L’Acadie post-nationale: Producing Franco-Canadian Identity in the Global Economy

By

Mireille McLaughlin

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
For the degree of Doctor in Philosophy in Education

University of Toronto

© Copyright by Mireille McLaughlin 2010
Abstract
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Ph.D. in Education, Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, University of Toronto

Language is at the center of much debate in l’Acadie, a Francophone community in what has always been a peripheral region of, first, European Empires, and next, the North American market. Now, mobilizing neoliberal ideologies, Acadian community leaders and the Canadian federal government are striving to develop the global commodification of Acadian culture, through arts and tourism, as a way to ensure the reproduction of Acadian identity in a global economy. The Acadian art scene, first institutionalized as a space for the protection of Acadian culture and the French language by community organizations and the State, has long been a privileged space for the production and reproduction of nationalist understandings of Acadian culture. The commodification of culture is a site of ideological tensions on questions of nationalism as, simultaneously, increased urbanization and the democratization of the media is challenging the nationalist understanding of Acadian identity, as artists and community organizations claim a space of multilingualism in their work. In this presentation, I will draw on data I collected in a multisited ethnography, to show how the push for commodification is a source of tension for the Acadian community. I track ideologies of language from the government decision-making to the production and circulation of Acadian art, to analyze the tensions Acadian artists and community organizers experience as they try to enter or maintain
themselves in the global economy, through the use of web-based media, alterglobalizing networks or government and private sponsorships. I will show how the institutionalization of languages as homogeneous is constraining the field of Acadian art, as actors are deploying diverse strategies to participate within or critique the existing networks.
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1. New boundaries: postnational practices and discourse

c’est comme politiquement correct astheure de parler chiac
Alex (APN participant, new media artist)

I am sitting at an academic conference where a friend and colleague, Denise Lamontagne, is providing a gendered psychoanalytic analysis of Acadieman, an increasingly well known animation about an Acadian anti-hero (in fact, Acadieman is more like a non-hero than an anti-hero: an average guy whose heroism is perhaps more his humility and his working class code of ethics).

Dano LeBlanc, the show’s creator and main writer, is there with Denise to receive questions. The public is constituted mostly of professors involved in one way or another with Acadian studies at the Université de Moncton. They quickly get onto the topic of the show’s impact on local high school students: they all express a fascination with the degree to which youths identify with the character. According to most, this is because the character speaks the youths’ language, Chiac, a local variety of French that has long been at the centre of linguistic, sociolinguistic and educational debates (Boudreau 1995, Perrot 1994, Péronnet 1989). Acadieman, indeed, is known for his use of Chiac and for his all-languages-are-equal quips about linguistic variation. In the show, Acadieman never waives from his accent and he never perceives it as problematic, even as other
characters, from Québec or the Acadian upper class, comment on it. What the crowd at the Lamontagne talk does not comment upon is that Acadieman also represents Acadian youths in other ways: he works at a call centre, hangs out in cafés, lives in the city (even though he was brought up in the woods), is asked to tour the francophone\(^1\) world to promote an Acadian tourist event and bears a rather cynical-yet-laid back understanding of Acadian identity: Acadieman, being authentically Acadian (by his practices), doesn’t have to wave flags or overtly state allegiance to Acadian identity, other than through his clothes.

In spite of Acidieman’s other attributes, and Denise’s gendered approach to the narrative, the conversation in the room revolves around Chiac, a regional and long stigmatized variety of French, that is perceived as being particularly prevalent amongst youths even though people of older generations actively speak it and as the English-French mixing that is at the center of concerns about Chiac has been traced back to 1914 (McLaughlin 2002). Acadian identity is, after all, understood to be first and foremost a linguistic identity – so the value Chiac is gaining on the linguistic new media fueled global market is a matter of concern and comment. The effects of the show on language dynamics in the region is at the centre of some debates, as some feel that speaking Chiac leads to language shift, from French to English. Indeed, Chiac has long been indexed as marking the devalued position of French in Canadian society, as many perceive it to be the product of years of linguistic oppression and economic marginalization. Others,

\(^1\) I mobilize categories of Francophones and Anglophones to describe what I perceive to be a process of categorization in my field work (and of which I myself, as a member of the community and researcher often reproduce). These categories themselves are increasingly problematic in regards to the new boundaries of the politics of languages in Canada. My establishment of linguistic categories is generally based on what participants have told me about themselves as well as on their own trajectories in regards to language. In the instance above, both participants had first acquired English and then learned French as a result of an extended stay in various areas of Québec. For a discussion on the constitution of linguistic categories in Canada, see chapter 5.
adopting a contemporary interventionist sociolinguistic approach, argue that as youths consume products in varieties of French, they are more likely to identify with francophone culture (Péronnet 1989). All in all, it is language that has these Acadian scholars talking. It is language, they feel, that is central to Acadian identity: how it is performed, transmitted and reproduced. So the value of linguistic practices within the local, provincial, federal and global markets is a question of great importance to them.

To talk about language, I argue in this thesis, is to talk about the conditions that structure linguistic practices. It warrants an analysis that questions not only the effects of artistic and media products on linguistic ideologies, but also how these very products came to be, circulating the way they are, produced by whom they are produced. This requires three things: 1) looking at the links between economic conditions and the constitution of ethnolinguistic categories 2) understanding modes of governance and how they impact who gets to participate in the Acadian art scene in what ways 3) paying attention to the legitimating discourses of Acadian identity, what conditions sustain or challenge them and how these discourses structure who does or does not participate in what ways within them.

For the purposes of this study of Acadian identity and globalization, I have chosen to look at how governance and economic conditions are intertwined to produce the current structuration of Acadian identity. In collaboration with the instituted Acadian associative network\(^2\), the federal Canadian State, provinces and municipalities are indeed active players in the inscription of Acadian identity into global networks. The logic of

\(^2\)The Acadian associative network (le réseau associatif) is a network of organizations that receive funding from the State to represent Acadians and take position on issues pertaining to the governance of linguistic communities. La Société Nationale de l’Acadie, la Fédération Acadienne de la Nouvelle-Écosse, la Société de l’Acadie du Nouveau-Brunswick, la Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes, etc.
this participation is, as with most States, primarily understood in capitalist terms (Adams 1999). More importantly, as the federal and provincial governments shift from welfare to neoliberal workfare ideologies, the Acadian art scene³ is undergoing an important restructuration: it is brought to reposition itself as a globalized site of economic development instead of a site of territorialized cultural promotion. This, I argue, affects the value of linguistic practices within Franco-Canadian communities. Authentic regional varieties gain value on the local stage as they help the commercialization of artists on the global stage. Simultaneously, bilingualism is increasingly mobilized as community workers reach out to non-Acadians publics. (Heller 2002, 2007; McLaughlin and Le Blanc, in press; Malaborza and McLaughlin 2008). In other words, the inscription of Acadian identity in the global economy through the commodification of culture is a challenge to nationalist language ideologies and their structuring effects. On the one hand, a long-standing tradition of language prescriptivism comes under tension as language varieties are mobilized to market Acadian identity on the global stage. On the other, the increased mobilizations of multilingualism challenge the nationalist understanding that the best way to ensure the reproduction of the community is to maintain monolingualism within franco-canadian spaces.

What we are witnessing is the emergence of the commodification of Acadian culture for global publics. Cultural tourism is also emerging as a site for the production and circulation of artistic products as government agencies and community actors turn to the commodification of culture. Indeed, developing tourism allows a broader expansion of the market for Acadian art, as it draws global publics to traditional Acadian regions.

³ The term art scene refers to the set of community organizations and artists who participate in the structuration of Acadian art. All fields of art are here included: music, visual art, theatre, dance, literature, filmmaking and new media.
This is, of course, a site of tension within the art scene, as the imperatives of tourism enter into tension with the legitimating discourses of the art scene (as a space for the representation of “real” Acadian identity).

The logic of tourism is, in the context of contemporary Acadie, linked to the art scene in multiple ways: 1) Both rely on the commodification of culture to position their products as Acadian products on a global scale 2) Government agencies such as the Canadian Tourism Commission is now one of the leading funders of festivals which were previously thought to be “cultural” and other historically relevant major funders are changing their own mandates from a cultural one to one of economic development as a way to position Franco-Canadian communities as participants of the global economy. 3) These same festivals remain areas where Acadian, Franco-Canadian and francophone artistic products circulate. 4) Tourism enlarges the local (as tourists visit traditional Acadian regions) and global (as Acadian artists circulate outside of traditional Acadian regions) public for Acadian artistic products. 5) The Acadian elite itself is collapsing the field of art, tourism and economic development as a way to position Acadian commodities in the global economy. 6) Cultural tourism relies on the nationalist understanding of Acadian culture being linked to artistic production to market Acadian identity. So tourism and artistic production are intertwined in many of the economic developers conception of community economic development. The commodification of culture in tourism in the arts, I argue, is changing ideologies of language about linguistic and cultural authenticity.

When it comes to ideologies of language, the incursions of Acadian products on the international field are having multiple effects, sometimes contradictory in appearance.
I have chosen to focus on this terrain because the Acadian art scene is one of the privileged spaces for the reproduction of nationalist discourses. State-involvement in the art scene is linked to the emergence of European modernity. As Nation-States replaced the church as the dominant structuring organizations of society, art became linked to the reproduction of national cultures. Art ensured, as Bourdieu has shown, the reproduction of elites within markets ideologically constructed as “meritocratic” (Bourdieu 1979). The role art plays in the legitimation of social inequalities within communities gives us a privileged window into the struggles around the reproduction of ethnonationalist discourses in today’s globalizing regime. This requires that we understand who the actors of the art scene are and how the Canadian State came to be involved in its reproduction.

Francophone Canada has relied on a nationalist ideology to institute itself, with the help – and, since the 1950s, the incitation- of a Canadian State interested in maintaining its legitimacy (faced with the threat of Québec sovereignty) through official bilingualism. Canada, as I will show, was also investing in arts and culture to promote nationalist ideologies. In the post-Second World War second world war period, a Canadian elite felt it was imperative that Canada fund the arts to instill a sense of national belonging within its borders, as, according to this same elite, Canada ran the risk of losing sovereignty over its territory either through internal pressures (namely the historicized political tensions between French-Canadians and English-Canadians) or external ones (in particular, Americanization). As it strove to redefine itself against the backdrop of the fall of the British Empire, Canada borrowed from leading conceptions of Nation-States: that sovereign States are distinguishable from each other through cultural differences. Canada needed to be 1) no longer a British colony 2) different from the
United States; 3) able to include French Canadians. For Canada, language homogeneity was not available, but the State could invest in culture as a way to produce a distinct “Canadian” identity (Handler 1988).

French Canadian, and particularly, the Québécois elites felt that Canada was overstepping the spirit of the Canadian 1867 British North America Act by investing in culture. It was felt that cultural policy was best left to the provinces, which were better equipped to represent the ideal of nationalism: cultural and linguistic homogeneity. And so a policy war ensued between federalist and Québécois elites, which left Canada to gamble on official bilingualism and meant it had to ensure that francophone minorities could reproduce themselves within the framework of the Canadian constitution. This led to the 1969 Official Languages Act, which recognized English and French as official languages of Canada. The 1969 act was therefore a way for the federal government to curtail the Québec sovereignty movement and meant that Canada had no choice but to protect francophone minorities outside of Québec. Consequently, the Canadian State has been the major funder of the Franco-Canadian art scene since the 1960s. It is also by borrowing on the State’s nationalist understanding of culture that doing art came to be understood as doing culture for Acadian elites, as they strove to participate in modernity on equal footing with other communities in Canada, mainly the dominant English-speaking community.

The federal investment in the arts worked out fairly well: from the 1970s onward, a network of Acadian associations emerged, all concerned with promoting French within francophone communities through the production and circulation of art pieces either made in French, or by francophone artists for a francophone public. The one problem
across the board was that of constituting and reaching a public large enough to make doing art and culture worthwhile for all parties involved. Different actors adopted different strategies to reach broader publics: some, like Antonine Maillet, moved to areas which had broader publics (such as Montreal or Paris). Another strategy was to tap into the Canadian public either by working and producing in English (and therefore being lost to the Acadian cause, according to the leading nationalist ideology) or by marketing an Acadian product in a form that spoke to a bilingual public (such as Edith Butler’s use of country-folk music). Of course, one last strategy is to showcase one’s Acadian identity for a francophone public (a strategy that has worked for folk-rock group 1755 – a group which indirectly received federal funding through the associative network to tour and be promoted in Québec).

The collusion between State and the associative networks has left, I argue here, the Acadian art scene vulnerable to the priorities of the State. As the Canadian State has moved to neoliberal discourses and practices (understood to be the way to remain competitive as a nation in the global economy), the ways in which the federal State continued to fund the Acadian community have changed. For one, the relative stability and autonomy of the art scene is being undone by neoliberal regimes of governance. Where, under welfare regimes, the State mostly gave out operating budgets, now it is increasingly running funding on a grants-based model. As operating budget subsidies shrink or are being altogether dismantled, organizations now access funding by competing for shorter term issues-specific government grants. In other words, the events organized by community organizations are no longer funded through operating budgets but rather through competing for federal grants. This shift in management means that
Acadian cultural organizations find themselves having to respond to the priorities of the State, in order to meet federal program requirements, or face economic repercussions. Simultaneously, the Acadian associative networks also espouse discourses which put the onus of the reproduction of identity on economic development: in grant proposals, community organizations present their expected results in term of economic benefits. Neoliberal approaches to the art scene are a challenge to its value as a space for the promotion of culture (for culture’s sake). The art scene, in response, has to position itself as a field of economic development (instead of a field of cultural promotion).

This raises multiple tensions for the actors involved, as they seek to position or maintain themselves in the scene. Budget cuts and restructurations in State programs are meant to push organizations to lobby for more funding, a type of funding that remains somewhat elusive. The short-term program-based way of funding the Acadian art scene means that “business expertise” is increasingly a requirement for community workers, who spend a good deal of their time writing grant applications to secure their own positions (as well as that of their employees). The program coordinators also find themselves juggling the shifting economic-centered priorities of the State, priorities which can enter into tension with their own organization’s community mandate. This is where artists and cultural events organizers find themselves confronted with their own conception of artistic integrity and cultural authenticity. And meanwhile, Franco-Canadian intellectuals find themselves confronted with the tensions that the increased mobility of artistic products, artists, and Franco-Canadians alike brings forth for the reproduction of Acadian identity.
The question, for the latter group, remains a question of nationalism: nationalism was the ideology mobilized to access State-funding, and so it remains central to how Acadian communities understand the stakes of the reproduction of the identity in a global economy. Yet, the global economy and neoliberalism are challenges to many of the fundamental discourses of the first foray into semi-statist nationalism: first, the accent on generating profits and reaching broader publics is increasing the value of multilingualism within the sphere. Second, these same processes are pushing forward the commodification of both language and identity. This becomes a site of tension for artists who are often selected on the basis of their “market-readiness” and associations who strive to maintain their cultural mandates from within the economic development discourse. Finally, these processes bring the question of culture to the forefront as government policies are arguably more than ever intertwined in the production of Acadian culture.

Who gets to define Acadian culture is increasingly a site of tension as actors seek to position themselves as either interlocutors of the State or as functioning outside the State-community nexus. And yet, as the State moves to neoliberal regimes and as the mobility of individuals, products and identities increases around the globe, the nationalist elites are feeling increasingly betrayed by governments and the general Acadian population alike. Analysts such as Joseph-Yvon Thériault, for instance, feel Acadian identity is increasingly apolitical in the current global context (Thériault 2007). Some of the artists who participated in this work view this apoliticization as a crisis of authenticity: as they mobilize multilingualism in their work, they risk accusations of betraying the ethnolinguistic cause. The only way to defend multilingualism in this
context is to mobilize the very ideologies of authenticity which are central to the ethno-linguistic project: the multilingual artists would rather see “their” multilingualism and cultural hybridity represented in their art work at the risk of alienating themselves from the infrastructures offered by the community (and government) (LeBlanc 2004). They are then brought to position themselves as “apolitical”: their multilingual stance isn’t recognized as a potentially political practice by the nationalist mobilized elite who still strive to protect French and to institutionalize homogeneous French spaces.

All these processes are tensions I examine in this thesis. I will first develop the theoretical framework and methodology, where I position myself as a critical sociolinguist interested in questions of group belonging, in this case, Franco-Canadian nationalism. I then discuss issues related to my methodology, which involved gaining access to different kinds of spaces as I sought to follow nationalist and postnationalist discourses and events. I then trace the question of State investment in culture and the production of nationalism all the way back to the publication, in 1951, of the Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. This report set the parameters for how Canadian State involvement in the production of ethnic identities came to be linked with investment in the arts. I follow with a chapter where I further analyze the observations of my ethnography on the collusion between the Canadian State and Franco-Canadian communities in the production of ethno-nationalist art in the global economy. I argue that governments are co-producers of Acadian identity and then, in chapter 5, I look at the structuring effects of a neoliberal shift on the field and what that means to social actors and community organization as they navigate that same field. This brings me to the current tensions raised by changing economic and political
conditions. I there outline how these new conditions create ideological tensions around authenticity within the art scene. I then investigate further the tensions that the turn to cultural recognition and State investment has created for the art scene: the current production is no longer representative of the issues of social justice which first characterized the Acadian nationalist movement. This disconnect becomes a site for social struggles centred on the notion of “authenticity” as language and culture become central terrain for commodification.

