fitting into they certainly find themselves faced with the racial categories that both include them and exclude them, and organize other people’s positions in an overall hierarchy.

R: ... from what I understand antiracism to be, for me antiracism says that, despite what has happened historically, there is a role for every one of us, despite our race and culture, to contribute to fighting racism, and in that way it’s a very empowering philosophy. You know, I think the very word 'anti' denotes action ... And I think with a lot of ESL students I’ve worked with, that there is no place in their day-to-day school lives for them to talk about their experiences and, one of the powerful things that I see about antiracism education is that it allows students to both talk about it and to find other people who have the same experience as themselves. And that is very empowering, just being able to talk about it and to find, that you’re not alone in these experiences.

An integrative analysis raises difficult issues for discussions of ‘inclusive curriculum’. In order to get beyond an anodyne, containing multicultural inclusion (as I explored in chapter III.2 in relation to Bhabha’s theory of ambivalence) a critical, complex analysis grounded in this country’s history of colonialism and racialized exclusion would need to address pressing questions: which basis of ‘cultural inclusion’ would seriously challenge discourses which marginalize, reify and commodify non-white non-European cultures? How might it be possible to validate immigrant contributions to Canadian society while simultaneously disrupting the ‘ethnicity paradigm’ which
would erase the experiences of First Nations Peoples and
Canadians of colour?

These questions return me to Bhabha's theory of the
rupturous potential of cultural difference, as distinct from
diversity is based in a notion of culture as definable and stable
in content/meaning, such that boundaries may be drawn, the
differences between bounded 'cultures' inventoried, domesticated
and contained within systems of equivalencies, each
'multiculture' an ambivalent mimicry of the unmarked dominant
'universal'. On the other hand, the notion of cultural difference
references the "disruptive temporality" of "the act of cultural
enunciation - the place of utterance - ... crossed by the
difference of writing or ecriture." Difference in this sense
refers to the disjuncture in "the structure of symbolic
representation": it refers to the gap between the signifier and
signified, between the symbol cited and the contextually-
determined meaning arising from the "discursive embeddedness and
address" of the actual citation. In other words, while 'cultures'
may be represented through frozen, selective snapshots which may
incite identification and accrue authority, cultural practices
which reference these representations never reproduce these
snapshots exactly: the act of cultural expression is always an
expression of context such that meaning depends on who is
expressing to whom when, where, how, why. One performance of
Chinese culture can never mean the same as another: while it may
reference a notion of a country called China or dynasty called Han, it also references the history of Chinese Canadians, discourses of Canadian ethnicity and contemporary relations.

R: Another example is that we did a conference at a Toronto university on Equity in the Classroom, Equity in the Curriculum, and one of the groups we really encouraged then to invite is Wasabi Daiko, because they're really gay-positive, feminist, really strong Asian women ... and that really kills two birds with one stone because it challenges all the stereotypes we have about who gay and lesbian people are, who Asian people are, who women are ... it's also very multicultural.

When I did a workshop for Asian history month with students and Wasabi Daiko it was so energizing and one female student of Asian heritage said "What can't we do this for gym class?" I mean it's so integrated, it's phys ed, but it's also antiracist.

Bhabha refers to this gap between signifier and signified as the "Third Space": "the place of psychic ambivalence and social contingency ... an interrogative space produced by the overlap between symbol and sign" (1992, p.59). "It is that Third Space ... which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew" (1995, p. 208). Bhabha's imagining of what might be 'postcolonial authority' is one which would privilege the epistemic standpoint of those liminally positioned by narratives of liberal community:

"The migrant metaphor ... suggests, by analogy, that the Western, metropolitan histories of progress and
civitas cannot be conceived without evoking the savage colonial antecedents of the ideals of civility and the mythology of 'civilization'. By implication, it also suggests that the language of rights and obligations, so central to the modern discourse of citizenship, must be questioned on the basis of the anomalous and discriminatory legal and cultural [and racialized!] status assigned to migrant and refugee populations who find themselves, inevitably, on the other side of the law" (1990, p. 218-9).

In this sense, immigrants, refugees and illegals, anomalously positioned on the cusp of a nation's Self/Other divide, experience this symbolic disjuncture in ways which reinscribe, relocate and read anew the internally alienated narratives of the society and culture they are joining.\(^\text{101}\)

Kramsch (1995) has interpreted Bhabha's concept of cultural difference to suggest a reframing of the "shifting, emerging third place of ... language learners" from one of deficiency and error to one of a unique critical perspective: "[l]earners of a foreign language, challenged to learn a linguistic code they have not helped to shape, in social contexts they have not helped to define, are indeed poaching on the territory of others - a kind of oppositional practice, that both positions them and places them in opposition to the current practices of their discourse community that speaks that language". She recommends that ESL students be addressed "not as deficient monoglossic enunciators, but as potentially heteroglossic narrators" (p. 90).

\(^{101}\) This entire section is based on Bhabha 1992 and 1995.
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B: I mean what’s good is that by doing antiracism in a formal way students have been empowered. By ‘a formal way’ I mean they’re knowing what the Board policy is, having it up in every classroom and going through what it means, vis-a-vis gender equity, racism, homophobia - then we have a starting place and students can say ‘OK this occurred’ and we can deal with that. As a result of educating the student body in the last, say, 5 years, using the model of trained facilitators - students - so we train a core group of students, and then they go into classrooms and then they, in pairs, do, you know, scenarios and do the work with students and that’s your most powerful training. ... So as a result of that you’ve got students who can make really informed comments, like when we’re teaching critical thinking. We recently had an incident in which the students identified racist representation in a school publication that the administration had missed: I mean maybe the administrators weren’t as well trained or didn’t have the same consciousness levels as the students. It wasn’t overt name-calling or anything, but pictorial representation of mainstream stereotypes that the students certainly wouldn’t choose to represent themselves. ... And the administration had to recognize that this was a very legitimate issue and the publication was reprinted.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

T: I remember a school a few years ago that was having a fashion show and wanted to become more multicultural. They were going to have people in their traditional costumes. And this one young woman, a black woman, said: “Well, if we’re going to do that, I want to see people dressed up in business suits and briefcases walking around because that’s the traditional costume of Canadians’.

In terms of classroom practices, this perspective underlines the importance of materials which open critical discussions of how ESL students understand themselves and their cultures to be represented and viewed within popular discourses in Canada. This might, for example, involve asking students to read a text or view a film with an attention to the characterization of specific cultural groups, and to respond through dramatization, discussion or journal questions (for specific examples from my own teaching, see chapter IV). Discussion could be directed through questions
which ask: whom is this text talking about? What does this text suggest about the people it talks about? Do you believe all members of this group are like this? Do you believe some are like this? What are some reasons some people might appear this way? Morgan (1993), for example, invites his students to respond from personal experience to a newspaper article which identifies and debunks popular myths about immigrants: his students hypothesize how and why these myths have come about and develop powerful arguments to challenge them.

Beyond engaging students in critique of reified, absolutist, backward-gazing exclusionist representation, however, Bhabha’s elaboration of the ever-incompleteness of narration suggests the importance of engaging culture’s other aspect, that which transgresses, subverts and exceeds. It implies materials that disrupt the expectations of commodified multiculturalism and expand and complicate the range of identificatory sites of cultural difference such that ethnicity is seen to be ‘done’ (Simon, 1987) in many ways, not just one.

Consider, for example, how ethnic essentialism and monolithic notions of 'minority' or 'multi' culture are disrupted by the Desh Pardesh festival of queer South Asian activist art, theatre work by Native Earth Performing Arts, Andrew Moody’s play "Riot" or Guillermo Verdecchia’s "Fronteras Americanas", Magnus Isacsson’s documentary "Power" on the Quebec Cree, Srinivas Krishna’s film "Masala" and Clement Virgo’s "Rude", musicians such as Li Pui Ming, and the work of various artists part of each
year's Asian History Month, to name a few examples. The provocative pedagogical potential of such cultural work lies in their enunciative embeddedness, in chance resonances kindled in students for, even as dominant and institutionalized narratives tend to racialize, fix and narrowly circumscribe ethnicity, ESL students' experiences of hybridity contest this.

Developing curriculum, pedagogy, learning activities and events for all students and teachers of the school around the topic of culture - culture as a dynamic expression of ongoing resistant re/creativity - opens up positive venues through which to disrupt negative or simply reductive stereotypes. It opens up spaces of relationality and communication which, while never outside relations of power, allow for potentially subversive slippages between those regulative sites of identification available to students and performative citation (Butler, 1993; and quoted in Simon, 1995) of these 'identities'. Such is the pedagogy imagined by Shirley Heath (1993) in her research into the potential use of drama for a pedagogy which invites learners to explore the multiple vocality of language, the differential authority of different discourse communities and positionalities, and possibilities for reframing power relations through play. One example Heath gives is the collective writing, performance and production by Puerto Rican youth of dramatic pieces based in portorriqueño popular literature, histories, mythology, and personal experiences of immigration. In the course of the project the participants innovate hybrid and resistant
cultural forms: the youth critically rethink hegemonic representations of monolithic groups into which they are interpellated, and craft counter-narrative cultural practices which disrupt this process. Central themes to the dramatic piece are:

"-Conflicts between the sexual norms of their peers and those of public heroes, on the one hand, and the rules and regulations their elders and the school lay down for them, on the other
-Conflicts between their own struggling self-image as not part of the city's gang life - so intensely identified by the police and public media along ethnic/linguistic lines, and some new self-image that will somehow bring power, possibility and promise
-Finally, the central conflict resting on their fears of getting jobs, of where they will go with the education and the English language that seem to promise so much and to give so little for the friends they have seen finish high school and then search and search - often fruitlessly - for a job that offers some dignity" (Heath, 1993, pp. 179-80)

In the final section I explore how an integrative 'race' analysis, informed by my discussions of the Canadian context in chapter II, might enrich the research of Bonnie Peirce on social identity and language learning among immigrant women. I treat Peirce's work separately from the rest in this section for two reasons. First of all, I wish to consider her work in greater depth than other pieces I have looked at, having access to the quantity of data presented her doctoral thesis in addition to her journal articles on this research. Secondly, her research being based specifically in feminist postmodernism, I am less interested here in how she is conceptualizing cultural domination
and subjectivity than the ambiguous status of 'race' in her analysis focused on gender, class and ethnicity.

**Peirce's Research**

Peirce's work (1993, 1994, 1995) is notable among the range of research which explores power relations in language learning, in that she sets out to rigourously challenge central concepts in second language acquisition theory: the individual learner, motivation and communicative competence. Drawing from feminist postmodern theory, she disputes theoretical premises which locate the factors for successful learning in decontextualized, fixed, monolithic depictions of the individual learner. Proposing a concept of language learners as non-unitary subjects negotiating complex, unstable, multiple and contradictory social identities in relation to inequitable social relations, she recasts language as a non-neutral medium through which social identities are constituted and power relations continuously re-organized. That is, she proposes a theoretical approach to the study of language acquisition which recognizes how social identities and language use are intimately connected as the site of competing desires and inequitable relations of power. She argues further that students' experiences learning a

---

Canagarajah also complicates these notions through the very complexity of his analysis and discussion in his critical ethnography (1993). Particularly of note is the subtlety, contingency and contextual ability of his discussion of ambivalence and multi-layered desire among learners in a context of imperialisms and neo-colonialisms. While there is little consideration of dynamics of gender and heterosexism in the one article I have read the ethnographic examination of the complex and integrated impact of colonialisms is unusual for this field.
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language can not be understood outside of the social context of power relations, since the act of utterance, the conditions and very possibility to speak and be heard, are structured by these relations.

Peirce’s qualitative study involved a diary study in which students reflected in journals and group interviews upon their experiences learning English outside the classroom. All of the participants are immigrant women - Eva and Katarina from Poland, Martina from Czechoslovakia, Felicia from Peru and Mai from Viet Nam - and, building on research into the social construction of this category, Peirce states her clear objective to explore the interconnected social relations of ethnicity, gender, class and language learning. Analyzing her students/subjects’ tellings of their experiences, she presents in her research a strong evidence of how the women’s desires and identifications (although she doesn’t use this term) need to be understood contextually as strategic responses to inequitable power relations, and how they struggled to create, define and resist spaces for language practice. A central argument in Peirce’s thesis is that the sense of authority needed to access opportunities for language practice which are central to learning (see specifically pp. 116, 131, 165, 186-9) are structured along lines of class, gender, ethnicity.

I will read Peirce’s work within Bhabha’s perspective of cultural difference, paying particular attention to the historically sedimented associations and discursive tropes in
which relations of racialized, cultural and language difference unevenly intersect within narratives of the Canadian nation. In this analysis I will advance that this analytic perspective would complicate and enrich Peirce’s analysis in two important ways.

First of all, rather than collapsing ‘race’ into the category of ethnicity, she might have been able to ask questions and analyze her data in a manner which paid attention to the complex ways immigrant women are racialized and ethnicized differently, with different consequences for their positionings in relations of legitimacy and belonging. Secondly, a stronger and more complex ‘race’ analysis might have helped Peirce to think differently about her own position as teacher/researcher and relation with her students/subjects.

Analyzing Mai’s accounts in journal writings and conversations, Peirce notes the impact of racist practices upon the self-image of Mai’s brother and nephews. A complex ‘race’ analysis suggests to me other questions and readings of Mai’s very patriarchal family relations. For example, I wonder to what extent the relations of domination within Mai’s family can be ascribed to individual psychology, unique cultural characteristics and personal histories, and to what extent they can be framed as the performative identifications taken up by marginally-positioned subjects within the hegemonic terms they somehow agreed to in joining this national community. Mai’s description of her sister-in-law provoke me to ask how racialized discourses of Asian immigrants as hard-working and
entrepreneurial are secured through the exclusionary organization of the economy which channels them into low-income work (which requires long hours to ensure a decent income, let alone save enough money to pay the $1475 price of Canadian citizenship). I would suggest that the conflictual relations within Mai’s family, such as her nephews’ resentment of their mother’s money-hungry workaholism, could to a certain extent be understood within the context of racist stereotypes of Asians and indignant white resentment of wealthy Hong Kong Chinese immigrants.

More intriguingly, however, my explorations of the discursive slippage between racialized and cultural difference in the Eurocentric ethnicity paradigm of multiculturalism suggest a reading of the European immigrant women as undergoing a process of integration different from Mai’s. That is, I see the Europeans passing through a process of becoming white - a process which illustrates how they ‘fit’ the ethnicity paradigm in ways Mai cannot. Peirce remarks upon the racism reflected in the fact that, despite her positive experience at her particular workplace, generally Mai feels less "accepted" by Canadians than Katarina (1993, p. 180), and senses she will feel like an immigrant in Canada all her life (p. 84) while Katarina no longer feels this way (1993, p. 86). Indeed, the ambivalence with which Mai’s racialized subjectivity positions her both ‘inside’ and ‘outside’

103 While Mai’s family is Vietnamese, not Chinese, this may not matter: Winant has argued that one aspect of anti-East Asian racism involves the homogenization of anyone of Oriental heritage into the category of Chineseness. (Winant, 1994, referenced in Ibrahim, unpublished, 1996b)
Canadianness is evidenced by her being the only woman to express discomfort with her hyphenated status (interpellated as a "Chinese Canadian citizen", 1993, p. 84). Peirce remarks upon the impact of racism on the intense desire of Mai’s family for assimilation, in contrast to Katarina’s pride in her cultural heritage (1993, p. 180). My theoretical framework from chapter II reframe this distinction, suggesting that to the extent that the Vietnamese family does not 'fit' Eurocentric settler/immigrant images of multicultural ethnicity, they find no position of positive cultural difference but are interpellated into abject colonialist stereotypes of disavowal, erasure and exclusion. I present this reading, not as an absolute deterministic pronouncement, but as a contemplation of the discursive dynamics and tropes possibly at play in Mai’s family’s experiences of racialization.

My theory of the differential and narrowly proscribed acceptance of difference within the multicultural ethnicity paradigm furthermore offers intriguing readings of the very different sense of legitimacy or authenticity as Canadians expressed by Eva and Katarina (different from Mai’s). As mentioned above, Katarina feels quite "accepted" by "Canadians" and is raising her children within the Polish language, culture and community (1993, p. 180).

104 Please refer back to my discussion of Stymeist and the case of Canada, chapter II.
Eva's positionality in her relation with her coworkers, is certainly organized by subordinating discourses of ethnic and language difference: she complains that they think she's "stupid" because she is an immigrant (doing unskilled immigrant work) and can't speak English (1993, p. 102). However, the fact that the cultures and languages with which she is familiar are European means that she is able to cite them as authoritative frames of cultural reference. It was because her coworkers had an interest in "life ... in Europe" that they "started to ask [Eva] some questions" and she was able to gain access to the conversation and their attention as a legitimate speaker. (1995, p. 111). It was because her manager had married an Italian that she sought Eva's tutelage; and it was because European languages were both familiar to and relatively highly esteemed that her fluency in several of them made a positive impression on her coworkers (she understands "Czech", Russian, German and Italian) (p. 112). In reading these extracts I could not help asking myself whether Eva might have been able to turn her relational identity of cultural difference to such social advantage if she were an East Indian woman familiar with life in South Asia and fluent in Tamil, Hindi, Urdu and Punjabi.