The leading questions throughout are linked to economic conditions, group dynamics, social justice and community and State governance: what happens to a linguistic community once the legitimating basis for its original mobilization is transformed by policy and economic conditions alike? How does State involvement in producing minority art participate in the reproduction of Acadian identity, with what effects? What are the legitimating principles for continued State investment in linguistic communities? And, most importantly, what happens to nationalist discourses under global neoliberal processes?
2. Critical sociolinguistics: A post-linguistic turn to language and social action

2.1.1 Three Generations: language and social change in New-Brunswick

I grew up in what I like to call an ethnolinguistic pride parade: from childhood on, I bathed in Acadian nationalist discourse. I attended national Acadian day and saw the Acadian art scene expand exponentially. My parents, two Francophones, grew up in Northern New-Brunswick (Restigouche and the Acadian Peninsula) at a time when it was one of the poorest regions in Canada. My father grew up in Tracadie, a fishing community, where my paternal grandfather was considered (by the fellow townspeople) to have held a cushy job: Pépère had fought for Canada in the Second World War and so was awarded, upon his return, a job as clerk for the local liquor store. My paternal grandmother, after having worked in Montreal as a live-in cleaning person, had married and taken up the work of running the house.

My mother grew up in Balmoral, a small farming village, where my maternal grandfather wasn’t able to secure enough land for commercial farming. He worked as a lumberjack instead, supplementing the income of the family with some farming and river fishing (trout and salmon). On top of canning and storing their home-grown products for the family, my maternal grandmother worked in the kitchens of the hospital in Dalhousie at times when the family needed supplementary income. The Dancause, my mother’s family, were considered to be one of the poorest families in Balmoral and received, at Christmas time, baskets for the poor. Neither of my parents would have been able to afford a university education, had it not been for the system of student loans that Louis J.

---

4 My mother’s family is typical of the experience of the Acadian economy at the time as depicted by Johnson (1999). The household was the centre of economic activity which mostly aimed at providing for basic needs.
Robichaud, the first Acadian premier of New-Brunswick, put in place in 1963. At the same time, he also oversaw the opening of the Université de Moncton, the first francophone university to open its doors in the Atlantic Provinces.

A Liberal, Robichaud negotiated economic development programs with the federal government, seeking to modernize New-Brunswick’s economy by putting infrastructure in place that would create full-time waged labour for New-Brunswickers. Robichaud also headed the Equal Opportunity Program, whereby he centralized taxes and modernized the health care and educational systems. This program aimed at redressing the economic inequalities between poorer and richer counties in New-Brunswick, a divide which generally corresponded with the linguistic boundaries between majority Francophone (poorer and rural) and majority Anglophone regions (richer and slightly more urban). This led him to overhaul the education system (which was divided between public schools and Catholic schools), abolishing the divide between catholic private and English public system and replacing it with a public system constituted of core English and core French schools. Eventually, the core English schools would include French immersion curriculum.

His government passed a motion that declared, in 1969, that New-Brunswick was an officially bilingual province. The aim, again, was to redress historical inequities, this time specifically between the two main language communities in the province – but Robichaud also presented it, against the backdrop of rising political tensions about the cost and job market effects of bilingualism, as a question of culture: “Language rights are more than legal rights. They are precious cultural rights, going deep into the revered past and touching the historic traditions of all our people” (Robichaud in Stanley 1984).
The province strove to offer services in English and French and thereby created a need for bilingual public servants. As Acadians had had, until then, a greater need for English than their Anglophone counterparts for French (in order to enter the job market), this meant, in effect, that the province had created a niche for Francophones within the public work-force. And so, after having obtained their degrees at the Université de Moncton, both my parents ended up working for the province of New Brunswick. My father first worked for Welfare New Brunswick in the Acadian Peninsula (working on economic development, instituting insertion into labour market programs and restructuring the welfare program) and was soon recruited to work in Fredericton, New-Brunswick’s capital. My mother worked for the now defunct department of Fisheries, where she did market development at the time when the Cod Fisheries entered its moratorium, in 1993 (thereby prompting an enormous economic restructuration for New-Brunswick fisheries).

And that’s where the pride parade comes in. Robichaud was able to pass the motion in the late 1960s as Acadians, inspired by Québec politics, were increasingly aware of the economic and cultural inequalities in New Brunswick and were ready to fight for linguistic rights and demand services in French. My parents had experienced oppression, both economic and cultural. They also participated in the movements for the recognition of their newly acquired rights, made sure to send me to French-speaking schools and to raise me to be “proud to be Acadian”, which, for my father, mostly meant to avoid French-English code-mixing and code-switching, to speak French to other identified Francophones and to ask for service in French wherever he felt it should be
offered (government, stores in Moncton but not stores in predominantly English-speaking Fredericton).

So where does that leave me? Even though, as I explain in section 2.2, I have experienced forms of cultural discrimination, I have always felt that being Acadian and educated made me one of the poster children for the new bilingual and multicultural Canada. I recognized the paths of opportunities my parents and their generation – along with an emerging knowledge economy- created, studying in France under the umbrella of a France-Acadie scholarship (which the French government instituted in 1968 as a way to help Acadians access higher education) and often getting student service jobs in cafés or as a camp councillor, followed by jobs in the Acadian artistic and cultural scene, and eventually academic student ones (studying Francophone Canada). In all those fields my linguistic abilities came in handy, if not my Acadian identity itself.

In other words, I consider my individual trajectory to be the result of State linguistic policy, community mobilizations and a restructuration from a resource-based economy which favored the emergence of territorialized nationalist discourses against the backdrop of a classed society. Bilingualism, however, became an asset as the structures of the economy changed from primarily resource-based and industrial to entrepreneurial and service based. I grew up in a climate where language and linguistic practices were at the centre of political struggles in New-Brunswick and was so fascinated by what I now know as the effects of policy, economy and the structuration of discourse, that I entered university wanting to understand these tensions. I ended up in a department of French Studies, where I specialized in sociolinguistics. At the time, I was fascinated by the

---

5 For stores in majority Anglophone regions, where asking for service in French could threaten both interlocutor’s face, my dad advocated “dropping” French words so that if the interlocutor was a Francophone, s/he could choose to switch to French. Example: “Hi, I want to pay my, facture, my bill.”
construction of boundaries and sought to explain, as many researchers in Moncton did, the difference between Acadians and Anglophones in terms of collective consciousness (see McLaughlin 2002, my MA thesis, as one example). The construction of the difference was meant to legitimate government intervention on language dynamics by asserting its importance at an individual level. To do this, francophone and Québécois scholars relied, from the 1970s onward, on a psycho-social understanding of cultural identities: individuals “had” “a” culture and, in French Canada, “a” language which would ensure their proper psychological development and their proper integration in society.

And yet, I was not satisfied with this psycho-social explanation. I felt it erased the differences amongst Acadians, did not explain the links between language power relations and identity, left little room for agency, was too normative, was not representative of my own trajectory, bilingual practices and sense of belonging (Acadian) and often reified the tensions between communities. I would later come to think that the notion of collective consciousness reproduces power dynamics within communities by naturalizing the ideology of the defining elite as the ideology of the whole community. By defining the “proper” practices of the community as monolingual standard languages, it ensures that only individuals with access to these resources also have access to the central spaces of Franco-Canadian decision-making, thus reproducing social inequalities within the group (Heller and Labrie 2003). And this is where I turned to sociology, and, more specifically, critical sociolinguistics and the sociology of nationalism to better understand the practices, institutional and individual, and the discourses, individual and governmental, which serve to structure the Franco-Canadian
space. In view of my trajectory, my theoretical framework borrows heavily from sociolinguistics. Studying nationalism has taught me to be critical of the ideologies in sociolinguistics which have served to reify nationalism (Handler 1988). In this next section, I will draw the link between nationalism and sociolinguistics, concluding with some questions relevant to the field of sociolinguistics and conceptions of nationalism alike.

2.1.2 Acadian identity in a postnational context

The ethnolinguistic mobilizations of Franco-Canadians that emerged in the 1960s are now eroding as they are confronted with the changing value of language(s) in the post-industrial economy. Linguistically defined communities, such as Franco-Canadians, are no longer competing for legitimacy and recognition uniquely within local and national spaces. This is the result of a shift from a protectionist State to a neoliberal one that pushes these communities to compete and collaborate with each other in fields such as arts as a way to position them in the global economy.

In other words, globalization and the emergence of a knowledge economy is changing sociolinguistic understandings of ce que parler veut dire, what it means to be a speaking subject in today’s social fields (Bourdieu 1982; Castells 2004). Franco-Canadian boundaries, once defined on the basis of linguistic ethnicity, are increasingly porous in today’s increasingly urban and mobile economy. The institutional and political bases which once served nationalist mobilizations are challenged by the increased circulations of people, industries, identities, discourses and products across national and State boundaries, be it in commercial, tourist, informational or migratory exchanges. These social transformations challenge current understandings of what Bourdieu called
linguistic fields: the processes whereby individual and group linguistic practices gain value – or, in other words the processes which contribute to the construction of territorialized linguistic communities and the deployments of power relations within and across the boundaries of these communities (Bourdieu 1977).

In Francophone Canada, the modernization of the agricultural economy, the collapse of the industrial economy, the growth of the service and knowledge economies (which are fuelled by a global trend towards urbanization) have brought associative and State decision-makers to bet on the commodification of culture as a way to position francophone communities in the global economy. As Franco-Canadian institutionalization has shifted from Church to State (Allaire 1993), the interweaving of the associative network with State agencies (Heller 1994) meant that the professionalization of Franco-Canadian arts is happening in great part with the involvement of State resources.

The involvement of the State raises tensions around questions of authenticity for community workers as the events they produce strive to unite their understanding of Acadian culture, their association’s cultural mandates and the governments’ priorities. This negotiation of authenticity in turn raises questions as to how we define and understand both language and culture. This is why I choose to approach the field through a critical sociolinguistics that posits the production of knowledge on language and culture as part of the social negotiation of what these entities mean.

2.1.3 Sociolinguistics and the post-linguistic turn: critical sociolinguistics and social sciences
I take the view that actors position themselves in particular ways when entering the Acadian art field. My approach is anchored in my appropriation of Pierre Bourdieu’s work, as I pay attention to social struggles for legitimacy and the effects these struggles have on power relations and the constitution of social categories. More particularly, I analyze how language and culture are terrains of social action, as social actors mobilize these concepts to position themselves and others in social fields. My argument is that the definition and institutionalization of language and culture were constitutive of a Franco-Canadian field in nationalist discourse. Now, the emergence of the new economy and the neoliberal shift is destabilizing how these concepts are mobilized and defined in the field, as community workers of the arts mobilize multilingualism to draw in bigger publics and “authentic” local varieties to produce cachet.

For Bourdieu, social categories were more than just discursive, constrained as they are by struggles for material and symbolic resources and limited by historicized discourses. And so, Bourdieu starts his critique of the “linguistic” prevalence of social sciences by criticizing social scientists themselves:

The anthropologist’s particular relation to the object of his study contains the makings of a theoretical distortion inasmuch as his situation as an observer, excluded from the real play of social activities by the fact that he has no place (except by choice or by way of a game) in the system observed and has no need to make a place for himself there, inclines him to a hermeneutic representation of practices, leading him to reduce all social relations to communicative relations, and, more precisely, to decoding operations. (Bourdieu 1977: 1)

In 1977, Bourdieu put forth his theory of practice as a critique of the linguistic turn of social sciences (the one that led to structuralist understandings of culture). The linguistic turn refers to the development of approaches that understood culture as an ensemble of texts, symbols and significations that can only make sense when understood as being part of a bounded system. These social theories followed in essence Saussure’s theoretical
divide between language and practice. In his *Cours de linguistique générale*, Saussure (1952) posited an opposition between the act of speaking and language as two potential sites of study. Speaking was boundless where language, in Saussure’s view, was bounded and systematic. As he was building legitimacy for the study of language as a science, Saussure therefore stated that language was the object of scientific analysis for linguistics and not random acts of speaking. For the linguist, science needed systematicity: it was on the side of the rules (understood to exist objectively outside of individuals) and not that of the performance (or practice) that objective knowledge could find its course.

But it is sufficient to consider the quite exemplary theoretical operations whereby Saussure constitutes linguistics as a science by constructing language as an autonomous object, distinct from its actualizations in speech, in order to bring to light the implicit presuppositions of any mode of knowledge which treats practices or works as symbolic facts, finished products, to be deciphered by reference to a code (which may be called culture). (Bourdieu 1977: 23, emphasis in original text)

Saussure had an influence in French sociology: Levi Strauss, for instance, took up the idea that culture could be analyzed the same way that language was analyzed in saussurian linguistics: as a bounded systemic whole whose significance and relevance made sense from within the culture. It is this influence that Bourdieu sought to disrupt by bringing the relationship between material means and symbolic markets to the foreground.

Bourdieu’s theory of practice was meant as a means of placing language – and discourse- as quasi-material means in the unequal distributions of power in conceptions of the social world and in the enactment of social relations. He did this by developing a theory of practice which sought to understand the reproduction of inequalities (1977). To do this he suggested three conceptual tools to understand the social machinery behind the reproduction of inequalities: habitus, capital and field (market). His work in Algeria and
France showed that socialization (in the form of the habitus) was an integral part of the constitution of what he alternatively called social fields and symbolic market (please note that I alternate between these two terms to signify the same social processes in this thesis).

In Bourdieuian theory, actors are positioned unequally in social markets. He developed the notion of symbolic, cultural and economic capital to show that social actors are caught up in the reproduction of inequalities by accepting the rules and values of thus constituted fields: we all arrive with different (economic, cultural, symbolic) resources (capital) on the market and are therefore positioned differentially in it. For instance, in his study of the symbolic value of language and the reproduction of inequalities in French schools, he showed that the dominant are dominated by their domination and the dominated are prone to accept their own domination (1982; 1998).

The question, then, is, how do we come to accept inequalities so readily? Bourdieu argues that processes of institutionalization linked to capitalist States naturalize inequalities in social fields: for Bourdieu, the dominant class is the one capable of defining the value of resources within fields and is therefore has a vested interest reproducing its own social position. Dominated actors are brought to internalize their domination within socially situated fields. As the value of symbolic resources in markets remain unquestioned, dominated groups accept the processes of valuation as just and will often perceive the social processes of marginalization as personal failures (Bourdieu et alii 1999).

For example, Bourdieu shows that in the French school system, “standard French” was recognized by all as the language of the school. What was misrecognized was that
the language of the school isn’t a neutral language in France, but rather the language of an instituted French elite. Consequently, some French citizens enter the school market at a disadvantage, as their linguistic habitus isn’t recognized within the school system. Bourdieu goes as far as to show, in *Ce que parler veut dire*, that the upper classes in society are likely to redefine capital in order to protect inclusion in privileged social networks.

The notion of field/market is at the center of my understanding of the structuration of the Acadian art scene in a globalized economy. I’m interested in the global and local processes through which linguistic and cultural practices gain value in the Acadian discursive space, with the effects these processes have on the inclusion or exclusion of certain practices and trajectories. The Acadian art scene is an interesting site for a Bourdieusian analysis, as Franco-Canadian communities have long struggled to maintain their legitimacy as interlocutors of the State. Doing so has involved defining the practices of the communities in particular ways: in the 1960s, under nationalist impetus, it meant defining it linguistically: the means of the State were therefore meant to create homogenous francophone spaces. This did serve to constitute an Acadian market where some practices ensured participation within these spaces and some forms of capital ensured inclusion within the defining elite. This left some actors to seek out opportunities outside of these spaces. Globalization is challenging the homogeneity of the Acadian social market and bringing differentiated practices and social positionings into the foreground. These tensions, linked to the commodification of Acadian culture for a global public, are what I will focus on in the analysis section.
An important critique of Bourdieu’s work is that in that he evacuated agency in his focus on the role of socialization in the systemic reproduction of inequalities. Bourdieu, au contraire, conceived of his work as potentially transformative: to undo power relations, one must first and foremost understand how they reproduce themselves. He also felt that individuals did possess agency, but that this agency itself was constrained. In other words, the choices social actors make are constrained by the interplay of their position and capacity to define the value of resources in ever moving fields.

I take linguistic identities to be a mode of categorization made relevant today by spatio-temporally situated processes whereby power is distributed through the legitimization of certain practices of language. I believe, also, that in a world of limited resources, processes of categorization and their institutionalization are unavoidable. Looking at identity processes enables us to examine the links between power, language and culture through 1) theoretical analysis that highlights processes of legitimazition, hegemony and contestation 2) the discursive constitution of categories as well as the processes of institutionalization and memory they entail 3) the production of relevant knowledge that social actors involved in the fields of linguistic identities (such as associative leaders, politicians, policy makers and academics) can use to further equity.

As I pay attention to social struggles in the production and reproduction of an ethnolinguistic minority, this thesis is a contribution to the development of critical sociolinguistics: a field focused on social processes, outlining the role of linguistic practices and its symbolism in the structuration of power relations (Heller 2002, 2007). To understand how linguistic fields function in a global context, I place identity processes
at the intersection between knowledge production, associative and State intervention and socio-economic processes to better grasp who is doing what with what kinds of resources and with what consequences for whom (Bourdieu 1982, Heller 2007, Cooper 2005, Handler 1988).