My point is that colonialist and elitist discourses of European culture as sophisticated and most civilized are working in these interactions to whiten Eva, to wash the racialized stains of classed and gendered immigrant woman status from her, and position her within powerful discourses of European
multicultural ethnicity. I would argue that it is to this cosmopolitan, sophisticated and upwardly mobile position of cultural difference within celebrated / fetishized narratives of the Canadian mosaic - narratives cherished by Canadians across the country as proof that we are NOT like Americans - that Eva is referring when she asserts that she "not only wants to be accepted, but wants her 'difference' to be respected" (p. 117).

Thus, my theories of the exclusions and abjections of colonialist narrations of Canadianness allow a complex reading of the differential experiences of belonging of the different women. They provoke revealing questions in regards to which discourses may be contributing to Eva's confidence in claiming an identity of "the model 'multicultural' citizen" (p. 117), and upon which abject, racialized 'absent presences' this sense of cultural legitimacy depends.

Two important conclusions might emerge from this reading of Peirce's data. First of, it would illustrate the impact of racist discourses on the experiences of the European immigrants, and not only Mai's experiences. The significance of this conclusion is that it challenges the very mechanisms of these discourses of racism, which work to hyper-mark racialized others and unmark whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993). Secondly, it would allow Peirce to extrapolate this evidence of racialized distinctions in her data to add the separate category of 'race' to the list of the discursive structures - class, gender, ethnicity - which, according to her thesis, organize ESL learners' experiences of
authoritative vocality, relational identifications and language learning.

A more theoretically grounded 'race' analysis might also add more complexity to Peirce's reflections as a teacher and researcher. It might encourage an attention to the contradictory and complex discursive configurations at play in this teacher-student and researcher-researched relation. I would argue that there are intricate layers of power/knowledge (Foucault) in this relation which organize authority, legitimacy and desire along axes of racialized, ethnicized, language and class difference. I would further propose that these layers have important implications for the relational identifications of herself and her students / subjects, as well as for her research and analysis.

In an effort to downplay the aspects of her identity which gave her access to power and privilege unavailable her students, Peirce admits she "wanted the participants to relate to [her] as a 'woman' ... a mother, wife and housekeeper" (1994, p. 24) and therefore tried to feminize the interview setting: the "intimate" "private sphere of [her] home, where [Peirce's] domestic position ... as homemaker [was] more foregrounded than [her] professional position as teacher/researcher" (1994, p. 25). However, in her desire and investment in identifying solely in terms of common gender (and linguistic difference), Peirce does not explore how her de-emphasized class, ethnic and racial positionalities might continue to function as resources of authority, legitimacy and
security, resources beneficial to her as a researcher and kindly friend/teacher. She constructs the "architecture" of meetings with the goal of reducing the linguistic authority she felt ascribed to her "from [her] command of the target language": at the same time, it would be insightful to ask how her and her students' performative identifications and subjectivities may be responding to discourses of ethnic, class and racial difference.

I turn here to the work of certain 'race' theorists in order to suggest how dominant discourses of social difference, including those of racism, incite mutually indexing identifications. Morrison (1992), for example, has theorized how, in U.S. American literature, a positive white self-identity is defined in contrast to the projected negative aspects of non-white foil identities in a discourse of white racist binary oppositional logic. Stuart Hall (1989, p. 16) has eloquently elaborated this notion in the British context: "The English are racist not because they hate Blacks but because they don't know who they are without the Blacks. They have to know who they are not in order to know who they are...And there is no identity without the dialogic relationship to the Other."\(^{105}\)

Troublesome theories like these would invite Peirce to ask how her own relational identity as powerful, highly educated, generous helper may somehow depend upon the same discourses that

\(^{105}\) I continue this discussion in terms of its implications for white Anglophone ESL teachers of variously racialized immigrant students (in specific reference to my own teaching experience) in the next chapter.
contrastively position and incite her students to take up performatively identifications of lesser legitimacy and authority/stature. Such questioning might further lead her to examine her investment in a relational identity of femininity voided of 'race', class or ethnicity.

Several 'moments' stand out as I read Peirce's thesis as ones at which this line of questioning would be particularly fruitful. On certain occasions the words of the women she records refer directly to these powerful differences in positioning between themselves and her. These utterances present valuable opportunities to consider these words as possible acts of refused or resisted disempowering identifications. An attention to the play of racializing, classed or ethnicizing discourses in the researcher-researched relation might encourage an interrogation of the sense Peirce has of a certain "ambivalen[ce]" and "distance" in this relationship. For example, after quoting Katarina's direct comparison of her own and Peirce's immigrant experiences, rather than enumerating the many forms of service Katarina had willingly accepted from Peirce (1993, p. 146), it might enrich the research to pry open the play of desire and resistance this exchange suggests. How is Katarina struggling to position herself in relation to Peirce in this utterance? How does this struggle impact upon the data with which she provides Peirce, what she shares and does not share in her journals? What does this struggle reveal of the racialized, ethnicized and classed tensions in the frame within which Peirce relates to and
interprets her research subjects? What do the investigator and participants desire of their relation and what implications do these desires have for their responses to and interpretations of each other? This would reveal for critical scrutiny a rich, complex and illuminating layer of identification, performativity and interpretation located in the power-laden researcher-researched relation. \(^\text{106}\)

Opening up the power dynamics in this relation furthermore provoke valuable discussions of the material inequities that structure inquiry, ethical quandaries with which Peirce engages in her reflections. She struggles to name and address feelings of guilt "as though I was undermining a friendship - betraying a confidence. Occasionally I felt that my comments on the women's writings of their sometimes distressing stories were inadequate and trivial" (1994, p. 24). One approach to turning this guilt to more productive purposes is to candidly explore the inequities which make research possible and are reproduced in its rewards. Patai (1991) writes, in regards to feelings of guilt in the process of investigation, "[h]owever powerfully we may experience these problems on an individual basis in concrete research situations, we must not lose sight of the fact that these are

\(^\text{106}\) I offer here the words of Berger-Gluck and Patai (1991): "To define feminist scholarship as work done by, about, and for women had seemed simple. Experience, however, demonstrated that these three little words positioned the scholar within a complex web of relationships, loyalties and demands". This anthology is a valuable example of current work in qualitative and feminist research which explore in much greater depth the questions I suggest here.
not, in fact, personal problems of overly sensitive individuals. They are, rather, genuine ethical dilemmas that the broader society, built on inequalities, strategically induces us to disregard". Numerous theorists have established and built a discussion in academic circles of how privileged investigators, entering relationships of solidarity with less privileged subjects, benefit - as they get published, finish their PhD's and gain faculty appointments - far more substantially than their participants (see Moraga, 1982; Kaplan, 1994; Nader, 1989; Stephens, 1982-90; McCarthy, Barlow, Asad, 1986; Abu-Lughod, 1991; Mohanty, 1991; and Patai, 1991). Engaging in such discussions as these in relation to one's own inquiry helps to demystify discourses of 'common sisterhood' and focus on the ethical responsibilities involved in research in an unethical, inequitable world. In this case it might allow Peirce to contextualize and name some of what was happening in this in-between layer of meaning in the research process: "I found myself trying to compensate for what Britzman (1990) calls 'guilty readings' by helping the women to find employment, prepare resumes, and deal with immigration officials" (1994, p. 24). Such a contextualization would not so much condemn Peirce's caring efforts as allow a more complex reflexivity; it would not so much invalidate Peirce's findings as situate and delimit their validity.

A situated approach to validity would begin with the recognition that knowledge is contingent and embodied: therefore
Peirce's analytical focus on ethnicity, gender and class and her investment in an identity of common womanhood could not but shape her research and analysis - what she saw and heard, and what she did not. While Peirce cites the unfaltering conversation at diary study meetings as evidence that the women were not inhibited or silenced by power differences in her relationship with them, recalling Foucault's debunking of the myth of 'repressive power' might suggest otherwise. Foucault argued (1980, 1982, 1983) that rather than imagining power as a repressive force which inhibits individuals' 'true' identities from surfacing, it is more insightful to consider the productive capacity of discursive power which incites individuals to take up regulative discursive subject positions. In relation to Peirce's research Ibrahim makes the point that the 'politics of embodiment' result not in less data but data of selective foci (1996b, p. 15). In other words, Peirce's physical and subjective whiteness, as well as her 'interested ignorance' (Taylor, 1995) in a reflexive critical 'race' analysis, may have contributed to a focus in the women's journals and discussions on issues of the margins common to all (including Peirce): that of immigrant status and gender.

In another moment I wish to consider, Mai relates to Peirce her comments to her nephews that with their Oriental appearance they will "never be perfect Canadians". Peirce presents this expression of 'internalised racism'\(^\text{107}\), as well as other

\(^{107}\text{Was it internalized racism? To what extent was it a sober appraisal of dominant discourses of normativity and national identity as defined through racist immigration policy}\)
utterances of heterosexism and classism by the research participants, as examples of difficult points at which she felt torn between a desire to "maintain solidarity" with the women and to challenge their "'commonsense' understandings" (1993, p. 223) of 'race', class and gender difference. The delicate tensions in an integrative antiracist pedagogical agenda are indeed a dilemma for critical pedagogues and researchers. At the same time, I would suggest that a critical reflexivity is also important for both teachers and researchers. That is, a critical 'race' analysis might also encourage Peirce to be suspicious of a desire for innocence, and identifications with issues of racism and classism solely as a topic of instruction. It might invite Peirce to ask, as I do of myself: what moves am I making when I assume racism is an ideology by which students are influenced but never the teacher / researcher\textsuperscript{108}, when I rush to inform and correct students without asking what this response secures?

I am suggesting that a stronger 'race' analysis might allow Peirce to integrate 'race', not only as a category in her data analysis, but into her reflexivity and vigilance in the very process by which she constructs knowledge. That is, in asking difficult questions about: how her relation with the research subjects is racialized; how her and her subjects' identifications and hegemonic representational practices? How much of a naive, victim of false consciousness should one assume Mai is?

\textsuperscript{108} The examples given in Peirce's thesis of expressions of racist, sexist or classist attitudes are only those of other people: Mai's brother and nephews (122-3), Mai (223), and Katarina (224).
and power/knowledge (perception) are organized by discourses of 'race'; and how these might impact upon the knowledge being produced in the process; Peirce would be able to resist or at least highlight the perpetuation of these racialized discursive effects in her research.

In conclusion, my reading suggests two possibilities enabled by a strong 'race' analysis. The first is a sensitive exploration of the implications of racialized (as well as ethnicized and classed) power relation in the research relationship for the design and analysis of the data. The second possibility is an explicit attention to resisting the discursive dynamics of this racialized (and ethnicized and classed) power relation in interactions and knowledge production.

Drawing from feminist postmodern theory, Peirce has made a significant contribution to SLA research in theorizing students' social identities as multiply invested, contradictory and relational. My reading of her work, informed by my theoretical frame of the last chapter, suggests the value of bringing an integrated 'race' analysis to an examination of how racialized discourses of Canadian multicultural ethnicity accept immigrant language learners differently. It also points to the importance of framing not only students' but also teachers' identities as a non-innocent site of struggle. It would seem that while writers working within multiculturalist and cultural domination paradigms have engaged in considerable investigation and discussion of the social identity and profiles of ESL students - their processes
of language acquisition, individual psychological factors in learning, factors deriving from cultural as well as gender difference - as of yet very little exploration has focused on the teacher's identifications, desire and other influences. Yet, as is evident from my own reflections on teaching discussed in the next chapter, these issues have serious implications for pedagogy, relational dynamics (especially but not exclusively student-teacher relations) and normative subtexts of classroom practices.
CHAPTER IV: REFLECTIONS FROM MY TEACHING EXPERIENCES
AND A PROVISIONAL CONCLUSION

K: A lot of people feel that once you’ve dealt with multiculturalism, race is a non-issue, there’s no problem. ... well, in the context of ESL, you’re dealing with immigrant students, so right away there is a notion of ‘them’ and ‘us’. Then, are they refugees? And what sensitivities would one need to have around issues of being a refugee? And where are they from? Are they from Bosnia or form Ruanda? And how do you view them? How do you begin to see human behaviour layered by ‘race’? And how, then, do you respond to students who are refugees, from nations that are European, African or Asian? ... I mean, those are intangibles, but they very clearly interact and interfere with and influence how you’re going to teach those students and what sort of expectations you’re going to have for them, in terms of their academic achievement, and what they can be in this society.

At the end of the last chapter I proposed that an integrative race analysis would strengthen SLA research by encouraging and contextualizing a rigourous reflexivity on the part of powerfully positioned researchers. In exploring the what an integrative antiracist pedagogy of ESL might involve, I’d like to address how TESL practitioners and theorists might begin to critically address the contradictory and complex discursive configurations at play in the relational identifications of white teachers of variously racialized ESL students.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁹ I am conscious of the slippage running through my thesis between various definitions of whiteness: as Anglo-Celtic, Caucasian, Anglophone of European descent and at times as ESL immigrant students from Europe or Russia. This slippage reflects the degree to which whiteness is a relationally constructed category: more of (Frankenberg) (a contextually specific relation of legitimacy) than an absolute, static essence. I am also aware of a tendency in my writing to frame discussions of ESL pedagogy
I want to pause here to address the slippage running through my thesis between various definitions of whiteness: as Anglo-Celtic, Caucasian, Anglophone of European descent and at times as ESL immigrant students of European descent from the Eastern Bloc or the European-identified upper classes of other countries.

This slippage reflects the degree to which whiteness is a relationally constructed category rather than an absolute, static essence. I draw here from Ruth Frankenberg's conceptualization of whiteness as a set of linked material and discursive dimensions: a location of structural advantage; a standpoint and normative gaze; and "a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed (1993). I am also aware of a tendency in my writing to frame discussions of ESL pedagogy in terms of a white teacher teaching students of colour. I believe this is to a considerable extent due to the oppositionary rhetorical frame of the point I am trying to argue. That is, in my wanting to challenge the unproblematic imagining of teachers as racially unmarked and students as culturally different - so prevalent in the TESL literature I have read - it is possible that I am staking out an in terms of a white teacher teaching students of colour. I believe this is to a considerable extent due to the oppositionary rhetorical frame of the point I am trying to argue. That is, in my wanting to challenge the unproblematic imagining of teachers as racially unmarked and students as culturally different - so prevalent in the TESL literature I have read - it is possible that I am staking out an equally specific pedagogical relation for theoretical examination and discussion. I am also conscious of an interest in exploring the implications of a suggestion I made earlier in this thesis, that is, that ESL students might fruitfully be theorized as differently racialized - through discourses of language, national, cultural
equally specific pedagogical relation for theoretical examination and discussion. While concerned about the new erasures and essentialisms I am setting up, I also believe this narrow frame allows me to explore two important lines of questioning. First of all, it allows me to consider the implications of a suggestion I made earlier in this thesis\textsuperscript{110}, that is, rather than framing them as ethnicized but raceless, ESL students might fruitfully be theorized as differently othered: through discourses of language, national, cultural, racial, classed, gendered and ablist difference. Being that I have argued that racialized discourses have played a central role in the history of Canadian immigration, national formation and identity, as well as European linguistic and cultural imperialism, unpacking the way racialized discourses interlock with other relations of difference to frame ESL students opens valuable discussions for teachers. Secondly, this approach enables a sustained discussion of how the various discourses of whiteness intersecting with those of what I call 'teacherliness' incite a dangerous pedagogical relationship for those who embrace transformative educational and social goals.