One thing is becoming apparent: We can no longer tell the Franco-Canadian story, or history, the same way. It is no longer about mobilizing an economically oppressed ethnolinguistic minority: the mobilizations of the 60s and 70s have been successful in granting some Franco-Canadians, the ones with the right symbolic capital, social mobility. Rather, the Franco-Canadian story is increasingly being told, for profit, to a global public. Add to that a desired increase in immigration and the recognition of diversity within the community and tensions emerge: who gets to do what with Franco-Canadian identity? Who gets to define it in the current economic context? What expertise is being mobilized, which one is being contested, which one can no longer function? And finally, what are the legitimating ideologies of State, governance, language and culture that structure this field? How do these ideologies, as they evolve, inform or challenge each other? And finally, how do ideologies come to be instituted, how are they linked to economic processes and material resources and what role does government and the State play in the production of nationalist discourses?

2.1.4 State doing community through language

Franco-Canadian communities came to be institutionalized as a linguistic minority (and now an official language community in minority situation) under the guise of a nationalist understanding of the ‘normal development’ of a culture. This development discourse is itself a site of tensions in a post-colonial world where the constitution of
national and ethnic identities are sites of escalating tensions as the form of the Western Nation-State institutionalizes, and reproduces, very specific ideas about governance, markets and democracy (Gilroy 2005): that States should, as much as possible, be culturally and linguistically homogeneous, that free markets are the best way to regulate social inequalities and that democratic processes, and thereby, “majorities” are best positioned to protect both State and nation (Gilroy, 2005; Harvey 2006). These ideas in turn draw lines of inclusion and exclusion in the capitalists markets as the Nation-State continues to promote and push minority leaders to conceive of communities as economic agents (Brubaker 2006).

Today’s tensions around State and culture emerge out of the interconnected histories of State and capitalism, the effects of which, on ideologies of language and linguistic practices, have been well documented (Hobsbawn 1990, Higeonnet 1980). Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, European States underwent a century of restrictive language shift, enabling linguistic homogeneity or limited and territorialized forms of multilingualism (Lafont 1993). But western States struggle themselves with their colonial and modern heritage, as multilingualism comes to the forefront because of minority rights movements within ‘homogenized’ States, the increase in transnational migration and the linguistic turn of the economy (Heller 2003, 2007; Martin Rojo and Moyer 2007). The stakes are high for minority groups bidding for equitable access to capitalist markets (Jaffe 2007; Pujolar 2007). These minority groups often struggle with the tensions arising from their own diversified linguistic resources at a time when Western Nation-States are facing globalization by investing in the internationalization of
‘their’ language.s (such as La Francophonie, la Portugalidade, la Hispanophonie (del Valle and Stheeman 2002).

It is by now common currency to describe nation as an imagined community (Anderson 1983). Scholars of nationalism fall into two camps: on the one hand, there are those who pay attention to nationalism as a historically anchored response to a psycho-social construct –if not a psycho-social need (that of belonging and community) (Taboada-Leonetti 1999). On the other hand, a more Marxist school views nationalism as being linked to the colonial and postcolonial expansion and regulation of capitalist markets (Balibar 2004). In this view, nationalism is meta-discursive, an ideology stemming from the forces of the market. Both camps agree on one thing: nationalism, in producing an us/them dynamic, is a double-edged sword: on the one hand it creates community and can orient social projects. Many researchers of Franco-Canadian nationalism are quick to point out that it is at the core of the mobilizations, to this day, for redistributive and recognition measures (Thériault 2007). On the other hand, by historicizing and defining ethnic boundaries and organizing a moral agenda, nationalism can be repressive to people within and outside of the community so defined, imposing particular moral regimes which might run counter to individual freedoms or other collective imaginings. McLaughlin and Heller (forthcoming) have studied, for instance, how ideologies of gender have operated in the French-Canadian space from the 1920s to 1965 to reproduce a heteronormative, patriarchal, religious and racialized understanding of the French Canadian nation. Trying to reproduce these ideologies during the emergence of an age of recognition and transnationalism is what led to the rise of Québec sovereignty and the toppling of a particular mode of structuring the French Canadian
elite. The entrance into modernity came at the price, however, of an ethnicizing and bounded definition of Franco-Canadian identity. Language was here mobilized to replace patrilineage as the central means of inclusion in Franco-Canadian identity.

To understand Acadian language politics today, it is important to understand the imbrications of nationalism in the production of knowledge about language. Contemporary common sense ideas about language stem from the emergence of the Nation-State as a model of governance in America and Europe at the end of the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century (Heller 2002, Duchêne 2008). Modern understandings of languages are in continuity with the imperial colonial and mercantile projects of European States which mobilized language as a resource for nation-building (Hobsbawm 1990). With republicanism, language was enshrined as a conveyor of citizenship, often by territorializing and normalizing the linguistic and cultural practices of elites (the case in France and the United States) or “peoples” (the case in Germany and Italy).

As States made education mandatory, language became a matter of the State, one that was generally linked to citizenship. Indeed, the involvement of States in the production of citizens, through contingent fields such as education, brought about a vast project of language standardization and even prompted, based on the Latin and Greek models, a hierarchization of linguistic practices whereby “languages” were constituted by the extent of their capacity to represent modernity (Bauman and Briggs 2007). This of course happened against the back drop of academic/scientific debates about the nature of linguistic practices, discourses which served to legitimize certain languages and delegitimize others (the case of African languages, understood, up until anti-colonialism, to be “patois”, being one of the most telling examples of how expert constructions of
languages served to legitimate unequal power relations). As States like Canada, France, Great-Britain the United States participated in the structuration of the boundaries of international commerce, languages became means of social mobility both within and across boundaries. This meant that often times, language served as the basis for the transmission of capital and, being mobilized to legitimize inequalities, the reproduction of classed, racialized, religious, linguistic and gendered identities (Bourdieu 1979, 1982, 1998). In Canada, the systemic exclusion of Franco-Canadians from the higher rungs of the economy in order to use them as labour brought on the quiet revolution and the ensuing Québec sovereignty movement (Levine 1990; Mann 2002).

From 1945 onward, under decolonization and with the increasing support of language experts, Franco-Canadian minority groups mobilized nationalist linguistic discourses to regionalized ends as a way to contest their exclusion from decision-making and economic processes: Franco-Canadians demanded State recognition of French as a way to enter the modern economy (Latham 2000; Bauman and Briggs 2003; Levine, 1990). In this context, State discourses which understood monolingualism to be the “normal”, “healthy” and “viable” condition of a nation within a State served as the basis for the political mobilizations of ethno-linguistic groups.

The latter then went about the business of convincing the State to produce, at least in institutional and associative networks, monolingual spaces where the minority language could be practiced. The monolingual understanding of linguistic communities has produced an important array of State intervention, itself reliant on a body of expert literature where language is an object to be protected, language vitality is measured by the tally of linguistic transfers within a territory, by the number of public spaces occupied
by a language and by the linguistic competence of speakers who, in turn, become objects for “consciousness-raising” to speak “their” language so as to benefit “the community”. Duchêne qualifies this predominantly functionalist approach to language as “the sociology of objectifying language” (2008: 6). Indeed, in Canadian policy, as well as in linguistics, sociolinguistics, language planning and the sociology of language, the dominant conceptualization of linguistic practices remain centered around a language, understood to be a bounded entity, and its preservation remains the locus of social action and theorization.

The practice of objectifying language, prevalent in linguistics and many 1960s linguistic policies, links languages as rule-based systems to cultures as bounded, naturally occurring, essentialized categories. Occidental States –including Canada-, often relied on this conception of language to institutionalize and manage citizenship through explicit or implicit language and civic educational programs. The practices of objectifying language are central to the ways in which States participated in the establishment, first of national languages and then of redistributive measures for minority languages within.

It is important here to understand the role linguistic and cultural ideologies have played in the institutionalization of language communities. 6.2 Linguistic ideologies and nationalism. The concept of language or linguistic ideologies emerged in the field of linguistic anthropology to explain how ideas about language structured the institutionalization of language and informed the linguistic practices of speakers. Woolard defines it broadly as “[r]epresentations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (1998: 3). Ideology is indeed a ripe terrain for the social study of language on two fronts: 1) in the
ways ideologies of language inform social processes and 2) in the ways social processes inform ideologies of language. As ideology and social processes are linked, it is nearly impossible to study a particular ideology and its effects without historicizing its emergence and transformations – as well as the ways it is linked to other ideological spheres and to material conditions (Wacquant, 2009). Ideologies are also linked to academic productions: in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, researchers’ conceptualizations of language are regularly mobilized by minority groups to legitimate their claims (Handler 1988).

In this thesis I seek to do both the work of uncovering how language ideologies come to be and, in return, how they inform contemporary social processes, from public policy to cultural events. I analyze the result of changing economic conditions and shift in governance towards neoliberalism and, simultaneously, how language ideologies inform public policy. As such, my thesis is a study of three converging sets of ideological constructs: economic ideologies, cultural ideologies and linguistic ideologies. These ideological sphere often intersect as actors, from government to artists, mobilize to legitimate their actions. These ideologies also frequently come under tension: my main argument is that the turn to economic development as a way to reproduce community is a source of tension for the linguistic ideologies that underlie the Acadian art scene.

I trace how nationalist ideologies of language have evolved into post-nationalists ones: how artists are repositioning themselves outside of the political mobilizations of the 1970s. From being the voice of an oppressed linguistic minority for mobilization purposes, artists can now position themselves as representatives of an “exoticized” linguistic community for global niche markets. Questions deserving attention are: what is
happening in the Acadian art scene today when it comes to instituting language practices and why? How are these practices legitimated? How do they borrow from or enter in conflict with previous ways of conceiving of language? How are they part of the transformation happening today in Acadian communities?

I approach these questions by approaching language ideologies as social processes and as an integral part of social change. Woolard delineates two approaches to language ideologies, each serving specific research purposes. In the first, ideology is a somewhat coherent system of beliefs. Some studies of ideologies assume that ideologies are common sense shared beliefs that organize life in society (in other words, that ideologies are what differentiate one culture from another, one group from another, one societal positioning from another). In Woolard’s words, this approach to ideologies makes them cognitive structures people “have” rather than social processes people mobilize and participate in reproducing or transforming society.

The second approach presents ideologies as societal resources which structure interactions and processes of institutionalization. Ideological resources are, in that paradigm, often mobilized without social actors realizing their role in the reproduction of particular ideologies. Such an approach has been used, for instance, by Jane Hill to demonstrate how racism pervades the everyday language of whites in the USA, thereby ensuring the reproduction of racism “without racists” (2008: 23). In this approach ideology is constructed as contingent upon variegated social processes:

[T]he most widely agreed upon, strand is a conceptualization of ideology as derived from, rooted in, reflective of, or responsive to the experiences or interests of a particular social position, even though ideology so often (in some views always) represents itself as universally true. (Woolard 1998: 6)
This approach has been used, for instance, by Pierre Bourdieu to show how social inequalities can be reproduced in society with the complicity of the oppressed (Bourdieu et al 1999). As I look into the transformations and tensions surrounding how governments invest in francophone communities, I find it useful to think of ideology as a socially situated process. While I believe that ideology is definitely part of the organization of society, I view ideology as a site of social struggles, albeit struggles that are often erased by processes of institutionalization. In this sense, institutions such as government programs and schools neutralize or naturalize ideologies.

As sites of struggle, ideologies are terrains for social transformation. They are also vulnerable to changing conditions. As such, it is no surprise that the organizing linguistic ideologies governing the Acadian space are currently a site of struggles in the changing conditions of the economy: as some Acadians’ bilingualism positions them and their product favorably in a global economy, the ethnolinguistic foundation of discourses presenting French and Francophones as being under assault is being undone. What is currently (re) emerging, as Acadian artists seek to position themselves, their art and their community on the global stage, is a postnationalist ideology that, by hinging on discourses of economic development, favors multilingualism as the way forward for the reproduction of Acadian communities. But as with any social change, this shift, both ideological, governmental and institutional, is ripe with unintended consequences for the communities as they strive to maintain the nationalist understanding of the reproduction of Acadian culture.

As social positioning and social struggles around the reproduction of Acadian identity are central to my work, I approach language and linguistic communities through
the lenses of critical sociolinguistics (Heller 2002). Critical sociolinguistics is at the cusp between anthropological political economy, critical sociology and sociolinguistics. I want approach language as a terrain of social action, one where social actors are constituted and caught up in webs of historicized struggles over 1) the definition of what a language is 2) the institutionalization of communities 3) the intertwined discursive spaces which inform subjectivity and 4) everyday practices (Heller 2002, Bourdieu 1982, Giddens 1984).

I rely on an approach where speakers and language communities are constituted by deployments of power that often lie outside the space of agentive subjectivity: in the effects of discourses, the reproduction of social categories, socio-economic processes and modes of governments. This is why I have chosen to follow the structuration of Franco-Canadian identity through the lens of artistic events, associative networks and government policies, all the while tracking the economic processes affecting the reproduction of these communities today.

The task calls for an approach that historicizes ideologies and their symbolic and material institutionalization. Bourdieu (1977), Goffman (1979) and Bakhtin (1934-5) offer frameworks that link processes of meaning making to the empirical conditions of their production. Meaning is always incomplete in the here and now, for much of its making happens in another space and at another time (Bakhtin, 1934). It is, however, the continual co-construction of the frames of interaction that render communication possible, if laden with the power relations which actors pull in to make meaning and stake claims to legitimacy (Goffman, 1974).
One of the fundamental questions to understand the production of meaning is the question of the distribution of power and the production of authority and legitimacy. I take the view, here, that the federal State and the provincial New-Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island governments are interlocutors in the production and reproduction of the Acadian art scene and the reproduction of Franco-Canadian actors. Critical sociolinguistics allows me to see how communities and State co-construct discourses on identity and how this co-construction is navigated and taken up by the various social actors occupying the space. This co-construction, however, does not mean that social actors, community leaders and government are positioned equally as being able to define Acadian identity.

Where most forms of nationalism relied on a homogeneous bounded and territorialized conception of subjectivity to instill governmentality, transnationalism\(^6\) brings movement, hybridity and fluidity to the foreground (Clifford, 1997; bhabha 1994). In this thesis, I focus on 1) what this increased mobility means for our understanding of language and the way we operationalize the links between language, identity and market 2) how language operates as a field that can help researchers understand, through ethnographic methods and analysis, how social actors navigate global processes, how they are involved in the reorganization of discursive spaces and the value and production of resources within these spaces. In other words, I want to understand the circulation of linguistic practices, resources and identities through the lens of the structuration of society and vice versa: how do linguistic practices, resources and identities structure global processes?

\(^6\) Transnationalism is understood to be the movement of capital, people, identities and products across the institutionalized boundaries of nation-States.
2.2 The end of State-nationalism?

2.2.1 Postnationalism defined

One of the leading questions of this work asks: what happens to ethnolinguistic nationalism when the conditions that saw its emergence are being undone by the current conditions of the economy? If nationalist discourse is still prevalent today, it is increasingly challenged by what I will call, following an emergent body of literature, post-national conditions and the emergence of post-national discourses. Post-nationalism is simultaneously in continuation and in rupture with the institutionalization of nationalist regimes. Nationalism in Québec and Francophone Canada was anchored in part in the constitution of economic and symbolic markets where French could be spoken and gain value. Postnationalism undoes the protected boundaries of this market, as the value of linguistic practices themselves becomes a central part of the globalized economy. As Pujolar states:

For the global or international company, language is no longer a natural, taken-for-granted medium of operation and organization, but a component of markets that has an economic significance, while their value as national symbols and as resources for social identification and differentiation become secondary. This situation effectively erodes the capacity of nation-states to control public linguistic practices, define their conditions of social legitimacy and, as a result, to maintain procedures for the enactment and reproduction of the national speech community. (Pujolar, 2007: 75)

Postnationalism is at the root of much anxiety for the actors who were involved in the creation of Franco-Canadian markets as the globalized economy enables midsized and even small enterprises to compete with multinationals for shares of niche markets. The arts and tourism are two fields that can easily be mobilized in the creation of niche publics for regional market, all the while addressing national identities: what government
claims to be doing is fostering linguistic communities through the economic development of linguistic communities within the State.

The modern nation building of l’Acadie is still a viable discourse, one that remains dominant in the Acadian space, even as the condition which saw the emergence of this discourse have completely changed. Francophone mobilizations have produced a two generations of educated, upwardly and geographically mobile bodies – who can stake claims, as had one of the project’s participants – to be 100% bilingual (Philippe Caissie) in an economy where individual multilingualism is taking great value (Heller 2007; Pujolar 2007). In other words, modern nationalism achieved its goal of creating a market within Canada where French would be in demand. As this market and the value of French/English bilingualism increased, arguments indexing economic and cultural oppression as the means for group mobilization were put to the side – even though unilingual Francophones, and especially immigrant unilingual Francophones – remain amongst the lowest income earners of the Canadian job market (Statistics Canada 2006). As such, it isn’t so much French that gained value in the market, but French-English bilingualism. The myths of monolingualism upon which Franco-Canadian relied to institutionalize themselves are challenged by the increased value of multilingualism in the Canadian and global economy.

The new means thought necessary for contemporary nation-building often in and of themselves challenge the ethno-linguistic boundaries of modern nationalist discourse. For instance, an influx of immigrants is welcomed by nation-builders as a means of increasing the francophone population in Canada. This influx, in turn, serves to maintain the modern francophone space and the basis for its institutions. These institutions,
however, are now faced with internal tensions as internal diversity creates tensions in regards to a particular way of instituting francophone communities in Canada (as redistributive measures against an historically oppressed group. School is an institution where these tensions emerge – around how to produce a francophone identity when everyone has a different trajectory (Heller 2006; Martin Rojo 2008). Franco-Canadian communities are therefore in the midst of redefining themselves from ethno-linguistic communities to civic communities, capable of addressing issues of anti-racism, while trying to maintain the political basis relative to their own othering within the Canadian system.