I would posit that a careful examination needs to be made of the sources of authority drawn upon by white teachers. In trying to initiate this discussion, I wish to gesture to specific work that has been done in race theory which would problematize this "race to innocence" (Razack and Fellows, forthcoming) in the relational identifications of white teachers. Christine Sleeter,\textsuperscript{110} See chapter III.1, footnote #4.
for example, has argued convincingly that "[w]hite people generally frame racial issues in ways that are congruent with our own positions, experiences and vested interests" (unpublished draft, 1994). The white teachers in her research tended to perceive students of colour according to their own experiences of Euro-American ethnic family history, and in ways which reinforce their sense of normality, fairness, innocence, and authoritative position as helpers of deficient Others (unpublished, 1994). Cheryl Harris (1993) has documented how whiteness has been constructed and legitimized through the very legal codes of the U.S. to signify exclusive rights of entitlement and naturalized privilege. Goldberg has theorized how racism insinuated itself into the philosophy and morality of modernity, so that whiteness came to represent rationality and morality (1994, chapter 2), tropes that were reinforced by colonialism. Robert Young (1992) has also argued that the impact of colonialist discourses of European cultural authority is reflected in the very method of Western authority and knowledge construction as the appropriation of a defined Other. I would argue that this anatomy of authority has functioned to inscribe white teacherly desire with sedimentary traces of the Western epistemolologico-anthropological "will to know" (Walkerdine, 1990). In it's gendered form this authoritative colonial whiteness took the image of "Lady Bountiful", the moral guardian of the Empire (Honour Ford-Smith, 1994), and "an invincible global civilizing agent" (Ware, 1992, p. 128).
I find particularly provocative Judith Robertson's research (1994) into how discourses of white womanhood, cultural authority and racialized purity converge to constitute "an invitation [to white woman beginning teachers] to produce themselves as subjects entering teaching through a distinctive kind of embodiment ... as pale, pure, passive, charitable, consecrated, and good ... rescuers, saviours" (pp. 191, 205). One of the stakes she identifies in this dynamic is the longing for freedom and "escape from the sacrifice paradigm of womanhood as motherhood" by means of racialized metaphors of others' unfreedom; another is the desire to imagine and consolidate a transcendent and secure subject position and "proper" embodiment of authority, of the desire to wield power/knowledge innocently (p. 201). In terms of the latter, Robertson points to "an intense and grandiose ... structure of feeling ... [which] resonates with the making of the body through teaching ... the imperial body, the white body, the womanly body, the body that aspires to be somehow simultaneously human and divine, the perfectly safe body, the body whole and complete, the body built through expulsion of an other" (pp. 6-7). Robertson's insights underline for me that critical reflexivity for white anglophone teachers of variously racialized students must begin with questions as to how the historical, material and discursive construction of the ESL teacher-student relation through neo/colonialism resonates with raced and gendered structures of feeling (Williams in Robertson) in teaching.
Following from the assumption that "[a]ny pedagogical position, in actually trying to construct its authority, is always the internally alienated" (Bhabha, 1992, p. 66), an integrative antiracist orientation encourages me as a teacher to interrogate the process of abjection through which an authoritative, benevolent white teacherly subjectivity is constituted and the relative subject positions upon which it depends.

In my own classroom experience I have sensed a racialized and classed edge to my pedagogical identifications. I have suspected it had to do in part with the blurring between the teaching of language and the 'settlement' aspect of teaching ESL. It has at times seemed to me that my teacherly authority, founded upon 'expertise', is based as much in my pedagogical training and native fluency in English as it is in my whiteness, my middle class-ness, my level of education, my Anglo and European heritage, my ability, my classroom sexuality. I have sensed how the discursive tropes of whiteness, referred to above, work to over-determine images of 'teacherliness', to secure the white teacherly identity as authoritative, respected, in control, yet also benevolent and helping. I enumerate these characteristics, not as absolute laws, but as authoritative imagery and latent structures of desire potentially at play in any racialized relationship, but particularly that between a white ESL teacher and racialized immigrant students.
The work of various authors cited above suggests that the position of white teachers of racialized ESL students can never be one of uninterrogable innocence, and that white ESL teachers' adoption of the role of advocate for minority students\textsuperscript{111} may do little to disrupt the discourses of normalization and white ethnocentrism buttressing relations of racist subjugation. As I have written in my own journal: "Questions of race mean that the identity I inhabit as white Anglo-Canadian teacher of ESL immigrant students can only ever be one of continual crisis"\textsuperscript{112}.

Thinking about pedagogy might begin, then, with an insatiable critical concern for the workings of discourses of social inequality, normativity and legitimacy, starting with one's own subject position as teacher. This situated pedagogy would include an awareness of how discourses of whiteness combine with discourses of 'teacherliness' to frame issues of difference as concerning students rather than teachers, as content to be taught rather than profoundly disruptive questions. Before focusing on the sexism (see for example Toohey & Scholefield, 1994), homophobia, classism or racism of ESL students, teachers and researchers might examine and challenge the way these discourses and systems of oppression structure the curriculum.

\textsuperscript{111} This is one of the prescriptions made by Cummins (1986, pp. 24-30) in order for teachers to empower minority students dominated by the devaluation of their culture.

\textsuperscript{112} Please see chapter IV in which I explore this question in particular relation to discourses of teacherly identity as authoritative, corrective, helpful and innocent.
board and school policy, their relationships with students, relations among staff and within the student body.

**Specific Classroom Examples**

Although I have tried throughout the thesis to explore ideas in terms of practice to a certain degree, I want to turn now to two examples from the intermediate English as a second language course I teach to high school students with the Toronto Board of Education. I hope these examples will offer the opportunity to push the edges and probe the gaps of the conceptual frameworks and recommendations I have developed thus far.

From my analysis of the discursive geographies through which ESL students, particularly of those colour, must chart their path within their new language and society, it became clear that it matters very much how culture is understood by teachers. Being that official multiculturalism tends to offer very reductive, absolutist notions, radical alternatives are needed: concepts of culture which highlight hybrid practices and ambivalent and contradictory identifications; concepts which deliberately disrupt exclusionist narratives that would fix bodies and identities to totalizing categories.

Addressing the question of teaching practices returns me to my discussion of Courchene: being that attempts at definition and description end up essentializing and delimiting notions of cultural identity and difference, I prefer engagement directly with innovative and transgressive cultural work for its
contextualized expressive and enunciatory potential. I have had the most success using materials such as those examples I enumerated in chapter III.3, which encourage discussion around how cultural practices cross-fertilize and change within different social relations and interests. Besides presenting positive examples of cultural practices and identifications which disrupt over-determined categories and static formulations of identity, these materials encourage understandings of culture as profoundly expressive of historically specific relations of inequality and discursive marginalization, stigmatization and/or erasure.

This has been my experience, for example, using the film "Double Happiness". Made by a young Chinese Canadian director, the loosely autobiographical plot centres on a young actress dealing with issues of identity and trying to find a compromise with the strict, traditional values of her immigrant parents. Class discussion after viewing deconstructed the backward-gazing notions of authenticity upon which the director was suggesting the parents based their concepts of Chinese culture and ethnic identity. Several students responded by pointing out the emotional and psychic value of these notions: "It's like I still look at all these old photos I brought from my country to Canada. That's not my life now. But I need to remember" said one student. My question as to whether these were racist stereotypes sparked a long debate which brought us back to complicate implicit definitions of racism and ended with distinctions being made as
to who was using the stereotypical representations for what purpose. "If I want to do a traditional Chinese Full Moon Festival is this racism? I don’t say. Every Chinese student must do this. But I want to" said one student. Another responded that she didn’t want other people to assume "because I am from Sri Lanka so I should do this and this".

One student also contested my framing of the central conflict of the plot, saying that to him this appeared to be a generational conflict rather than a cultural one. I had phrased journal questions around assumptions that the central conflict in the plot was one of a young first-generation woman caught between incompatible cultures: the traditional, static one of her parents and the modern, multicultural Canadian (for all purposes, white?) one of her friends and her own desires. In my attempt to pedagogically address the question of cultural difference, my very naming of this issue articulated difference in the conceptual language of populist tropes of ethnic absolutism and the schizophrenic minority. It was in the discussion of cultural stereotyping and racism that this binary was shaken: students suggested other images of Chinese culture, such as Hong Kong movies and MuchMusic television host Sook-Yin Lee, that also circulate in popular culture.

This example illustrates some of the transformative resignifications that can be catalyzed by engaging directly with exploratory and hybrid cultural work. Along this vein, I try to select readings from collections of writings by immigrants, such
as *New Canadian Voices* (Porter), which discuss issues of identities, hope, refusals and ambivalence in identification, relations of non/belonging, cultural difference and cultural change, all from a complex, embodied perspective. The above anecdote also demonstrates the perils of talking about culture and cultural identity in the absence of a critical theoretical framework of how discourses of racialized and culturalized difference intersect, especially in the context of Canadian multiculturalism. It corroborates my thesis that ESL teachers need to work, not only with dynamic notions of culture, but also with an explicit antiracist orientation.

In exploring what an integrated antiracist pedagogy might look like in the ESL classroom, I take as my initial premises certain assumptions. First, I assume that interactions between people are made meaningful or comprehensible by discourses circulating in the context of the interaction; that subjects are produced and recognized through performativity, the 'citation' or 'reinvocation' of the relative subject positions referenced by these discourses (Butler in Simon 1995, p. 104). Secondly, I consider the pedagogy and bodily presence of a teacher to be performative of discourses which both support and are sanctioned by the central and authoritative position of the teacher in the classroom. This plays a role in the identifications of students in that a teacher’s "capacity to act in ways that act upon the actions of others is not so much a matter of individual charisma, or lack of it, as it is the ability to ‘draw upon modes of
domination structured into social systems'" (Britzman, 1991, p. 18). I have already enumerated some of the discourses of whiteness and teacherliness available to me in my interactions with ESL students (see my discussion of Pierce's research in chapter III.3): below I consider what these imply for an integrative antiracist pedagogy. Finally, I assume that teachers embody and express in their pedagogy relations of identity and alterity113.

It is in this situation, then, that my pedagogy becomes a site of unending crisis: how do I attempt to disrupt through my pedagogy the very racist, imperialist and neo-colonialist discourses which create the grounds of possibility of teaching English to immigrants and refugees in Canada? These discourses, which interpellate my students into positions of racialized alterity and qualified Canadianness, produce my physical presence in the classroom as a visual and textual expression of normalcy and hegemonic selfhood. This authority - connected to my dominant positionality - is further reinforced by my position as teacher, as "subject presumed to know" (Felman, 1987, p. 85). Let me explain: Felman has interpreted Freud and Lacan to have suggested

113 I struggle in this chapter with the binary of student/teacher. Rather than suggest that autonomous teachers assert pre-existing desires through the citation of powerful narratives, I am trying to think about discourses of white and teacherly authority as making commonsense notions of an authoritative, unquestionably benign teacher/student relation available and "provok[ing], reassembl[ing] and produc[ing] desires" in what Todd has called "an amniotic-like setting ... creating a 'third space' where it is not so easy to tell whose desires are whose any longer" (unpublished paper to appear as Chapter 12 in Todd (ed.) 1996, p. 10, 17).
that a central dynamic of learning is transference, the emotional investment in the knowledge another is supposed to possess. I would argue that these stakes are particularly high for learners of ESL which is not merely inert, academic content, but one of the "codes of power" (Delpit, 1988) of this society. Firstly, insofar as the construct of linguistic difference intersects with discourses of racialized difference (as I have sketched above in sections II.1, II.2 and III.1) my students' imperfect English racializes them (in many contexts), my fluency further whitens me and the English lessons I teach them represent a potentially de-racializing factor. Secondly, the implicit content of English as a second language is English as a second culture: my supposed fluency in the norms, values, assumptions and shared codes of mainstream Canadian society represents a valued resource of knowledge for students navigating the social and economic conditions of their daily lives. My point, which I have been arguing throughout this thesis, is that in the teaching and learning of ESL in the Canadian context, the very dynamics of desire\textsuperscript{114}, social mechanisms of racialization and relations of

\textsuperscript{114} Being that the scope of my research for this thesis precluded the scale of reading that might support a more precise definition of the term 'desire' in relation to various traditions and authors in the field of psychoanalysis, I am humbly following the path charted by Sharon Todd between the Freudian and Lacanian emphasis on the subject's entry into the symbolic order and Irigaray's focus on the production of desire through embodied, interpersonal interactions. Todd defines desire as: "an unconscious want or longing produced and borne out of intersubjective contact (both said and unsaid); and insofar as intersubjective interaction always takes place within specific settings and at historical junctures, desire is not a neutral term, but a dynamic saturated in the capitalist, patriarchal,
authority and legitimacy - which reference histories of conquest and exclusion - are working to organize my own and my students' identities to support colonialist discourses before I even pick up a chalk brush.

Of course, the gap between signifier and signified - produced both by the changing historical context of situated relations within which signifiers are read and by the unpredictability of desire (Todd, forthcoming, pp. 7-8) - ensures that the teacher is never read exactly as the identity defined by hegemonic discourses. However, this gap, which is neither entirely determined nor entirely indeterminate, focuses attention in an integrative antiracist pedagogy of ESL on the need for teaching practices to subvert these discourses of domination.115

What are some of the ways this might be done? First and foremost, I am arguing for an approach to critical ESL pedagogy which challenges notions of the teacher's identity as monolithic, innocently progressive and external to negotiations of power relations and knowledge construction in the classroom. This would represent a radical departure from the TESL literature I have

neo-colonialist, and homophobic contexts from which it emerges" (unpublished paper to appear as Chapter 12 in Todd (ed.) 1996, p.3). At the same time, I realize that Bhabha's use of the term references Lacanian theory.

115 Many of the questions and issues I raise in this section I can only address to a limited degree, due to space considerations and the need for further reading on my part. For a much more thorough treatment of such issues of desire and identification in transformative pedagogy, see Todd (ed.) forthcoming; Britzman, 1995b; Simon, 1995; Felman, 1987.
read\textsuperscript{116}, as well as the teacher training I have received. The desire for innocence is there in almost everything ‘we’\textsuperscript{117} do within the identity of teacher. There are powerful discourses of teacherliness which condition expectations not just in terms of expert knowledge and innovative practices but also personal leadership qualities, moral impeccability and always having the final answer. While I do not dispute the value of these qualities, I would argue there is a particular way that they intersect with certain aspects of discursive whiteness, including what Rockhill has called "the desire to get it right" (personal communication, in class, 1995).

I believe these teacherly desires - for purity and innocence, for a secure place on the side of the good guys, for "properly" embodying both moral and epistemological authority - get at the heart of what is at stake in the seemingly unanimous desire to preserve the integrity and sanctity of the subject position of teacher from the onslaughts of critical deconstruction. What is maintained by the knowledge/ignorance of Cummins’ original 1986 ‘framework for empowerment of minority students’ - which set up the polarity of empowering and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} Exceptions to this are the work of Arleen Schenke (1991, 1996) and Kathleen Rockhill.
\item \textsuperscript{117} While not presuming to speak for teachers, I would like to address the discursive identities which incite teachers to identification.
\end{itemize}
disempowering teachers\textsuperscript{118} - is the notion of a stable/secure, coherent, and internally consistent teacher subjectivity: that is, an untroubled unified sense of self.

The implications of this notion of harmonious, innocent teacher subjectivity are that in practising critical pedagogy teachers either work within categories within which they can "run for the margin" (Sherene Razack in class, 1994) or else their subject positions are somehow rendered benign. This impractical identity politics underlines my argument in the last chapter as to the importance of a theory of domination that goes beyond concepts of structural exclusion and individual attitudes of devaluation (Chapter III.1). In the absence of discussion of how "power effects" circulate among subjects as performative citationality and "actions upon actions" (Foucault, 1990), structuralist notions of domination imply that reorienting one's pedagogical goals will suffice to get onto the right track, and that one's subjectivity will transfer neatly and intact into this new antiracist teacherly identity.

In my experience, this project is not at all tidy. Practising a pedagogy aimed at disturbing the very discourses which interpellate me into dominant, authoritative, unmarked and innocent identities profoundly disturbs my inhabiting these

\textsuperscript{118} 1986, p. 24. Cummins has since complicated this model in 1989 with the additional dimension of teachers' knowledgeability as well as orientation. See: 1989, p. 135. The model was further developed in 1996 to differentiate between "Compliant/Uncritical", "Liberal but Uncritical" and "Empowered/Critical" (1989, p. 154). I would still complicate this third position.
positions. It is for this reason I am trying to imagine ESL pedagogical practices based in an understanding of identifications not as the trappings, 'baggage' or clothing of unitary selves. Rather I want to think about identifications as the reflexive deployment of our respective "dense particularities" and intertwined histories (Mohanty in Simon, 1995) in ways that can still critique the discourses of subordination to which these have been recruited. Simon has explored, in a masterful work of reflection, what it might mean to bring this disruptive understanding of identification to teaching from a position of alterity. My aim here is slightly different: I want to think about what it might mean to practise transformative pedagogy from subject positions of dominance. As I struggle with the implications of engaging in an integrative antiracist pedagogy of ESL as a Caucasian, middle class native-born native speaker of English, I turn to understandings of identifications as profoundly contradictory: as ambivalent, as partial, as a refusal, as a sharing of goals or sentiments (identification with), as a shared subject position (identification as), or as an attempt to resignify the signifier of a cited identity119.