Other fields where nation building comes under challenge under the impetus of globalization are, as is the topic of this thesis, in the production and circulation of Franco-Canadian products for community economic development projects and in the conceptualization of other, larger, publics (Malaborza and McLaughlin 2008; McLaughlin and Le Blanc forthcoming). These products, plays, festivals, and tourism exhibits, often struggle with tensions regarding authenticity, all the while trying to sell culture to global publics. This is to say that while modern nationalism remains the organizing discourse of francophone identity, the ways of doing identity in the global conditions have changed, as more activities call “Others” into the realm of Francophone Canada, whether as part of the commodification of Franco-Canadian history or as potential consumers of Franco-Canadian commodities.

The situation is much more complex than a question of right and wrong, good or bad, crisis or celebration. The modern ways of doing Acadian identity as a means of social justice are entering into competition with other ways of conceiving the links
between national categories and ways of doing community. The new conditions of the economy open up possibilities for individuals and communities. The global market indeed is a challenge for the reproduction of modernizing identities and indexes the limits of identity politics: can territorialized and homogeneous understanding of culture and language be reproduced under the current global conditions of the economy?

In her ethnography of the performative negotiations, contestation and reproductions of Tanzanian nationalism, Kelly Askew summarizes some of the debates which marked the literature on nationalism and which are of relevance for the reproduction and transformation of identities in a postnational era:

[N]ationalism has evolved as a concept from being (a) a uniform Western construct, to (b) one that varies with cultural context, to (c) one that is strongly contested and highly negotiated with differing internal variants. (Askew 2002: 10)

Nationalism is, indeed, a space of struggle. Symbolic capital often becomes the locus of these struggles, what Pujolar calls “the secret life of nations, that is, the unofficial processes and agendas that legitimize the cultural capital (including the linguistic capital) of some groups over others in society (…)” (Pujolar 2007: 73). As Pujolar points out, the salience of nationalism as a way to organize State intervention and linguistic communities is “increasingly difficult to carry through” as transnational flows of people, products, discourses and identities challenge the one language / one culture /one nation paradigm as multilingualism gains value in some sectors of the workforce (Heller, 2007). This culturalist understanding of language is itself, at the center of how States like Canada organized their official bilingualism under welfare regimes (Heller 2002). Yet, as States shift to neoliberal discourses and an increasingly global market, nationalist discourses remain salient in the political spaces where struggles around recognition and
resources occur (Pujolar 2007). This is, as I will show, often the result of community leaders trying to reproduce social categories and nationalist discourses in the global market. Nationalism also informs how global publics purchase and understand cultural products, be they in quests of exoticism or distinction.

In l’Acadie as in Québec, nationalist discourse presented language as a bid to access “modernity” from the 1960s onward. Franco-Canadian communities were presented in discourse as lagging behind in income and education because of the marginalized and subordinate place occupied by French in public spaces and the work force in the Canadian context (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism). State institutions and communities became important catalysts in the construction of the modern identity, even, if not especially, from within the concerned communities. Using discourses that link identity to consciousness-raising, one participant describes the first moments of mobilizations as a “war of mentality”: “c’était pas une guerre avec les Anglais, said Bernard – a 1969 political activist turned artist - c’était une guerre avec les Français […] OK une guerre de mentalité (PP1, C-01-015) »7.

According to the increasingly educated and urbanized Franco-Canadian youths of 1969, a Franco-Canadian nationalist awakening was central to dismantling systemic economic and cultural oppression. In this move, French, its status and its corpus, became the centre of much debate: which French should be taught in the francophone schools, using which literature? And what were the elites to do with code-mixing and code-switching practices prevalent amongst Acadians? Did these practices index an unwillingness by the speakers to “be proud” of their identity? Or should they be considered as an integral part of Acadian identity? These debates were fueled by the

---

7 It wasn’t a war with the English it was a war with the French […] OK a war of mentality [attitude].
budding fields of sociolinguistics and language policy, where the place of language in the reproduction of power relations was an important field of study. Studies of language linked its practices and uses to reproduction of inequalities in society, if not to out-right oppression (Bourdieu 1982, Lafont 1993)

And so the modernizing nationalist movement of the 1960s and 70s was based on 5 principles: 1) Mobilizing the means of government 2) the creation, through “Parlez Français” campaigns, of a demand for French-Speaking services and therefore a bilingual workforce 3) the mobilization and consciousness-raising of potentially francophone bodies, 4) the expansion of monolingual spaces for the use of French 5) the emergence of an academic discourse on Franco-Canadian identity, one that was itself inscribed in the project of nation-building.

It is by linking symbolic and economic markets, government, identity and subjectivity that language replaced religion as the dominant uniting trope of francophone identity. This was happening at a time when public education, new media technologies and urbanization were disrupting the Church’s central position as the dominant institution of social life. Language and language identities, on the other hand, were perceived from within nationalist discourses as inclusive elements of social life under increasingly meritocratic social regimes. Language, already, was easier to mobilize in the creation of a francophone national market, as languages have long been resources for the constitution and policing of national markets. Higonnet (1980) showed that, in the case of the French Revolution, the institutionalization of French as the language of citizenship in effect helped legitimate the emerging bourgeoisie’s class position – and property rights- in an otherwise meritocratic republican discourse centralized on Fraternity, Equality and
Liberty. In Francophone-Canada, the emphasis on language, through its educational effects of selection also positioned some individuals as the legitimate voice of the group, capable of leading the “projet de société”, prescribing the necessary modes of intervention, disciplining “inappropriate” practices and policing the boundaries of the groups. In other words, mobilizing language as the means to equity within the Canadian-State also structured variegated power positions within francophone communities, from being part of the defining elite to being a migrant worker.

While Franco-Canadian modernity has often been presented as being in rupture with a traditional past, modern nationalism’s understanding of the links between language and community remained nestled in the heterosexual and patriarchal model of the family (of linguistic heritage as a form of biological heritage) (McLaughlin and Heller, to be published). This enabled a link where biological bodies became carriers of language and of language communities (Duchêne 2008). This was a way to partake in forms of strategic essentialism (Spivak 1990) that posit that there were differences between Anglophones and Francophones which needed to be protected by the State. The State-funded production of cultural artefacts became the central way to produce modern difference while entering the modern economic market. Under a nationalist regime, however, these artefacts were often conceptualized as targeting Franco-Canadians for the purpose of consciousness-raising. As we shall see, inscribing identity in the globalized economy changes the rules of the games of identity, as the producers increasingly rely on multilingualism to reach new publics. But first, let’s look further into questions of how nationalism has been conceptualized within Franco-Canadian communities.
2.2.2 Two faces of the same coin: ethnolinguistic nationalism in New-Brunswick

At a presentation she gave at York University in 2006, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, a scholar concerned with social justice in a postcolonial world, talked about the particular moment in which researchers of anti-racism, anti-oppression and social justice now find themselves. The question, for Spivak, was how to effect social change without reproducing the very discourses and institutions which produce the inequalities in the first place. One thing she said really spoke to me. She was talking about her notion of strategic essentialism, saying that she often finds herself to the left of the left, wanting to transform colonial and racial categories, at the expense of the groups and communities who still mobilize them to argue for equity. But then, once she looks outside of the circles of postcolonial studies she is reminded that on the other side of the debate lies racism.

Much the same way, as I try to get past a nationalist understanding of linguistic communities, I am sometimes soberly reminded that on one side of the debate lie some particularly traditional understandings of language politics, some of which still envision language politics in New-Brunswick as a mutual war of assimilation. Take, for example, this excerpt taken from the classified ads website Kijiji. This ad aims to recruit members to the Anglo Society of New-Brunswick, the Moncton faction:

**Address:** Moncton, NB  
**Date Listed:** 25-Jul-09

The ANGLO SOCIETY OF NEW BRUNSWICK is in the planning stage of starting a new chapter in Moncton NB for Moncton and surrounding areas. If you and others you know are interested in joining please contact us. All Anglophones and even non English speaking are welcome to join as we do not discriminate. The Anglophone Society is against forced bilingualism, the discrimination, cost and the division it has caused with the people of NB. Here are a few facts on bilingualism.  
*The percentage of Canadians that are functionally bilingual is ONLY 17%.  
*In assessing adequate bilingual ability for federal jobs, apparently there is NO equivalent examination for French speaking applicants, as there is for English speaking applicants.
* Anglophones are being reduced to working McJobs, (Low minimum wage jobs) many with no benefits or are applying for welfare as they don't meet the "bilingual qualifications" Francophones are getting the best positions and everyone else gets the leftovers. This has resulted in large numbers of Anglophones leaving the Maritimes to seek employment elsewhere.

[...] First segregation in the work force and schools and now in our healthcare. Segregation can only lead toward more division between the English and the French. (http://moncton.kijiji.ca/e-community-other-THE-ANGLO-SOCIETY-PLANNING-CHAPTER-4-MONCTON-SURROUNDING-AREAS-W0QQAdIdZ144385131 - consulted on July 31st 2009)

The text then goes on to cite a document by Jock V. Andrew, titled “Bilingual today, French tomorrow” which stipulates that:

The primary and sole objective since Mr.Trudeau came to power has been to convert Canada to a French-speaking nation. That objective will remain until every city, town and village in Canada has become French-controlled. (Ibidem)

The Anglo Society’s discourse and actions are not representative of the dominant view within Anglophone networks in New-Brunswick – but it is worth analysing as it is part of the discourse around language that circulates in Atlantic Canada. A number of things stand out from the above texts: first, that language policy is a matter of demography and therefore population (why should 17% of the population be given any form of what is perceived as privilege?). Also, the ad concludes with a long-standing discourse within New-Brunswick language politics: the view that the “French” want to take over, a view which had enough credential in the 1970s to be the subject of editorials in local English newspapers like Fredericton’s Daily Gleaner, where, in one caricature, you see Charles de Gaulle and Napoleon plotting the conquest of Canada.

Discourses run deep and are often reentextualized to fit new contexts and serve to explain or contest the differential positioning of individuals in society. The recuperation of these arguments suggests, as have some comments I heard while living in New-
Brunswick, that the struggles around linguistic identity have been historically anchored since the times of the colonial wars. Indeed, one of the comments I heard, as a teenager sharing a bus with Fredericton High School students goes as follow: “You frogs lost the war. Deal with it and learn the language”. In a traditional nationalist way, this view was generally territorialized (another bus soundbite: “why don’t you go home to Québec if you’re not happy here?”) and even, on a few rarer occasions, borrowed on racial hierarchies, as I was told to learn to “speak white”. Other more innocent questions revolved around asking me what language I spoke at home. I would answer “French” and the interlocutor would generally answer a variation of “wow, that’s weird” or “really?”, as English was taken to be the de-facto language of everyday life and family. This last question also made sense given the politico-linguistic context: as most Francophones were bilingual, their desire to be able to work and be addressed in French in public was construed by some to be based purely on identity politics. Francophone community leaders therefore had to neutralize the arguments lobbying for equal access to economic mobility in favour of the argument that they needed francophone public spaces to protect the language from linguistic code-mixing and the community from assimilation.

At times, the comments reflected the changing economic nature of the contemporary tensions, as bilingualism gained value on the economic market. My middle class neighbourhood shared a school bus with one of Fredericton’s social housing neighbourhoods. One morning in the early 1990s, Keith, a Fredericton High School student, told me that the struggles around linguistic identity have been historically anchored since the times of the colonial wars. Indeed, one of the comments I heard, as a teenager sharing a bus with Fredericton High School students goes as follow: “You frogs lost the war. Deal with it and learn the language”. In a traditional nationalist way, this view was generally territorialized (another bus soundbite: “why don’t you go home to Québec if you’re not happy here?”) and even, on a few rarer occasions, borrowed on racial hierarchies, as I was told to learn to “speak white”. Other more innocent questions revolved around asking me what language I spoke at home. I would answer “French” and the interlocutor would generally answer a variation of “wow, that’s weird” or “really?”, as English was taken to be the de-facto language of everyday life and family. This last question also made sense given the politico-linguistic context: as most Francophones were bilingual, their desire to be able to work and be addressed in French in public was construed by some to be based purely on identity politics. Francophone community leaders therefore had to neutralize the arguments lobbying for equal access to economic mobility in favour of the argument that they needed francophone public spaces to protect the language from linguistic code-mixing and the community from assimilation.

At times, the comments reflected the changing economic nature of the contemporary tensions, as bilingualism gained value on the economic market. My middle class neighbourhood shared a school bus with one of Fredericton’s social housing neighbourhoods. One morning in the early 1990s, Keith, a Fredericton High School student, told me that the struggles around linguistic identity have been historically anchored since the times of the colonial wars. Indeed, one of the comments I heard, as a teenager sharing a bus with Fredericton High School students goes as follow: “You frogs lost the war. Deal with it and learn the language”. In a traditional nationalist way, this view was generally territorialized (another bus soundbite: “why don’t you go home to Québec if you’re not happy here?”) and even, on a few rarer occasions, borrowed on racial hierarchies, as I was told to learn to “speak white”. Other more innocent questions revolved around asking me what language I spoke at home. I would answer “French” and the interlocutor would generally answer a variation of “wow, that’s weird” or “really?”, as English was taken to be the de-facto language of everyday life and family. This last question also made sense given the politico-linguistic context: as most Francophones were bilingual, their desire to be able to work and be addressed in French in public was construed by some to be based purely on identity politics. Francophone community leaders therefore had to neutralize the arguments lobbying for equal access to economic mobility in favour of the argument that they needed francophone public spaces to protect the language from linguistic code-mixing and the community from assimilation.

At times, the comments reflected the changing economic nature of the contemporary tensions, as bilingualism gained value on the economic market. My middle class neighbourhood shared a school bus with one of Fredericton’s social housing neighbourhoods. One morning in the early 1990s, Keith, a Fredericton High School student, told me that the struggles around linguistic identity have been historically anchored since the times of the colonial wars. Indeed, one of the comments I heard, as a teenager sharing a bus with Fredericton High School students goes as follow: “You frogs lost the war. Deal with it and learn the language”. In a traditional nationalist way, this view was generally territorialized (another bus soundbite: “why don’t you go home to Québec if you’re not happy here?”) and even, on a few rarer occasions, borrowed on racial hierarchies, as I was told to learn to “speak white”. Other more innocent questions revolved around asking me what language I spoke at home. I would answer “French” and the interlocutor would generally answer a variation of “wow, that’s weird” or “really?”, as English was taken to be the de-facto language of everyday life and family. This last question also made sense given the politico-linguistic context: as most Francophones were bilingual, their desire to be able to work and be addressed in French in public was construed by some to be based purely on identity politics. Francophone community leaders therefore had to neutralize the arguments lobbying for equal access to economic mobility in favour of the argument that they needed francophone public spaces to protect the language from linguistic code-mixing and the community from assimilation.

At times, the comments reflected the changing economic nature of the contemporary tensions, as bilingualism gained value on the economic market. My middle class neighbourhood shared a school bus with one of Fredericton’s social housing neighbourhoods. One morning in the early 1990s, Keith, a Fredericton High School student, told me that the struggles around linguistic identity have been historically anchored since the times of the colonial wars. Indeed, one of the comments I heard, as a teenager sharing a bus with Fredericton High School students goes as follow: “You frogs lost the war. Deal with it and learn the language”. In a traditional nationalist way, this view was generally territorialized (another bus soundbite: “why don’t you go home to Québec if you’re not happy here?”) and even, on a few rarer occasions, borrowed on racial hierarchies, as I was told to learn to “speak white”. Other more innocent questions revolved around asking me what language I spoke at home. I would answer “French” and the interlocutor would generally answer a variation of “wow, that’s weird” or “really?”, as English was taken to be the de-facto language of everyday life and family. This last question also made sense given the politico-linguistic context: as most Francophones were bilingual, their desire to be able to work and be addressed in French in public was construed by some to be based purely on identity politics. Francophone community leaders therefore had to neutralize the arguments lobbying for equal access to economic mobility in favour of the argument that they needed francophone public spaces to protect the language from linguistic code-mixing and the community from assimilation.

While I report, here, on my own personal experiences, I know that an analysis of the letters to the editor to The Daily Gleaner from 1960 to 2000 would yield a somewhat similar picture of the tensions provoked by language ideology and changing economic conditions in New-Brunswick.
student, told me: “It’s your fault my dad doesn’t have a job.” Indeed, at the time, the bilingualization of the provincial government meant that an increasing number of Francophones from other regions of New-Brunswick were moving to the region to take up jobs in the public service sector, at the airport and within the expanding school and parish-based francophone community. Language, in other words, was definitely the site of a social struggle, one that structured a boundary between two historically differentiated communities.

Clearly, the ad on Kijiji also shows that the economic restructurizations which the language laws enabled (along with the emergence of the knowledge economy) are points of contention. Béland et al. show, for instance, that New Brunswick differs from other Canadian provinces as it is the only province where francophone bilinguals still earn less on average than unilingual Anglophones (Béland, Forgues and Beaudin 2008). As for unilingual Francophones, they are still amongst the lowest wage earners, with newcomers who speak a Canadian non-official language and French occupying the lowest rung on Canada’s wage scale.

And yet, what is perhaps most disturbing about the Kijiji ad is that I recognize the rhetoric: it’s a rhetoric of conflict based on an idea that speakers of two languages cannot peacefully live on the same territory, that one will always win out over the other… That language, in other words, is a zero sum game. Most disturbing, perhaps, for me, is

---

9 On another morning, he told me it was my fault he was failing French. Keith, along with a few other bus riders, in a move reminiscent of 1960s racial politics, went through a one week period where they refused to let “Frenchies” sit next to them on the bus even if there were seats available (which meant a few of us would ride to school standing). This occurred during a particular heated election period in 1992, where the Confederation of Regions, an anti-bilingualism political party, came to be the official opposition to Frank McKenna’s liberals.
that I found the text as I was critiquing Acadian nationalism for still relying on the same binary conceptions of language dynamics.

My argument here is that questions of social justice and equity require that we think outside the nationalist box and that the way to understand this is to look at the sites where nationalism operates as well as sites where its constitutive discourses come under tension. One such site is the Acadian art scene, which struggles to coordinate its ethnolinguistic nationalist roots with the current global expansion of its networks. Power relations and identity processes are much more complex than the Anglo-society add makes them out to be. The traditional and modern ways in which we did nationalism, which prompted, in Canada, a strong movement of linguistic nationalism, are, be you on the side of the Anglo Society or the Acadian nationalists, two sides of the same way of understanding and institutionalizing power relations through language, State and territory.

### 2.2.3 Franco-Canadian studies and nationalism

Nationalism remains an important facet of Franco-Canadian studies, to the point where it is often taken for granted that researchers of Francophone Canada are de facto nationalists. Most studies tend to skirt the mention of nationalism, choosing instead to focus on specific elements of the community and using the indicators negotiated with the State to measure the success of the policies. As such, questions of “linguistic vitality” remain central (Landry and Allard 1990). These studies measure the success of political mobilizations, consciousness-raising and public policy by measuring how often French and Franco-Canadian identities are mobilized in personal practices as well as public
spaces (Castonguay 2003). Allegiance to this identity is also often at the center of studies. Social psychology is one of the leading paradigms through which identity is understood.

When mentions of nationalisms are overt, it is often to document the "development" of Franco-Canadian communities. These kinds of studies reproduce the dominant discourse of Nation-States and serve as a basis for political mobilizations. Nationalism is understood, in this paradigm, as being the ideal model or the development of ethno-linguistic communities. The homogeneous cultural space or the ‘majority’ group usually serve as the measure of the ideal to be attained (even as few studies actually look at what it means to be part of this majority). This body of literature is interesting in the emphasis it places on the production of independent Francophone spheres and on the production of a francophone civil society (Thériault 2007). This body of literature is therefore very active in producing nationalist discourse. Recently, authors such as Joseph Yvon Thériault have been worried about what they perceive to be the depoliticization of francophone identities, one that they read at two levels: the first on the level of individual political awareness and the second in government actions which ethnicize francophone communities. Meunier and Thériault (2008) also identify a third area of depolitization: post-structuralists approaches to identity formation.

Meunier and Thériault find the best example of this research trend in what they have called “L’école de Toronto”, the Toronto School. This is the name that Meunier and Thériault, have given to the work that Monica Heller, Normand Labrie, Diane Farmer and Diane Gérin Lajoie have been doing (notwithstanding the nuances and differences in approach and area of study that each of these researchers represent). Meunier and Thériault accuse L’École de Toronto researchers of ignoring the “vital intention” of
French Canada and of depoliticizing francophone communities by ethnicizing them. This, I argue, stems from two different understandings of politics to show that, au contraire, one of the things that bind the researchers Meunier and Thériault group together (apart from all working at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) is their focus on political and politicized processes of exclusion and inclusion both within and without the boundaries of imagined communities. Meanwhile, Meunier and Thériault’s apprehension of politics is imminently nationalist in that it understands politics as acts of governance constitutive of society, and societies to be bounded by national boundaries (so that l’Acadie, in Meunier and Thériault’s terms, is a society).

I have made the argument that the conditions that allow for the reproduction of nationalist discourses (where cultures are bounded entities) are coming under tension in a globalized economy. This perceived lack of political mobilization occurs, I argue, because Francophones do not suffer as acutely from the systemic oppression that was present only a few generations ago. The trajectories of Francophones in the workforce are also increasingly varied, as some continue to struggle with poverty, while others, such as MINE participant Jason, are using their bilingualism to position themselves within Canada’s upper class. Jason, based in Toronto, works as a tradesperson for the diamond industry and is currently acquiring his own franchises. What nationalist thinkers lament, in other words, is more than changing mentalities: in my view, what they perceive as depoliticization are the results of changing economic conditions which render nationalist political mobilizations increasingly difficult to identify with and to carry through.

Like the researchers Meunier and Thériault identify as belonging to L’École de Toronto, I define society as negotiated through interactions between individuals, groups
of individuals and institutions. Borrowing on Bourdieu, I argue that a great part of those negotiations occur outside of the space of individual and collective consciousness, but rather as resulting from historically situated processes, discourses and institutionalization (1977). As such, my approach to Franco-Canadian communities is makes room for societal processes which fall outside of political awareness – and in that it doesn’t construct society as being defined a priori by ethnic, linguistic or national boundaries. Rather, individuals are positioned and position themselves through these markers in a broader society. My understanding of society and Franco-Canadian communities, however, is far from being apolitical. But where Meunier and Thériault see politics as a project, as a historically legitimated “vouloir être” (being), I see politics as a “process”, as “what currently is”, as the struggles around legitimation.

Like others before me, I choose to try and “disentangle social-scientific analysis from […] the interpenetration of nationalist and social-scientific discourse (Handler, 1988: 8)”’. This isn’t because I am apathetic to the power relations which constitute linguistic and cultural identities in Canada, but rather because I want to step away from a binary/dichotomic analysis (which would make French Canadians the oppressed to an Anglo-Canadian oppressor), but rather grasp the complexity of how power relations have evolved in the current conditions of the economy. I want to study nationalism from beyond nationalism and, yes, at the risk of committing the crime of “ethnicizing” the “national intentions” of Franco-Canadian communities, I want to position questions of language and identity from within the other relations of power which traverse Franco-Canadian communities, from gender, to race, to multiculturalism to indigeneity.
2.3 Methodology

The focus of this study is on grasping how individuals, associations and government networks navigate practices, discourses and economic conditions in attempting to reproduce Franco-Canadian communities through the cultural art scene. To tackle this question in a way that leaves room for historicized processes of institutionalization, the circulation and reentextualization of discourse and the practices of individuals (both at an institutional and individual level), I chose to conduct a multisited ethnography, seeking access to individuals and spaces who play a leading role in defining the Franco-Canadian art scene under globalizing economic conditions. I also decided to be an engaged participant in the field, a position made possible by the fact that I was already embedded as a volunteer and worker for community art events. This, as I argue, proved to be beneficial in approaching culture from a post-structuralist framework: while doing my field work, I positioned myself as an active interlocutor (by revealing my own beliefs and understanding of the field to participants). In this section, I will explain my choice of multisited ethnography, my engaged participation in the field, present the participants and the data collected and finally explore how this data was analyzed.

2.3.1 Multisited ethnography

My position as a native observer and my involvement in the field of Acadian art, culture and tourism as a cultural worker during my undergraduate studies could allow me to present this thesis as relying on a classic situated ethnography, one of thorough, intimate and continued involvement with the participants in the field. Yet, I prefer to describe my study as multisited, precisely because my own position inside the community made me choose a more decentralized approach. Multisited ethnography
allowed me to follow how agents and forces outside Franco-Canadian communities informed ideologies and practices within the community.

The theoretical background of multisited ethnography as a type of ethnography invested in following linkages on particular questions of interests allows me to follow the links between government policy and the structuration of the field of Acadian art and culture. Over the course of three years, I have relied on participants, press conferences, social networks and news to help me move through different sites, through different government programs, different community associations who speak for the community as well as speaking to actors (such as literary editors and festival organizers) more directly involved in the field of arts and tourism. Throughout, I kept following the links between economic processes, government policies and identity products meant to bolster community development and francophone identity.

In a way, one might argue, the term ‘multilocal’ is a little misleading, for what current multilocal projects have in common is that they draw on some problem, some formulation of a topic, which is significantly translocal, not to be confined within some single space. The sites are connected with one another in such a way that the relationships between them are as important for this formulation as the relationship within them; the fields are not some mere collection of local units. (Hannerz, 2003: 206)

In the analysis, I paid particular attention to the questions of how and why government actions take the shape that they do in regards to the internationalization of arts, craft and culture. I also followed the effects for participants, and paid attention to sites of struggles.

My thesis is integrated as part of a SSHRC-funded research team, led by Monica Heller, that studies how ethnolinguistic categories are being deployed in the new conditions of the economy (Mobility, Identity and New Economy). I spent the summer of
2008 working in collaboration with researchers and associations in New Brunswick’s Acadian Peninsula and the Restigouche region, where I investigated the restructurations of the economy after the closing of a lumber mine and important crises in the fisheries. There, participants spoke of the impact of urbanization on their lives, as they attempted to develop art and tourism as economic fields. I also did a lot of work in the Moncton area on the structuration of the art scene and the turn towards tourism as a means of economic development. When possible, I did interviews with federal agencies involved in economic development and arts promotion, complete with interviews in the associative networks involved in economic development as well as with actors involved in private sector art projects.

I have conducted 29 interviews with government actors, associative networks and social actors involved directly or indirectly in the field of arts and have access to another 20 or so interviews conducted in 1998 by Annette Boudreau, Lise Dubois, Normand Labrie, Monica Heller and a team of researchers with actors involved in the arts. To this, I also add the field work and interviews that I did as a research assistant for Monica Heller in the course of her field work on la Francité transnationale (2005-2008) and as a research assistant for Boudreau in Prise de Parole 2 (2001-2002). I was also able to conduct field work and interviews in 2004 at the Congrès mondial Acadien 2004, work that was added to the Francité Transnationale data.

The interview participants were selected because of their positions and functions in the field of Franco-Canadian arts and tourism. The interviews were held on the topic of the life trajectories of the actors in regards to their current position, their functions at their jobs and their understanding of the field both of art and francophone communities.
Generally, I approached them by saying that I studied Franco-Canadian art, so I introduced that topic, but I focused on their work, and never raised the questions of Franco-Canadian or art communities as economic development myself. Rather, this has become the centre of my analysis because it emerged as a central theme of all the interviews. They, as we shall see, often spontaneously brought up those topics. This, I argue, is the result of the historicized links that have been established between building a strong francophone culture, doing modern art and the current shift to economic ideologies of neoliberalism (see chapter 5).

I have complemented the interviews with relevant documentation, relevant laws and strategic plans and newspaper article archives. In addition, I was able to assist as a volunteer in the organization of two Franco-Canadian events and one bilingual event. I selected these because of their relevance in regard to nationalism and post-nationalism. The first, Acadie Rebelle\textsuperscript{10}, is an “alternative” event organized to celebrate Acadian nationalism, which I have seen evolve from a party organized by an art gallery for a small local public to one where federal, municipal and international agencies were involved to promote francophone artists from the world over.

The second is a francophone media art festival, Festi-Doc, which has been around for over 25 years and which has recently undergone a shift in direction and important restructurations, all in the name of securing government funding by demonstrating that the event participates in the economic development of the community. I chose this festival primarily because it brings global francophone products to a local public, but ended up finding the restructurations more relevant to my argument than the aspect of the

\textsuperscript{10} In the hopes of being able to protect the identity of the participants, all participating organizations and participants’ names have been rendered anonymous.
circulation of products. These restructurations, as we shall see, involved shifting from an “art-centered” board to one that included more business-savvy entrepreneurs.

The third event is a bilingual literary festival which I selected because of the emphasis it places on bilingualism, which anchors it in the postnational moment. I should also add that I had volunteered, in the past, for all three of these events and that I therefore already knew the organizers and could compare the editions I attended as a field worker with the ones I attended as a volunteer.

This fieldwork provided me with a wealth of information. I was always assigned public functions such as ticketing or even public relations. I therefore had access to the public and could take the pulse of public reception. I also was given tasks that allowed me to work with many volunteers. Finally, all three events’ associations shared a wealth of information with me, from allowing me to attend meetings to sending me versions of their grant applications.

I was unfortunately unable to work with a fourth private sector cultural corporation, in spite of initial interest from the group. My analysis of their refusal to participate is that it was in great part due to the fact that this group was undergoing major financial stress. While I feel this might take away from the results of how the private sector operates, I was lucky enough to have the support of a few participants, Gab and Christina, who operate completely out of the private sector. Again, to this I have added fieldwork I worked on in Ontario and France, on questions of the commodification of culture, during my assistantship with Monica Heller’s Francité Transnational projects. While more works needs to be done on the functioning of the private sector, I feel that the
data I was able to access is representative of the reliance of the art sector on public funding more so than on private sponsorships.

2.3.3 Engaged participant observation

Clearly then, I was participating in the structuration of the very field I was observing and analyzing, not only as a volunteer but also as a self-identified Acadian, friend, family, fellow scenester\(^{11}\) and colleague to many of my participants. I knew from the very beginning that there was no way I could abstain from somehow “influencing” the data. So I chose another route: I would be upfront about my own positions.

This is how that choice happened. I was participating in an interview with Monica Heller and two government agents in Ottawa. I had been schooled in the linguistic school of interview techniques… I had, until then, believed that the interviewer’s stance in directing interviews was to tap into participants’ worldviews by having as minimal an impact as possible on the participant’s speech. Monica was leading this interview.

Towards the end of the interview, after the participants, Léonce and André had been freely discussing their involvement as government agents in francophone communities, the conversation, on the topic of the language industries, prompted by Léonce, went on to the topic of work Monica had done:

\[\begin{tabular}{ll}
Léonce & sur l’industrie/ vous avez parlé de l’industrie de la langue \\
Monica & oui
\end{tabular}\]

\[\begin{tabular}{ll}
Léonce & on siège sur le comité là qui a été mis en place par/ par Industrie X on vient juste d’être invité là puis l’industrie de langue/ moi je trouve ça un peu/ je trouve ça un peu technique/ un peu spécialisé \\
Monica & oui
\end{tabular}\]

\[\begin{tabular}{ll}
Léonce & puis je vois pas/ à part de ceux qui font ça là/ je vois pas quel est l’intérêt/ mais en tout cas peut-être que je comprends rien là-dedans aussi
\end{tabular}\]

\(^{11}\) While the Urban Dictionary defines a scenester as “a youth desperately trying to fit the stereotype of an artistic scene”, I chose this term because the New-Brunswick art scene is small enough that most of its participants end up knowing each other. A few of the participants I met, for instance, told me: “Yeah, I’ve seen you around”, by which they meant that they had seen me at the cafés, jazz club, concert halls and art galleries frequented by the art scene.
Monica: non/ pour nous c’est très intéressant parce que/ en fait j’en avais parlé avec Stéphane Dion à l’époque
Léonce: mm
Monica: ma vision des choses c’était beaucoup plus large en terme des/ des ressources langagières qu’on amène/ euh/ et non seulement l’expertise technique/ c’est rendu un truc d’expertise technique/ on essaie de comprendre les/ comment expliquer ça/ c’est que il y a énormément/ une économie énorme/ un marché énorme en traduction
Léonce: oui/ oui X
Monica: alors il y a une vision qui est une vision technique
Léonce: oui
Monica: et on peut voir comment tu peux faire des produits/ tu peux les vendre/ ça a un sens/ un sorte de logique interne
Léonce: mm
Monica: notre point de vue/ notre philosophie de la chose/ ça a pas/ pour nous c’est un cul-de-sac/ c’est difficile de voir comment ça peut en fait
Léonce: moi j’essaie de voir comment une communauté peut à s’intéresse à ça/ comment on peut amener une communauté à/ t’sais dans une perspective de développement communautaire/ comment on peut s’intéresser à cette question-là

Léonce: on the industry / you talked about the language industry
Monica: yeah
Léonce: we’re on the board of the committee that was put in place bu Industry we were just recently invited and the language industry / I find it a bit / I fin dit a bit technical / a bit specialized
Monica: yeah
Léonce: and I don’t see / apart from those who do it / I don’t see the interest / but maybe I just don’t understand it at all
Monica: no / for us it’s very interesting because / when I spoke with Stéphane Dion at the time
Léonce: mm
Monica: my vision of things was a lot larger in terms of / of linguistic resources that web ring / ah / and not only in terms of technical expertise / it is now an expertise thing / we are trying to understand how / how to explain that / there is an enormous / an enormous economy / an enormous market for translation
Léonce: yes / yes X
Monica: so there is a technical vision
Léonce: yes
Monica: and we can see how to make products / how to sell them / it makes sense / there is some internal logic to it
Léonce: mm
Monica: our point of view / our philosophy in regards to this / it doesn’t / for us it’s a dead-end / it as hard to see how it can actually
Léonce: what I’m trying to see is how a community can mobilize that / how we can bring a community to / you know in a perspective of community economic development / how we can participate in that line of questioning (my translation)
I remember sitting stunned in the interview, because 1) Léonce was asking Monica for an exchange of expertise 2) Monica had revealed herself and her research interests and 3) it had elicited an informative response from Léonce. This was very different from, and even contradicted how I had been trained, while doing my masters in language sciences, about how to conduct interviews.