Disrupting the formidable discursive alliance of teacherliness and whiteness might begin by identifying with a

---

119 My thinking around these issues has been influenced in ways too complex to reference exactly by the course "Pedagogy and Social Difference" taught by Deborah Britzman at York University in 1995.
critique of these narratives which render the concept of my coherent, authoritative, benign self intelligible (even as they provoke subordinating terms of engagement for my students). I might identify as a Caucasian, middle class native-born English teacher while challenging or refusing the colonialist discourses which organize my relation to my students. In some senses this ambivalent identification is an expression of my self’s embrace of it’s own alterity: in acknowledging my implication in the relations I oppose, I ‘own’ (up to) this subject position as one supported by relations I wish to destabilize.
What is it about whiteness, or 'teacherliness', or both, that listens to the question "What are the implications of antiracism, feminism and queer pedagogy for teaching ESL?" and hears "How shall we teach our ESL students not to be racist, sexist or homophobic?"

I wonder about what identity I'm trying to secure in the classroom. What identifications does it leave open for students? I recognize this security of always knowing better, of always being right or in the right, or having the latitude to admit error and being right again in the very act of admission. The security of unquestionable innocence on any issue, of no issue or border being closed off to me. And I think what I'm recognizing is the security of hegemonic dominance and unmarked normalcy. Has this been displaced by my ventures outside the cultures, communities and country I grew up in, or has it been reinforced by experience-based epistemological claims that erase the privileged conditions and constructed nature of those experiences? I feel like a year of teachers' college classroom experience under the evaluative eyes of professors and supervisory teachers just built upon other powerful discourses to produce an invincible armour of teacherliness. What has identifying as a teacher got to do with being in control, a compulsive need to enlighten, to know a topic better, before raising it in the classroom? This identification involves being able to listen only with an ear for evaluating progress, updating the chart, catching points upon which I could expand, articulate better, reframe, correct or question in that way parents do so that their children's response serves the sole purpose of prefacing the right answer. And this opaque identity of teacher adapts itself to each new pedagogical approach, staking out and guarding the same claim.

At the same time, I want to inhabit these subject positions of dominance in complex ways that engage my situated perspective of feminism - not as a margin of epistemic innocence in which to take comfort nor an excuse for engaging in "an identity politics ... that wages its front on terms of single axis subordination" (Robertson, 1994, p. 222), but as a critical practice of
"historical engagement" which seeks to disrupt and exceed the very categories of its name even while holding onto notions of identity as a state of emergency (Britzman, 1995b, p. 165). In this sense I wish to identify with a critical feminist postmodern epistemology and method as a means of probing the gaps of this identity.

In terms of practice, the pedagogy arising from these ambivalent identifications would not consist in frequent vociferous mea culpa's in re-centred, heroic confessional fashion. I believe it does consist in selecting curriculum materials that address the various narratives of subjugated social difference and the consequences for those they position both negatively and positively. In encouraging students to discuss the impact of these discourses, on characters in stories or the very writing of these stories (who is present/absent? who is presented as normal/strange? what relations of inequality are erased?) I also try to keep examples 'close to home'.

Part of what teaching 'close to home' has meant for me in terms of raising issues of sexuality in the classroom is resisting arguments that discussions of sexuality are "too culturally sensitive" (a culturalized racist assumption that

---

120 I wish to gesture here to Arleen Schenke's concept of feminist/antiracist teaching as "a practice of historical engagement. By historical, I refer to the ways in which we live our personal and collective histories in the present and how acts of remembering can fashion new stories out the familiar refrains of the old. By engagement, I refer to the willingness to involve ourselves ... strategically in critical analyses of the cultural/racial/gendered production of our everyday lives" (1996, p. 156).
other cultures are more homophobic than Anglo-Celtic Canadian) and engaging texts such as *Coming Out: an anthology of international gay and lesbian writing* (Likosky, 1992) and *A Letter to Harvey Milk* (Newman, 1988) on terms which interrogate and 'queer' normalizing practices. This has meant an anxious ongoing pedagogical dilemma: in my decision to identify with the method of queer theory, not to announce my identification as bisexual but to consciously open possibilities for this reading, am I bowing to narratives of proper non-sexual embodiments of femininity in teaching (Robertson, 1994)? I ask myself how I am rearticulating categories in my very choice to avoid fixing and spectacularizing a bisexual identity on the privileged centrepiece of the teacher's body.

I believe this critically reflexive pedagogy also entails a continual vigilance and problematization of how I establish my authority as a teacher and the discursive resources I draw upon. On some occasions this is an overt part of my pedagogy and on others it is an ongoing debate inside my own head. For example, I have asked students to trace the paths their lives have taken that finally led them to this classroom. I ask that the renderings be visual with a one to two sentence label for each of four to six significant events along the way. I do the same and distribute copies of my rendering on the day theirs are due. I then ask students, in groups, to compare their various paths.

---

121 These terms of pedagogical engagement are discussed in more detail in Britzman's article "Is there a Queer Pedagogy?" (1995b).
(including mine) and draw conclusions as to similarities and differences\textsuperscript{122}. I ask each group to also conclude from this comparison the different kinds of expert knowledge different people bring to the class. As groups present their findings, I engage if it was raised or raise if it is not, the arbitrary, constructed and limited nature of our teacher-student relation and try to gather from the students the parameters of my pedagogical authority and role in our relation that they see as fitting (what expertise can I legitimately offer and what do they ask of me?). This exercise works well to establish a working contract of mutual obligations, rights and areas of authority between students and myself. Aside from being a linguistic and cognitive exercise in written and verbal self-introduction, the verbal exchange, comparison/contrast and integration of information, I have seen students use this exercise to express their expectations of our mutual obligations in our pedagogical relation. One student used the exercise to hold me accountable to the parameters we had set down for my authority. Although it was only a matter of whether a specific directive of mine fell within my authority to implement school policy, having discussed the bases of my authority with the students made it stand out in my mind as 'public' while I was teaching.

\textsuperscript{122} I leave the question as to similarities and contrasts in which aspects open. This has led to a range of responses: countries or continents of origin, family structure, number of countries passed through, but also more overtly political aspects, such as the value/ing of education, experiences of war, disruption of schooling/careers, and experiences of discrimination.
On another level, I consider my vigilant critical reflexivity to involve problematizing my very understanding and practice of integrative antiracist pedagogy. In recognizing that every pedagogy mounts its own agenda and imagines normative identities within that agenda, I need to ask myself: which fixed, unitary identities - such as 'the critical ESL student' and 'the antiracist pedagogue' - are necessary to make this pedagogy intelligible and which practices/performances, in exceeding these formulations, are fenced off as deviant geographies of failed and betrayed transformative pedagogy?

When, for example, I introduced a newspaper description of the racist and homophobic comments of a Reform party member of provincial parliament and asked students to respond to these comments, the issues that arose in pairwork and group discussion went in directions I'd not expected. The reported incident occurred just before the Parliament was to vote on a proposed piece of legislation to add sexuality to the bill of rights as a prohibited form of discrimination. Bob Ringma replied to a reporter's question that if an employee of his drew objections from customers based on that person's sexuality, he would have no hesitation in relocating the employee to a non-public position "at the back of the shop" or firing him/her. Ringma went on to

---

123 In response to a reporter's question, Bob Ringma replied that if an employee of his drew objections from customers based on the employee's skin colour or ethnicity, he would have no hesitation in relocating the employee to a non-public position "at the back of the shop" or firing him/her. Ringma went on to draw a parallel with homosexual employees claiming his actions would be the same in either case. Toronto Star,
draw a parallel with an employee of colour, claiming that his actions would be the same in either case (Toronto Star). Because Ringma's comments were framed in a zero-sum format (i.e. if the employee was driving customers away, the possibility of bankruptcy would endanger the entire business) a discussion emerged around the issue of the classed and racialized nature of controls on small businesses. One student remembered her father asking, after a harrowingly ruthless audit of their family business, when the last time was Revenue Canada had put Eaton's through the wringer in a similar manner. My questions aimed at problematizing Ringma's framing of the issue exclusively from the point of view of employer's rights were complicated by many students' experience of family-run businesses which blur the line between employer/employee. Other discussions revolved around certain students' experiences (Caucasians and students of colour) of employees of colour using the 'race card' to silence criticism or manipulate others to increase their own power in an organization.