In linguistics, and certain types of sociolinguistics, such as variationism, ideologies of language and authenticity (and authentic language) have made it so that researchers have developed techniques so as to have as little effect as possible on the participant’s speech pattern (see Labov’s 1972 chapter on the paradox of the observer for an example). An important body of literature, crossing from linguistics to sociology, has indeed been devoted to participant observation – and “casual speech” had often been linked to authenticity and even, in the social sciences, to a deeper “truth” (Coupland 2003). Social science methodology has thus developed methodologies so that participants would be as comfortable as possible with the interviewer and so that interviewers would have as little effects as possible on the participant’s stance (Blanchet 2000). The underlying assumption is that the information participants would contribute and the speech they would produce would be as close as possible to some embedded idea of “speaker authenticity”.

The experience – brought about by Léonce and Monica- was informative in that it highlighted the role the co-construction of meaning plays at a methodological level in the research process. In her work on language ideologies and the reproduction of racist discourse in contemporary America, Jane Hill documents the prevalence of ‘personalism’ as leading linguistic ideologies and its effects on the reproduction of inequalities.
Personalism is the idea, reproduced in some research methodologies, that language serves the expression of the ‘self’. Hill argues that by approaching language as the expression of a deeper self rather than the site of the (generally not equal) co-construction and negotiation of meaning, white elites can escape the question of the reproduction of racist discourses by focusing on individual speaker’s intentions instead of pervasive sites of racialized meaning-making.

As I was reading about the co-construction of meaning, post-structural and post-colonial methodologies, I was interested in trying to insert myself as a researcher in the conversations I was having with field participants. I therefore chose to not position myself as a neutral and outside observer of social processes. When it came time to approach participants for my fieldwork, I decided that I would enter the conversation as a fully engaged participant and be as clear and as honest as possible about my work and my beliefs with my participants. Yes, this has meant that, at times, I have even found myself engaged in heated discussions about languages and publics with artists and producers and, even, contradicting –always respectfully- my participants with a few “but what about” as in the example below:

Béatrice c’est pas parce qu’il vient d’une région plus isolée qu’il est pas capable là // donc on peut pas rentrer dans le jeu de / on va les financer parce que les pauvres / petit chouchou qui viennent de [ville du Nord du Nouveau-Brunswick]
Mireille mais est-ce qu’il y pas / parce que je parlais à une intervenante […] qui disait / que eux ils ont travaillé au [auprès d’une agence gouvernementale] / pour essayer de les convaincre de reconnaître que il y avait certaines structures / (...) que il fallait faire du développement dans des régions qui étaient peut-être désavantagées au niveau des arts / donc vous vous considérer que ça ça relève du ministère de la culture
Béatrice hun hun
Mireille ok
Béatrice ben // ouais
Mireille ok // parce que il y a un débat dans le CA par rapport à ça
Béatrice tout à fait
Mireille ok
Béatrice ça veut pas dire qu’on doit pas nous / aller dans les régions / pis leur donner au moins des ateliers pour leur montrer au moins comment on fait des demandes de subvention.

Béatrice it isn’t because he’s from an isolated region that he isn’t capable // we can’t enter into that game of / we are going to finance them because the poor little / little pets who are from [town in Northern New-Brunswick]

Mireille but isn’t there / well I was talking to another participant […] who was saying / that they had worked with the [government agency] / to try to convince them to recognize that there are certain structures / (...) that development was necessary in the regions that were perhaps at a disadvantage when it came to the arts / so you you consider that this should be taken up by the department of culture

Béatrice hun hun
Mireille ok
Béatrice well // yeah
Mireille ok // because there is a debate within the board when it comes to that
Béatrice absolutely
Mireille ok
Béatrice it doesn’t mean that we can’t us / go in the regions / and give them workshops to show them how to apply for grants

Again, as was the case when Léonce and Monica exchanged on the topic of Monica’s work, the conversation helped Béatrice position me in the field and clarify exactly how she saw the role of her agency in the promotion of art and culture: she could specify that her agency’s role in the development of rural communities was to teach artists there how to write applications.

Choosing to actively engage oneself as part of the dialogue in research is perhaps not a method given to all research projects. It made sense in my case for many reasons: first, because I am from the francophone community I studied. This meant that I could not escape being positioned in that community and as such, I felt I might as well be upfront about my understanding of the field. Second, I was working with government workers, community leaders and artists. These groups are generally people who are used to various types of public speaking and who are often asked to be explicit about how they conceive the work they do (be it by participating in policy meetings or by writing grant
applications). Third, it helped participants position me, and also ensured they could clarify what they meant. I never once got the mention “I hope I’m answering your question correctly”, which I would regularly get in previous work I had done – likely because the participants knew precisely why I was asking the questions I was asking, and could engage with my point of view. I found this method often prompted the type of casual interactions that non-directive and semi-directive interviewers claim to try to produce.

This choice, to be actively engaged as myself in the interviews, clearly means that participants were responding to my priorities. I feel that the biases this might have created (although, I question if they are really biases), are counterbalanced by the field work I did, volunteering at events, assisting at different kinds of meetings, attending performances and just generally hanging out with my participants. The field work helped me contrast the participant’s interviews with their action in the field, to reveal, generally, that their discursive positinings were aligned with their social position in the field of art (and, for example, the mandates of their organizations) and their action.

I have also had the opportunity to return to the field on numerous occasions, and I did a few follow-up interviews, where I would engage my participants on my work: telling them, point blank what my analysis was. This proved to be very useful, and in a lot of ways, it helped them clarify a few things I might have missed. It also served to validate my analysis and made me feel like I was directly contributing to the community.

Theoretically, this approach also matched my ontological understanding of social interactions: since I believe, like Bourdieu and Foucault, that selves are enabled and constrained effects of social processes, I do not engage in a view where certain individual
embody the “truth” about their reality. I believe instead that we each navigate social interactions in multiple and complex ways, and that “true” selves are produced by effects of discourse (as historicized and institutionalized processes), not some inner psychological state of mind. In other words, for me, ‘truth’ is a negotiated social process and this methodology allowed space for the negotiation of situational meaning.

2.3.4 Confidentiality

As most of the participant in this thesis work in a field that is often part of the (francophone) public eye, and as many of them are positioned differentially, either as artists, entrepreneurs, government agent or community actors, in the production of Franco-Canadian products, I have chosen to adapt a few measures to try and protect, as much as I can, the identity of the participants.

First, I made sure they understood the risks they were taking when they signed on as participants. But even with this, the minute I started manipulating the data, I realized that some of them remained identifiable, by the very nature of their work. I have therefore given one of the participants multiple identities within the thesis, as a way to blur the boundaries even further. While this might take away from the coherence of the participant’s narratives for readers of the thesis, I feel it does not take away from my study of the links between the structuration of the field and its constitutive discourses. I have also tried, as much as possible, to engage in a continued dialogue with my participants, telling them which part of their interviews or the events they organized I was using to do what. This proved to be a second source of inspiration for me, as participants refined their ideas and often, quite generously, gave me insightful feedback. I wish here, again, to thank all the participants for their incredible support, and can only hope that
these discussions will continue, especially if I misunderstood some of the stakes of doing francophone arts today.

As for the analysis that follows, I have chosen to continue a qualitative analysis of the data collected. I let theoretical considerations (how to conceptualize language and language policy in a global economy) and the data itself (the emergence of economic imperatives) guide the analysis. I have selected, for this work, the data which seems most relevant to my research questions (Wacquant 2009): specifically the data pertaining to the links between government rationality and the reproduction of Acadian identity in the current conditions of the economy. I also ensured that this data was representative of the rest of the data by selecting the most telling examples of trends most participants commented on (Fairclough 1995).

The analysis thus became an intellectual puzzle, as I strove to make sense of as many of the processes observed as I could. I admit that, for the purpose of studying the shift from a cultural to an economic legitimation for the art scene, I have paid less attention to the cultural legitimation of the scene which, anyway, was not as present in the data as the economic one. This might be explained either by the fact that participants took for granted that as an Acadian, I understood the ethnolinguistic mandate of the art scene, or it might be the result of a discomfort caused by the tensions of the commodification of culture, where social justice is no longer the driving force of the scene.
3. *Par la brèche de la culture* \(^{12}\) : Art and nationalism in post-war Canada

This is why there is no more potent tool for rupture than the reconstruction of genesis: by bringing back into view the conflicts and confrontations of the early beginnings and therefore all the discarded possibles, it retrieves the possibility that things could have been (and still could be) otherwise. And, through such a practical utopia, it questions the “possible” which, among all others, was actualized. (Bourdieu 1999: 57)

3.1 **Government, Art and nationalism**

One of the central questions of this thesis seeks to examine how governments are investing in Franco-Canadian art, using which legitimating discourses, and with what consequences for Franco-Canadians and Canadian’s understanding of community. In other words, the question is: why is the government framing its investment in culture as an investment in art? This requires a foray into Canadian and Franco-Canadian history, in order to highlight, in Bourdieu’s word (cited above), “that things could have been otherwise” and to better understand what came to be actualized. Looking into the historical questions helps understand the links between art, nationalism and linguistic policy in contemporary Canada.

How have States, the world over, come to be invested in producing nationhood through funding the arts, especially in a context where modern art was increasingly linked to a quest for individual freedom (and a quest for individual self-hood)? I will first start with a condensed overview of how art has historically been linked to culture and societal organization. I will follow with an analysis of how the Canadian government and French Canadian institutions (most of which were Québécois) tapped into the field of art as a way to intervene in and promote culture from the 1950s onward. Here I turn to a

\(^{12}\) Approximate translation : « By the interstice of culture » Taken from the editorial of l’Action Nationale “Le Rapport Massey” (Sans auteur, 1951: 343).
foundational text, the *Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*, otherwise known as the *Massey Report*, which was the result of a commission led by Vincent Massey (then chancellor of the University of Toronto, who would later become Canada’s Governor General). At a time when Canada was striving to redefine itself in the face of the collapse of the British Empire, the members of the commission canvassed the country from coast to coast, solicited letters from arts and research organizations, mandated special reports from arts and culture experts to recommend that the government of Canada should have a unified and strategic approach to arts, culture and social research, or else it might lose its already fragile national character.

I will pay attention to the ideologies of culture held by the commissioners and by a group of French Canadian nationalist who rallied around a periodical, *L’Action nationale*, to show that the French Canadian reaction to the publication of the *Massey Report* informed how the federal government came to invest in the Acadian art scene as a way to promote culture. In other words, the *Massey Report*, published and submitted for consideration to the House of Parliament (where it was recommended that the State mobilize taxes to bolster a Canadian nationalist sentiment through the arts), was amended in following years to respond to the outrage of a group of French Canadian nationalists.  

---

13 This chapter, like the others, uses a variety of terms to refer to the linguistic and ethnic boundaries that are relevant to either the participants, archives, historians or to this very analysis. In this chapter, I have often reproduced the terms employed by the policy makers, such that “American” and “English-Canadian” appeared in the *Massey Report* (1951) and the Cultural Development Policy for Quebec (1978). As this chapter focuses on a particular period of Canadian history, I want to clarify that I use the term French Canadian here to refer to the group of French-Speaking Canadians living in Quebec and the other Canadian provinces prior to the Sovereignty movement of the late 1960s and 70s (at which point the term was replaced by provincial declinations). The terms Franco-Canadian or Francophone communities refer to current Canadian francophone communities in minority settings (for which Quebeccers do not qualify). Quebec can refer to both contemporary or 1950’s Quebec and usually refers to the geographical boundaries and the political organization of the province of Quebec. The term Québécois marks the population, the
who saw federal funding of culture as a breach of the 1867 Canadian Constitution. I chose to focus on *L'Action nationale* because it was one of the leading publications of influential French Canadian nationalists and it helps understand how this group positioned itself in a way that eventually fed the Québec sovereignty movement. Whereas the Québec nationalists could argue that culture was homogeneous and linked to language, the Canadian nationalist had no such luxury. They had to imagine a Canadian nationalism that was multilingual and multicultural. This went counter to the ideologies of nationalism being institutionalized (namely through art policies) elsewhere in the world, like in Great-Britain or France.

Below, I will link these ideologies and the debates that surrounded the funding of “culture” to the context – urbanization and the emergence of media technologies - which served to legitimate State intervention in culture through the arts. At issue here is the political context in which Canadian policy on francophone communities in minority situation evolved: growing Canadian nationalism on the one hand and French Canadian nationalist opposition to – and suspicion of- “centralization” on the other. But first, I will analyze how art came to be linked to culture, and, under French Canadian nationalist ideology, to language.

### 3.2 A history of art: the condensed version

Franco-Canadian communities and the Franco-Canadian art field have long been objects of study. My approach is different than most of the work that has been done on the Franco-Canadian art scene. Many Franco-Canadians researchers either approach the majority of whom speak French, which lived and lives within the boundaries of the province (apologies to the Quebeco-mobiles! This category, however, hasn’t been relevant in my study, except as being part of the public or associative networks in other Canadian regions). The term Quebec nationalists refers specifically to the social actors who were directly involved in the debates about nationalism and not the whole population of Quebec (whose political allegiances can be sovereignist or not).
study of art from an unproblematized nationalist stance, one that frames Acadian art as minority art, and measures its accomplishments in comparison with what is then constructed as “dominant” national cultures (Paré 1992; Handler 1988). Those who rally behind poststructuralist or constructivist analysis often find the need to complement the approach with a psycho-social understanding of identity: the notion of collective consciousness (a shared social understanding of the world by members of a group) and social representations. Either approach posits that Acadian identity exists in a bounded way and reifies the view that “dominant” nationalism (that of the majority) is the normative yardstick by which to measure the development of the minority culture (Ali Khodja et alii, 2009).

Many approaches take the link between art, artistic expression and the reproduction of Franco-Canadian communities as a given and the debates often revolve around questions of how to constitute the field of Acadian art to meet its linguistic or nationalist goals (the protection of French and of Acadian culture). Can an artist be considered Acadian and live in Montreal (or rather, under what conditions can an artist be considered Acadian and live in Montreal)? Can a musician, such as Julie Doiron, who started her independent music career with indy rock (English-singing) band Eric’s Trip and who now, years later, composes ballads in French, be considered Acadian (even though she never mobilized the identity)? And in the absence of words or overt nationalist symbols, what, exactly, makes a modern painter an Acadian painter? These questions are all sites of struggle for the actors in the field, as they strive for particular kinds of careers, as they define their publics, seek peer recognition and apply for particular kinds of funding (see chapter 5).
Of course, many artists, and the majority of artists who participated in my field work, readily identify with Acadian identity: most feel that their work does contribute to the construction of a contemporary modern Acadian identity. Community art associations, after all, often have a “francophone mandate”:

le mandat de la compagnie c'est vraiment d'aller dans les régions / où il y a des Acadiens et des francophones / et de diffuser du théâtre professionnel / et de leur donner accès à du théâtre professionnel de création […] on se perçoit un peu comme des gens qui contribuent au développement de la francophonie / pis comme des gens qui contribuent au développement du peuple acadien pis on // on est très conscient tu sais que les / que aussi l'avenir de l'Acadie se situe dans / en gros dans ses institutions / en fait la force de l'Acadie est / c'est ses institutions (PP1, C-01-003)

the company’s mandate is really to go into the regions / where there are Acadians and Francophones / and to spread professional theatre / and to give them access to professional creation theatre […] we kind of see ourselves as people who contribute to the development of the Francophonie / and like people who contribute to the development of the Acadian people and we // we’re very conscious you know that the / that also the future of l’Acadie is placed in / generally in its institutions / in fact the strength of l’Acadie is / its institutions (my translation)

In fact, many associations and artists mobilize Acadian identity as a way to position their product on the global stage, in an economy where “cultural products” can confer distinction upon their purchasers (Bourdieu 1979; Gee et al. 1996; Lindholm 2008). (In a private conversation, Diane, who oversaw an Acadian art scene development project, told me that artists who do not in some way position themselves as “Acadian” must compete for distinction on a bigger scale than artists who mobilize Acadian identity. She gave the example of a jazz musician: a jazz musician has to prove himself on the broader jazz scene. An “Acadian” jazz musician, on the other hand, can mobilize that part of her identity to tap into alter-globalizing networks and to capitalize on her exoticism.)

Certainly, artists benefit from the associative and governmental structure which supports and funds cultural and artistic programs. As I discuss in chapter 4: “Merci pour la cash”, there is a dialogue between the associative network and the federal and
provincial governments to legitimate funding for the art scene. This collaboration reifies an understanding of the mandate of the Franco-Canadian art scene and the different ways the actors position themselves in it. What’s more, the cultural mandate of the scene is often at the centre of the appreciation of the artists’ work. This happened with Acadieman. In the Acadieman Diaries, an internet blog, Dano LeBlanc, the creator of the show and writer of the blog, was accused of misportraying Acadian identity to the world (2009). Elsewhere, empirical evidence suggests that artists who want to escape the “nationalist” discourse do so by either producing in English or by moving to Montreal or Toronto. This last practice is a source of tension for the cultural mandate of the art scene, as this artists fall outside of the nationalist aims of its institutionalisation.

Instead of essentializing culture by assuming a direct link between art production and the reproduction of Franco-Canadian communities, I will argue here that that link needs to be worked on, justified and reproduced by the artists, government, associative network and publics alike. Throughout my thesis, I explore how the link between community reproduction and art as cultural reproduction, simultaneously enables (by creating the market) and constrains (by setting its parameters and the possibility of reception) the field of art.

The question of the role of art in society is one that was at the centre of much debate and analysis throughout the 20th Century. Anthropological approaches to art, from Eliade to Levi-Strauss, often link it to spirituality and to some kind of discursive avant-garde, a trope that is taken up by some participants in this study. This approach raises questions as to the tensions between universality and locality, social life and individual freedoms (Harvey 1990). In mythological and spiritual approaches, art is simultaneously
the expression of a culture, and, linked to spirituality, a mode of organizing life in society. For some, art is a means by which humans negotiate meaning in the face of strife and struggle, or, as in European modernity, a quest for progress understood to be linked to the expression and emancipation of the group, or of the self within the constraints of the group (where community is built out of emancipated selves, free of social constraints (Barthes 1972)). Here, anthropology meets Freudian analysis: art is the means by which individuals and groups operate sublimation of their suppressed violent instincts through controlled mediation. In the spiritual approach, artists are often imbued with the role of visionaries: this is a role that is prevalent in the conception of the role of art in Franco-Canadian communities, even as its actors seek to professionalize the field. Embedded in discourses that link culture to art, many Acadian artists indeed position themselves as the “guardians” of identity, the ones who insure its contemporaneity in a global world. They envision their role as artists as ensuring that the “essence” of the culture will be reproduced in contemporary forms.

In the spiritual approach, there is a tension between art and the collective, a tension which nationalist discourses neutralize through the idea of progress and universalism. Simply put, universal art is art because it benefits the whole of society:

Enfin, au-dessus de la culture nationale proprement dite, qui est en perpétuelle évolution, il y a les manifestations objectives les plus hautes, les œuvres de civilisation. Ce sont les œuvres d’art et de pensée. Elles fondent les traditions intellectuelles et les alimentent. Le peuple, à toutes les époques s’y reconnaît; et en même temps il apprend à se dépasser, puisque toutes les œuvres vraiment grandes sont universelles. (Laurendeau 1951: 370)

In short, beyond national culture per se, which is in perpetual evolution, there are the highest objective manifestations, the works of civilization. These are works of art and of thought. They serve as the basis of intellectual traditions and stimulate them. The people, in every era, recognize themselves in it; and, at the same time, there, it learns to surpass itself, since all the really great works are universal. (Laurendeau 1951: 370, my translation)
This statement implies that we are able to define a society as a bounded entity; albeit one that enters modernity artistically by producing universal art. As we shall see, in Canada, nationalism was mobilized to rally the tensions between community and universality. The first group of commissioners who were asked to make suggestions to the Canadian government on funding the arts in 1951 considered their mission as both a spiritual and a nationalist one. In the Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, the commissioners state that: “The work with which we have been entrusted is concerned with nothing less than the spiritual foundations of our national life. Canadian achievement in every field depends mainly on the quality of the Canadian mind and spirit (Massey Report 1951: 271)” In both citations, art is linked to the betterment of individuals within a defined society; it is also the means by which a nation, be it French-Canadian (as in Laurendeau’s citation above) or Canadian (as in the Massey Report) can define itself in regard to other societies. This approach to art is very modernising: artists, then, are entrusted to be visionaries, spiritual guides tapping into powers of their societies to better society, somehow, in the long run, and enter it into universal discourse.

In opposition to the spiritual views, one also finds materialist approaches to art. For Marx, art is linked to the (re)production of ideology (1970). It is in its link to ideology and the modes of production that art becomes a terrain for social struggle. Benjamin, in his Arcade projects, saw art as a potentially revolutionary space, one that could counteract the alienation specific to the evolution of capitalism (2002). Bourdieu also takes on an approach to art as a site of social struggle, linking taste, and the appreciation of taste, to a quest for social reproduction and distinction in contemporary
societies (1977). This approach is informative in the ways it links cultural production to the distribution of material resources in society.

The social actors for the policies, and the participants to my study, waver between spiritual and material conceptions of the role of art in society. Many artists did criticize the taste of others as inauthentic, folklorizing or “cliquey”. This was their way, however, to position their art as being authentic, contemporary or working class (and therefore truly representative of Acadian reality). And so, most often, the material means of the scene were legitimated on a spiritual basis, even as more and more programs are currently conceived of as ways to foster economic development. The Massey Report, for instance, justified federal funding for the arts on the basis that the Canadian public does not have the means of supporting its own artists.

While my approach throughout this thesis is closer to the materialist approaches, I argue here for a sociologically interpretative approach to art. Art is structured simultaneously by ideology and material constraints and resources. The leading ideology which interests me here is, of course, nationalism. The nationalist approach to art mobilizes arguments stemming from both the spiritual and the materialist approaches. Originally, State investment in the arts was legitimated through a moral stance: arts would serve to foster a sense of well-being of the population, a way to create social cohesion in a modern environment, as societal organization shifted from a family-religious regime to a more individualist State organized one. The report and subsequent government investment in the arts, which I will analyze in the next section, came as a response to shifting structures in society, as mass media emerged and the Church ceased to be the center of social life.
Before proceeding to the problems of broadcasting, of moving pictures and of the other “mass media” in Canada, we think it worthwhile to point out that about one half of the Canadian population was born earlier than 1923 and that most of these older members of our population spent their formative years in a society where radio was unknown, where the moving picture was an exceptional curiosity rather than a national habit, and where as a consequence the cultural life of most communities centred about the church, the school, the local library and the newspaper. (Massey Report 1951: 19)

The commissioners thus paint a portrait of a changing society, one that, they argued, in the 517 page report, was, by then, in need of State intervention to ensure the an idea dear to the commissioners: “common good.” Art was (and remains) at the centre of the tensions between tradition and contemporaneity, between individualism and community, between materiality and spirituality, between individualism and collectivism.

Historically, art has been linked to spiritual rituals. Art historians trace modern art back to Church involvement in the production of medieval art. Indeed, the emergence of Modern art is linked to many processes that were part of the emergence of secular modes of organization: in Europe, the spread of Protestantism prohibited religious funding of the arts and promoted the separation of Church and State. At that time, an emerging commercial and industrial bourgeoisie started funding artists to do portraiture. This expanded the market and created a push towards romanticism and its counter movement, realism, as art increasingly became an individualized (authorized) field and artists gained autonomy from their bourgeois patrons (all the while the patronage became invested in strategies of distinction). Meanwhile, colonialism and imperialism meant that civilizational ideologies were reentextualized in the production of national cultures: along with the normalization of national languages, national museums and art institutions

---

14 National languages were at the centre of much debate from 1781 onward, as philosophers and politicians alike debated about the superiority of European languages: the central question was this, which language was superior at representing modern rational ideas? The idea that some languages were superior to others was linked to the idea that some cultures were superior to others and served to index the languages of the colonized as non-languages: charabia, patois, barbarism, etc.
became the means, in colonial Europe, for State to assert their national identities. In other words, modern art is closely linked to the emergence of the Nation-State as a leading mode of social organization. Throughout, there has been a tension between art as a progressive visionary and emancipating practice and the artist’s dependence on access to private or public funding.

In Canada, the government first invested in the arts as a national field as a way to build unity in a diversified country. The fall of the British Empire caused a crisis of legitimacy in Canada: the country had to assert its sovereignty on the international stage, and had to do this in terms that the international community could recognize: by being a distinct nation, with internal “national” coherence all the while being distinct from both Great-Britain and the United States. Internally, however, Canada had to contend with its diverse heritage and the long-standing political struggles between French Canadians and “British-dominant” elites. Like many post-colonial nations, Canada could not stake claims to linguistic and cultural homogeneity, and, therefore, had to imagine “nationalism” differently, as including French-English bilingualism and multiculturalism.

What this has meant is that the Massey Report’s first suggestion, that Canada fund the arts to build unity through diversity mostly through individual funding, was amended to take community mobilizations into account. While individual artists were the primary recipients of the first attempts at funding (Canada Council 1958, 1959), eventually, political mobilizations on linguistic or ethnic grounds – with French Canadians at the forefront- have pushed Canada to also invest in community art practices. This meant a reorganization of funding and institutional practices across departments – namely through the State Secretariat and the Canada Council (established in 1957). Today, these two
agencies have been divided into multiple culture or language related departments, with
the ministry of Canadian Heritage currently being the main purveyor of community and
linguistic art resources, but with the Canada Council for the Arts ensuring minority
community funding.

At a broader level, I argue here that the Massey Report and the debates it
provoked within French Canada informed the institutionalization of the 1969 Official
Languages Act (as well as, Québec’s response in the form of the 1978 Cultural
development policy). The federal government responded to the French-Canadian
nationalists by institutionalizing bilingualism as the protection of French monolingual
spaces all across Canada. Although First Nations and other cultural communities were
fundamental in the mapping out of Canada’s multiculturalism policy, the debates of
surrounding the Massey report also spurred Canadian language policy. I here concern
myself primarily with the Official Languages Act and its links to art-based funding for
two reasons: 1) At the time of the Massey Report, Canada’s diversity was understood to
be between “two main groups”: French Canadians and English Canadians (with a few
passing comments and one memoir on “Indians”); 2) because today, the art scene is such
an integral part of francophone identity. Basically, I am interested here in seeing how
Canadian, French Canadian and subsequently Québécois and Franco-Canadian
nationalism participated in how francophone arts came to be understood as part of the
mandate of the Official Languages Act in 1969.

Consequently, I choose to approach French Canadian and Franco-Canadian
nationalism from the broader spectrum of Canadian institutionalization of the arts. In
other words, I pay attention to the material and bureaucratic structuration of the field.
Studies on Franco-Canadian culture and nationalism often limit their scope to either Franco-Canadian, francophone (Québec, France and sometimes other European and, more rarely, African communities) or, minimally, other minority cultures worldwide (in comparative analysis). The limited scope stems from a long tradition of studying cultures, or languages, or ethnolinguistic communities, from within the cultures (a movement perhaps linked to a naturalistic understanding of cultures which considers them to be self-contained systems – supported by early to mid 20th century anthropology (think of Levi-Strauss)).

I approach culture from the lenses of critical sociolinguistics and political economy (Gal 1979, Heller 2002, Jaffe 2002), by linking the political evolution of the Québec and Franco-Canadian art scene with the broader context of Canadian nationalism itself. Later, I will show how Franco-Canadian nationalism was constituted in relation to existing (and dominant) understandings of nationalism. In other words, I follow how identity discourses result from interactions across boundaries of communities. In this instance as elsewhere, what happened is that Québec and Canadian nationalist both used the same definition of culture to define their separate field: culture as being linked to language(s) and as being built through tradition and contemporary art.

3.3 The Massey Report

How is the emergence of Franco-Canadian modern art linked to the increased reliance on the State for the protection of Franco-Canadian communities? The answer to this question involves taking a detour to the Canadian State’s approach to the arts starting from the 1950s onward. This period is interesting because it marks the moment when Canada legitimated investing in the arts (and social sciences) as a way to promote
Canadian nationalism and unity. This federal investment prompted the province of Québec to establish, in 1961, a Ministère des Affaires culturelles and to publish, in 1978, *A Cultural Development Policy for Québec*. At the federal level, Québec’s policy dialogue and rising sovereign movement prompted the elaboration and adoption of the 1969 *Official Languages Acts*. Franco-Canadian communities as they are conceived and funded today emerged out of the restructuring of French Canadian nationalism that is often attributed to Québec’s Quiet Revolution (in the 1960s). An analysis of the *Massey Report* and the French nationalists’ response shows, however, that the federal government’s intensely nationalist – and resolutely modernizing – investment in the fields of cultural production, as early as 1949, informed – or at least fuelled – ideas about sovereignty in Québec. As such, I fully support Handler’s view that the cultural aspects of Québec’s Quiet Revolutions were linked as much to political and demographic changes within Québec as they were linked to federal intervention in cultural policy and to a changing social landscape (Handler 1988).

In their approach to institutionalizing the links between State, art and culture, Québec nationalists and Franco-Canadian communities were preceded by Canadian nationalist themselves. Understanding the emergence of the Canadian State’s investment in the arts and culture as way to bolster Canadian nationalism in the post second world war period helps explain how and why this same sector was targeted as culture-carrying by the 1960s’ political mobilizations of Franco-Canadians, as French Canadian harnessed the power of the State as the dominant regulator of social organization (Handler, 1988). Federal investment in the arts raises questions, too, about the links between the institutionalization of “artistic and cultural” ways of doing Canadian nationalism and the
subsequent emergence of Québec and Franco-Canadian mobilizations: who got to dictate the terms of “culture” in Canada, and how did culture become so linked to language politics?


The commissioners of the Massey Report started their work in 1949. To address the needs of the artistic communities, they canvassed the Canadian landscape and met with artists, artistic associations and members of the public, and mandated and received briefs from over 300 individuals and associations. Reverend Georges-Henri Lévesque, Dean of Social Sciences at Université Laval, was considered, by the journalists of *L’Action nationale*, to be the representative for French Canada (and it is very likely that he was appointed for that purpose). Angers, one of the *Action nationale* journalists, reports that Lévesque was astounded by the lack of accolades the *Massey Report* received from French Canadian nationalists, as it was one of the first federal documents to fully present Canada as being composed of two linguistic groups (Angers 1951). Basically, the nature of Canadian politics was changing at the time of the publication of the Report: no longer was bilingualism considered a problem – it was rather a reality and became, in subsequent Canadian policy, an asset in the definition of a distinct Canadian identity. This new conception, however, dismantled the colonial discursive basis under which an
oppositional understanding of language politics in Canada had made sense. In other words, it dismantled the understanding of linguistic and cultural boundaries which ensured, at least discursively, the distinction between French Canadians and English-speaking Canadians.

The commission was mandated at a time when Canada had to legitimize its autonomy after the fall of the British Empire. A few institutions, such as the National Art Collection and the National Film Board\(^\text{15}^{15}\) had emerged since the beginning of the 20\(^\text{th}\) century, but these institutions were not represented by any strategy within government. Since the arts had figured very little in federal funding up until the 1950s, the commissioners of the *Massey Report* had to justify their recommendations that the federal government invest much more heavily (way more) in what it called the “intangibles” (*Massey Report*: 4): the production of an expert discourse on Canadian society and the production of a Canadian art scene. As such, it is here that we see the clearest enunciations of the arts as a way to maintain (and redraw from within) national boundaries, an ideology which will be taken up by Québécois and Franco-Canadian nationalist in the 1960s.

It is telling that the *Massey Report* is prefaced by the following quote from by St-Augustine:

A nation is an association of reasonable beings united in a peaceful sharing of the things they cherish; therefore to determine the quality of a nation, you must consider what those things are. (*The Massey Report*, 1951: 1)

\(^{15}\) The National Film Board was created in 1939 under the umbrella of the Ministry of Trade and Commerce as a way to keep Canadians informed of news on the War and as a way to foster a sense of unity amongst Canadians (Massey Report, 1951: 51). Interestingly, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, reliant on physical radio transmitters, was governed by the Ministry of Transport.
In the nationalist effervescence of the post-war period, the Report justifies its interest in symbolic goods on the basis of the constitution of nationalism:

   When Mr. Churchill in 1940 called the British people to their supreme effort, he invoked the traditions of his country, and based his appeal on the common background which had grown the character and the way of life of his fellow countrymen. (…) Canada became a national entity because of certain habits of mind and convictions which its people shared and would not surrender. Our country was sustained through difficult times by the power of this spiritual legacy. It will flourish in the future in proportion as we believe in ourselves. It is the intangibles which give a nation not only its essential character but its vitality as well. What may seem unimportant or even irrelevant under the pressure of daily life may well be the thing which endures, which may give a community its power to survive. (Ibid: 4)

From the beginning then, government incursions into funding the arts in Canada were a matter of nation-building so that, as the Report recommends:

   That it is in the national interest to give encouragement to institutions which express national feeling, promote common understanding and add to the variety of richness of Canadian life, rural as well as urban. (ibid: xi)

The investment and interest of the Canadian State in the arts, I argue, was caused by three interlinked phenomena: first, the patriotic mobilizations of the WWII led to a perceived need to create national cohesion; second, the emergence, in allied countries, of a substantial leisure class during the post-war boom; and third, the expansion of modes of communication and mass media.

   Nationalism progressed along with the emergence of communication media. From print to film (1894-5) to radio broadcasting (1923 in Canada) to television (1952 in Canada, but with people able to receive American networks before then) and, much later, the internet (1991), media technologies served to educate, inform, mobilize and entertain. Indeed, the Massey Report itself speaks of the importance of government investment in
the production of culture in the face of important social change. Media, and its
democratization, has been linked to the emergence of modernism and subsequent post-
modernism: “the end of the unified myth” (Appadurai 1996; Anderson 2006). At the time
of the Massey Report however, unity, morality and public education were still seen as
important social facts to establish social cohesion, especially in a country “as diversified”
as Canada.