Of course, the experience of students taking lessons in unexpected directions lies at the heart of critical pedagogical practices. What I wish to highlight in this case, is how, when I frame my authority as suspect and my identification as 'teacher' as ambivalent, partial or contingent, students' situated knowledge becomes a unique interrogative liminality and their
response a critical mirror in which I can build aperture\textsuperscript{124} and reflexivity into my transformative pedagogy. This allows me to examine my teaching in terms of how I imagine learning happening, how I read students as needing to learn certain things, how I identify and desire to be read as I plan this learning process, and how this desire may be read by students. In this case, the lesson I had envisioned and planned involved framing everyone in the room, as variously located employees facing the impact of different forms of discrimination by our imaginary employer, Bob Ringma (without necessarily equating these different forms). In this shared, though not totalizing, location I hoped to elaborate together a common linguistic and conceptual vocabulary with which students could critically address this situation, or similar ones in the future. I planned to use the 'power flower'\textsuperscript{125} as a means of letting each individual find their own entry point into an understanding of the interlocking nature of the various systems of discrimination. At the same time, I hoped the power flower image would allow me to acknowledge my own implication in relations of domination even while the desire behind my pedagogy might be read to suggest possibilities for exceeding these relations. In terms of my refusal to identify with the interests and logic of subjugation supposed by my position within

\textsuperscript{124} I use this term in order to problematize the assumptions behind the pedagogical practice of planning for closure at the end of every lesson.

\textsuperscript{125} The 'power flower' is a popular pedagogical tool in antiracism and popular education. See Toronto Board of Education Equity Studies Centre, 1994.
colonialist discourses, and in terms of the transformative goals with which I identified, I hoped to highlight the "in-between" space of possibility and change in my strategic performativity of this subject position.

What I was not able to predict was the desires, situated knowledge and experiences which students would bring to the lesson. It was especially useful, then, in my reflection upon the lesson afterwards, to be able to keep open a notion of diverse student identifications with the normative positions imagined by my transformative pedagogy. Thus the slippage between these fixed positions and student performances could be interpreted as sites of resistance or resignification and not simply betrayal. This has been insightfully demonstrated by Canagarajah (1993, discussed in chapter III) in his critical ethnography of student resistance in an EFL (English as Foreign Language) classroom. Refusing a view that decontextualized theories - be they conservative or transformational - might render student resistance predictable, Canagarajah explores the complex, contradictory forces of discursive alienation, oppositional identifications and socio-economic necessities for a group of Tamil university students learning English while resisting its culturally colonizing effects. In the case of my lesson, the student discussions were extremely valuable in that they complicated the static nature of the identity petals, disrupting neat equations between differences and selves: this is particularly important because of the abstract nature of the
flower image. This reframing of my pedagogy and my understanding of the learning was only available to me upon reflection afterwards. This suggests not only the importance of 'planning' spaces for students to exceed my pedagogical imaginings and desires. Furthermore, it emphasizes a double nature of integrative antiracist pedagogy: as curriculum and learning goals on the one hand; and as a critical, situated reflexivity on the part of the teacher, on the other.

"At once, it has something to do with whether in fact education can be more than colonization, more than the impulse to invent - through its technologies of correction - the needy student, the dangerous individual, the attention deficit, the ignorant parent, the docile body, the dysfunctional gender and all the other tragic roles that spring forth from the moral panic that stages education ... And I'm thinking, how is it possible for education as a discourse and as a practice, as an institution and as an experience, to listen to its own exclusions, repressions, and silences?" Britzman, 1995.
Provisional Conclusions

I began this thesis by proposing that a continual preoccupation with the abject histories of 'the ESL business' - histories of imperialism, racism, and neocolonialism, of missionaries and anthropologists - might transform how researchers and practitioners think about ESL students as subjects of social difference, about ourselves as researchers and practitioners, and about the teaching and learning of English as a Second Identity (ESI).

T: I mean certainly, there's a number of bases of unity that you can produce in a group of kids coming from different countries. Yes, they are all immigrants and undergoing particular kinds of assimilation experiences and difficulties with languages, so you produce a basis of unity in a classroom, around that. But, the other thing is that, while you're doing that, there is a hierarchy and structure to society that are pulling them apart, not only on the kinds of cultural differences they have, but also in terms of the way Canadian society is racialized. So, once they learn English the student from Poland or the Ukraine will become white, but once they learn English the student from Somalia will not, and if we're going to talk about any real and long-lasting unity, that produces a more just and equitable society, you've got to build a basis of unity that recognizes those differences and that people are aware of. Otherwise, it's really for those people who are put in a position where they can assimilate to say 'Well, gee, we did it, how come these other people didn't, it must be their fault.' and that begins to produce a whole level of divisions and discomfort that feed into notions of hierarchy.

I begin and end this thesis with the ethical horizon of my relation to the project of teaching English as a second language to immigrant and refugee students in Canada: ongoing histories of neo/colonialism and racist exclusion form the indirect causes of
and leave a palimpsest of images which populate and frame our engagement.

I proposed in my introduction that a continual preoccupation with the abject histories of 'the ESL business' - histories of imperialism, racism, and neocolonialism, of missionaries and anthropologists - might transform how researchers and practitioners think about ESL students as subjects of social difference, about ourselves as researchers and practitioners, and about the teaching and learning of English as a Second Identity (ESI).

Engaging this ethical horizon meant attempting to stake out and problematize certain narratives organizing the project of ESL pedagogy. I have argued that a critically reflexive pedagogy of ESL needs to be informed by an understanding of the discursive mechanisms of racialized subordination as they recruit stabilized, apparently benign categories of social difference. I have proposed that discourses of the Canadian nation combine with those of racialized, culturalized and linguicized difference to narrowly proscribe the terms under which ESL students are ambivalently invited into relations of belonging, terms which exclude and erase disruptive divergences. Tracing these discursive effects in the framing of ESL students in ESL academic pedagogical literature, I have tried to explore how insurgent notions of scavenging culture and the 'Third Space' of cultural difference might ground conditions for language learning which critique and exceed subordinating categories of non/belonging.
Returning to the classroom I sketched possibilities for how these ideas might impact upon ESL curriculum and teacher reflexivity, in terms of how ESL teachers might engage the crisis predicated by a refusal of the terms under which they and their students arrive at the classroom.

A continual preoccupation for me throughout this thesis has been the question of what this work means in practical terms for teachers and researchers. As I suggested above, the issues I've raised have implications both for critical reflexivity and for materials and practices. That is, my discussions suggest that practitioners exercise caution around the categories they use every day in their work: far from neutral, the conceptual vocabulary we rely on to make sense of what we do comes with its various agendas. Terms such as 'proficiency', 'second language learner', 'immigrant', 'Canadian', 'diversity', 'inclusion', and 'culture' each "constitutes, even as it mobilizes and shuts out, imaginary communities, identity investments ... discursive practices" and inequitable relations of legitimacy and belonging (Britzman, 1995, p. 239). The conceptual language we use to instruct, evaluate, plan the learning of, motivate, listen to, assess, research, and interpret ESL students does not exist in isolation but legitimizes relations of power, re-narrates histories and re-iterates the mechanisms of marginalization to which it has tended to be recruited before and around us.
At the same time, I’m suggesting it’s not just what we think it’s also what we do. I have pushed myself to repeatedly return to the question: what would this look like in my teaching? I have tried to suggest some ways rethinking the categories of difference and belonging would guide teachers in their choice of materials, literature, questions, projects, and evaluations of students, and guide researchers in their choices in analytical categories, their framing of inquiry questions, their choice, constitution and interpretation of data.

I believe the understandings I developed of how discursive mechanisms of racialized subordination intersect with discourses of culture, language and nation are valuable to discussions of critical integrative antiracism in ESL pedagogy in that they enable complex analyses of the inequitable relations negotiated by ESL students - particularly those of colour. They also encourage innovative conceptualizations and uses of cultural practices to challenge these relations and mechanisms.

The obvious lacuna in my research which the scope of this thesis has not allowed me to begin to address is the critical perspectives of ESL students on the issues with which I have been struggling. This limitation encourages me to further research which would begin with questions as to how these perspectives might be proposed, elicited, framed, heard and represented.

I also remain keenly aware of the need for further elaboration of the embodied reflections I attempted in chapter IV on the implications of my tentative conclusions for understanding
classroom dynamics and interactions, student resistance and the transformative possibilities of my pedagogical identifications. Further research in this regard might be best pursued within the framework of critical ethnography informed by extended reading in theories of how education articulates difference (such as Todd, 1996 and Britzman 1995a) as does the process of research.

I will end with this speculation on the unfinished work of my thesis as an unhappy compromise with the interminable nature of this project of assembling knowledge not in mastery of itself nor of its others (Felman, 1987).
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