Since culture was perceived by the commissioners as being grounded in moral
regimes, the commissioners felt that the primary role of the government was to educate
and ensure Canadian unity. Culture, in other words, was education. (Education had, up
until then, been at the center of French Canadian mobilization as they strove to maintain
their own schools in order to maintain French Canadian culture). The commissioners
often cited the “public interest” to justify their stance that the Canadian government
should take an interest in the arts, sciences and media. Education, however, had been
assigned as a provincial responsibility since the 1867 constitution, in great part as a way
to deal with the linguistic tensions in Canada (this gave Québec the right to oversee its
own schools). This is why the commissioners felt the need to justify their stance vis-à-vis
education in the report itself:

[T]he public with a natural desire to express in some general way the essential character
of our inquiry immediately and instinctively called us the “Culture Commission”. […] Some witnesses […] have shown some concern lest in occupying ourselves with our
national cultures, we should encroach on the field of education obviously so closely
related. […] “Education belongs to the provinces”, say some. “But that”, is the retort, “does not affect
the right of the Federal Government to make such contributions to the cause of education
as lie within its means.” […] The whole misunderstanding arises from an imperfect grasp
of the nature and the end, the kinds of methods of education. Education is the progressive development of the individual in all his faculties, physical
and intellectual, aesthetic and moral. […] Modern society recognizes, apart from the
common experience of life, two means of achieving this end: formal education in schools
and universities, and general non-academic education through books, periodicals, radio,
films, museums, art galleries, lectures and study groups.
Because of the constitutional precedent and the stakes revolving around the construction of a “common Canadian interest”, it is precisely on the subject of education that French Canadian nationalists reacted to the Massey Report:

Nous avons vu au cours du dernier article comment, pénétré de préjugé centralisateur, des hommes (même humanistes!) ont pu, contre toutes les réalités historiques et juridiques, bâtir une thèse qui rendait philosophiquement nécessaire (au nom du bien commun) l’introduction de l’État fédéral dans les domaines qui lui ont été interdits précisément au nom de ce même bien commun. (Angers 1951: 229)

We have seen in the last article just how, full of centralizing prejudice, some men (even humanists!) managed, against all historical and legal realities, to build an argument which has made it philosophically necessary (in the name of the common good) to introduce the Federal State in domains which had been previously prohibited to the State in the name of this same common good. (Angers 1951: 229, my translation)

Indeed, while art societies and councils had emerged before 1957 (with the Canada Council), the federal government had not, until then, had a systematic approach to distribute funding for the arts and higher education. This left a group of French Canadian nationalists incensed by what they felt was the federal approach “il manque partout de l’argent, de l’argent, de l’argent” (“what’s missing everywhere is money, money,
money‖) (Angers 1951: 227, my translation). Indeed, a portion of French-Canadians were wary that federal funding meant that culture was going to fall under federal directive\(^\text{16}\).

It is precisely because the *Massey Report* legitimated State intervention in the field of art by mobilizing Canadian nationalism that the report provoked debates in French Canadian circles. They did not question the commissioners’ basic nationalist premise (that art and education were linked to culture), but rather took up the *Report*’s nationalist terms to argue against the federal State’s intervention in culture.

The *Action nationale* journalists were weary of the «Étatisation» of society (statization, State control), which they feared would come into conflict with good Catholic social values, namely, morality, family and education. The periodical – which is still published today but with a more secular discourse- has been identified by Franco-Canadian sociologists as one of the periodicals of the dominant “Christian social nationalism” prevalent in Québec in the 1950s. *L’Action nationale* was, together with *Le Devoir* and other periodicals.

While the French Canadian nationalists believed culture was anchored in a national historical trajectory, the commissioners of the *Massey Report* argued that Canadian nationalism was something to be produced. It was, indeed, the proximity to the United States as well as geographic and linguistic considerations which prompted the commissioners to advocate for State funding for the arts:

\[\text{T}\text{his young nation, struggling to be itself, must shape its course with an eye to three conditions so familiar that their significance can too easily be ignored. Canada has a small and scattered population[17] in a vast area; this population is clustered along the rim of another country many times more populous and of far greater economic strength; a majority of Canadians share their mother tongue with that neighbour, which leads to}\]

\(^{16}\) One must be reminded that while French Canadian nationalists had always been weary of Federal intervention, in 1951, the question of the Canadian conscription was fresh in Canadian’s mind. 

\(^{17}\) 14 million at the time of the *Report*. 

peculiarly close and intimate relations. One or two of these conditions will be found in any modern countries. But Canada alone possesses all three. What is their effect, good or bad, on what we call Canadianism? (The *Massey Report* 1951: 11)

How to shape nationhood, however, was already the centre of much debate for Canadians and French Canadians alike. This nationalist debate also puts Canadian nationalism into historical perspective: as Billig has pointed out for other forms of nationalisms, dominant groups in society often erase their own nationalist roots, while indexing the nationalism of minorities as problematic (Billig 1995).

The *Massey Report* led to the establishment, in 1957, of the Canadian Council, an institution which was linked, I argue, to the democratization and subsequent politicization of the fields of art in Canadian society. Through the work of the CAC, art was no longer enshrined in traditional and private art institutions. Government investments meant that the distribution of funding for the arts had to somehow benefit all of Canadian society. What that has meant has evolved throughout the history of the Canada Council and subsequently the Canada Council for the Arts. There has always been, as lobbies organized to advocate for minority recognition, an eye for issues of equity (see chapter 5 for a further discussion on the interactions between funding agencies and political lobbies). French-Canadian nationalists, however, felt from the beginning that Saint-Laurent’s federal government was infringing upon the spirit of the 1867 Act of Constitution by concerning itself with “cultural” matters which were best left, along with education and health, as provincial responsibilities. That way, provinces such as Québec could have functioned as semi-States within a confederate infrastructure. In the next
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18 The Constitution of 1867 stipulated that Canada was a “Union of provinces”, Ontario, Quebec, New-Brunswick and Nova-Scotia. The Constitution, by separating Upper Canada into Ontario and Quebec could be interpreted as giving more power to Quebec than the previous political arrangement.
section, I turn to an analysis of the conceptions of culture, nationalism and language that were mobilized by the commissioners of the *Massey Report* and the journalists of *L’Action nationale*.

### 3.4 Governing diversity in modernity: Ideologies of language and culture

The question of how to construct unity through linguistic diversity was already an issue for Saint-Laurent’s federal government in 1949. Both the federal government and the French Canadian nationalists relied on a similar understanding of nationhood: it existed, was the basis of political legitimacy and, in the modern mediatized era, was in need of a State’s protection from “foreign” influences (be those influences American or English-Canadian). Since “nations” existed, both the federal and Québec nationalists conceived the role of the State as being important yet exterior to the existence of a culture itself (an ideology I discuss in further detail in chapter 4). Government would support the expression of a Canadian or Québécois culture, a culture that was understood as existing in and of itself. It was important, for both the commissioners of the *Massey Report* and the policy makers of the *Cultural Development Policy for Québec* (1978) that government 1) fund culture but 2) in a way that was not perceived as stifling the artistic expression and the autonomy of artistic institutions (this, mostly, to avoid accusations of government partisanship). The best way to do this, according to the *Massey Report*, was to establish an independent agency, responsible for distributing federal funds: thus the recommendation that led to the foundation of the Canada Council.

And yet, the federal government felt it had a role to play in producing Canadian culture. French Canadian nationalists, however, maintained that while there was such a
thing as French Canadian culture, there was no such thing as Canadian culture for it lacked, according to André Laurendeau, the founding elements of a culture: language, history and collective consciousness:

J’ignore encore ce qu’on veut dire quand on parle de culture nationale canadienne – ou par voie de conséquence, de nation canadienne. Si la culture nationale est ce que nous avons dit, il ne saurait y avoir pour l’instant de culture canadienne; et s’il n’y a pas de culture canadienne, puisque la nation est d’abord un phénomène de culture, il n’y a pas de nation canadienne. (Laurendeau 1951: 372)

*I still do not understand what other people mean when they talk about a national Canadian culture – or, as a resulting consequence, of a Canadian nation. If national culture is what we have defined, there could not be at this moment such a thing as a Canadian culture; and, since there is no Canadian culture, seeing as nation is first and foremost a cultural phenomenon, there is no such thing as a Canadian nation. (my translation)*

Laurendeau therefore mobilizes a particular understanding of national culture to conclude that there is no such thing as a national Canadian culture.

Meanwhile, the commissioners of the *Massey Report* felt that the very fragility of Canadian culture was what mandated State intervention. In the eyes of the commissioners the Canadian nation faced many challenges, not the least of which was the matter of national unity in the face of diversity. However, this diversity was generally understood to be primarily language-based, as is exemplified in the following excerpt, where Canada is said to be composed of two Canadian cultures:

[The arts and letters] are also the foundation of national unity. We thought it deeply significant to hear repeatedly from representatives of the two Canadian cultures expressions of hope and of confidence that in our common cultivation of the things of the mind, Canadians – French and English-speaking – can find true “Canadianism”. Through this shared confidences we can nurture what we have in common and resist those influences which could impair, and even destroy, our integrity. In our search we have thus been made aware of what can serve our country in a double sense: what can make it great and what can make it one. (*Massey Report* 1951: 271)

To argue against the involvement of the Canadian government in funding culture, the French Canadian nationalists could mobilize the leading ideology which linked
“nationalism” to cultural and linguistic homogeneity. Meanwhile, as the excerpt above indicates, the commissioners had to resolve a classic tension of nationalist thought: how to make Canada one while recognizing its diversity. This desire to “make Canada one” is precisely what outraged the French Canadian nationalists: they felt that under the benevolent nature of the *Massey Report* lay the threat of cultural assimilation. François-Albert Angers argues that the *Massey Report* shows that prime minister Saint-Laurent and commissioner Lévesque were “unconscious” of the trap that was set out before them: first, because unity cannot be achieved out of diversity and second, because of the mechanisms of power in society, this new unity would be built to the detriment of French Canadian culture:

*Tout naturellement l’Anglais pourra s’imaginer qu’en définitive le Canada, par cette solution, sera surtout de culture anglo-saxonne, avec correctifs à la française. (Angers 1951 : 229).
L’idée de confier à des corps unifiés, à majorité anglaise, le soin d’édifier des réglementations différentes, appropriés à chaque groupe, place la minorité française dans la position de l’éternel quémandeur en théorie, de l’éternel opposant en fait, situation éminemment dommageable à l’épanouissement complet de la culture dans les deux cas. (Ibid : 230)*

*Quite naturally the English will be able to imagine that, when all is said and done, Canada, as a result of that solution, will mostly be of anglo-saxon culture, with a French-style corrective (…) The idea of trusting a unified body, an English majority one, the care of edifying diversified rules, appropriate for each group, places the French-speaking minority in the eternal position of a beggar in theory, of the eternal opponent in fact, a situation eminently harmful to the complete evolution of culture in both cases. (my translation)*

Furthermore, according to Arès, the incursion of the federal government in the fields of art and post-secondary education went against the Canadian constitution. The French Canadian nationalists’ understanding of the British North America Act was that the government of Canada would maintain infrastructure for a dominion of provinces, while matters of education and culture would be left to the provinces.
Dans notre pays, la Constitution a partagé d’une façon exhaustive entre les divers gouvernements la part de bien commun dont chacun aurait la charge et la gérance. Elle a attribué au gouvernement central cette part du bien commun qui concerne la paix, l’ordre public, la bonne administration, le commerce, les postes, les communications, les banques, etc., mais elle a explicitement réservé aux gouvernements provinciaux cette autre part du bien commun qui regarde l’éducation dans les limites et pour la population de chaque province. (Arès 1951 : 135)

In our country, the Constitution has exhaustively divided up between governments that share of the common good assigned to peace, public order, good management, commerce, postal services, communications, banks, etc., but it has explicitly reserved for the provincial governments that part of the common good that concerns education within the confines and for the population of each province. (my translation)

Not only did this incursion into culture go against the spirit of the constitution, it also signaled a move to a form of State control (Étatisation), which, the analysts felt, was too centralizing.

Le rapport Massey est rempli des intentions généreuses de ses rédacteurs, mais c’est une générosité qui, en définitive, induit en tentation les Canadiens, car elle les invite encore une fois à introduire dans leur propre domaine l’État, et l’État central, au risque de n’être plus bientôt maîtres chez eux, l’État ressemblant fort à ces gens dont parle le fabuliste : Laissez-leur prendre un pied chez vous, ils en auront pris quatre. (Arès 1951 : 138)

The Massey Report is filled with the generous intentions of its writers, but it’s a generosity which, in the end, can only induce Canadians into temptation, because it invites them once again to introduce the State in their own domains, and the central State, at the risk of soon no longer being masters of their own domains, the State which resembles those of whom the storyteller spoke : Let them take a step in your home, they will take four. (my translation)

Thus, Arès suggested that if the State must invest in culture, then it should leave it to the provinces:

Si donc on est convaincu que le bien commun, sous son aspect intellectuel et moral, exige la participation du gouvernement central à l’œuvre de l’éducation du citoyen canadien (…), pourquoi ne suggère-t-on pas à Ottawa de conclure à ce sujet une entente avec les Provinces ou même de modifier la Constitution, au lieu de s’efforcer de démontrer le caractère « national » de la question de l’éducation, en vue de la déclarer ensuite de compétences fédérale? (Ibidem)

If we are then convinced that the common good, under its intellectual and moral aspect, requires the participation of the central government to work on the Canadian citizen’s education (…), why doesn’t anyone suggest that Ottawa reach an agreement with the provinces, or, even, that the Constitution be modified, instead of trying to demonstrate
the “national” character of the question of education, in the hopes of then having it declared a federal domain? (my translation)

In short, the interference of the federal government in a field (of cultural and symbolic resources) which had previously been outside of government’s mandate, made the question of “ownership” of culture central and led some French Canadian nationalists to argue for a continued decentralized Canada, where the provinces - minimally, Québec - would have the charge of protecting culture. It also raised the stakes as to the content of culture: the French Canadian nationalists felt that culture had to be homogeneous, while the commissioners had to position themselves in favour of diversity. Whereas homogeneity was the basis for the political mobilization of the former, diversity gave legitimated “national” intervention for the latter. Indeed, the *Massey Report*’s definition of culture went against the dominant ideologies of culture (and nation) which were being implemented in France and the United States, and upon which the French Canadian nationalists relied to stake their claims against federal interference: a culture was a homogeneous entity. Two cultures could not come together under one nation, as one would (naturally) seek to assimilate the other. While one can see how both of these ideologies still operate in the Franco-Canadian art scene, the positioning of the *Massey Report* proved better suited for what was to become the transnational conditions of the global economy: the problems the commissioners faced anticipated the conditions in which a post-structuralist approach would become salient: definitions of culture would be revised to become, increasingly, spaces of fluidity and hybridity (Appadurai 1996; bhabha 2004).

The commissioners, however, were clearly invested in the idea of nation-building – and since they perceived a common national culture to be constructed through art (and
its mediums), language was consistently portrayed as a “carrier of culture”, one that left the English-speaking majority vulnerable to American influence while protecting the French-speaking Canadians (as American products inundated Canadian media). Indeed, almost every time Québec was mentioned, it was to index that it, unlike the English majority, was faring rather well in creating its own films, and therefore, a sense of Canadianness:

For general film entertainment, Canadians want commercial features; and in this field there is practically nothing produced in Canada. Promising developments in feature films Canadian in character are taking place in Quebec; but English-speaking audiences are still exposed to strange Hollywood versions of a Canada they never thought or wished to see. (Massey Report 1951: 59)

Yet, it was this very linguistic, racial, religious and geographic diversity upon which Canada could draw to assert its uniqueness in the face of a linguistically based Americanization. And so, diversity, linguistic or otherwise, became the hallmark of Canadian culture. In a precursory move to bilingualism and multiculturalism, already, in 1951, funding the arts, was about building a distinct if diverse common Canadian culture:

But tradition is always in the making and from this fact we draw a second assumption: the innumerable institutions, movements and individuals interested in the arts, letters and sciences throughout our country are now forming the national tradition of the future. Through all the complexities and diversities of race, religion, language and geography, the forces which have made Canada a nation and which alone can keep her one are being shaped. These are not to be found in the material sphere alone. Physical links are essential to the unifying process but true unity belongs in the realm of ideas. (The Massey Report 1951: 4)

What Canadian diversity meant, at that time, is a matter of debate. A small section of the report is dedicated to the information that various “Indian groups” provided on the Indian

---

19 It could seem paradoxical today to state, as the Report does, that Quebec arts were producing Canadianess. Up until the rise of Quebec nationalism in the 1960s, Québécois were grouped, along with other Canadian francophone communities, as “Les Canadiens-Français”, a term that has since fallen out of usage, except in academic circles to refer to the historical period between 1608 and the 1960s.
Arts and Craft. These groups prove to be groundbreakers in their approach to the politics of cultural recognition. The Report quotes a Special Study on the Contemporary Art of the Canadian Indian (Hawthorn and Hawthorn date unspecified, 59, in Massey Report, 1951: 239) where it stipulates that: “There is still a widespread ignorance about Indian Culture. The movies and the comics provide the only general knowledge to many people.” The commissioners then go on to report, in what would become a common theme of the cultural revival and survival movements – the need to invest in the arts so that minority groups are 1) capable of representing themselves to the community at large (and therefore capable of disrupting stereotypes) and 2) capable of ensuring the reproduction of the minority community through “conscientisation”:

This general indifference and ignorance on the part of the white population of Canada is matched by increasing indifference on the part of the Indians themselves to their native traditions and their native arts. (…) There was general agreement that the younger generation is turning away from the traditional crafts, and that some of the rarer such as the silver work and the argillite carving of the Pacific Coast may disappear completely before long. (Massey Report 1951: 239)

It has to be said, however, that aside from the “two linguistic cultures”, mentions of cultural diversity hardly ever appeared in the report, except in some passing comments. The commissioners received briefs by the Canadian Jewish Congress, and, elsewhere, defined diversity in terms of “national groups” in the following way:

Many national groups are preserving their own traditions and blending skilfully into a Canadian pattern, including of course, the original French communities and the disciples of St. George, St. Andrew, St. Patrick and St. David. Nor is regionalism confined to those from overseas. Maritimes Associations are found everywhere except in the Atlantic Provinces and, of course, French-speaking groups flourish in English-speaking areas, and vice versa. Such groups by their existence show the diversity within our unity. (ibidem: 67)

The biggest use of “unity in diversity”, in fact, seems to be oriented towards the differences between English and French-speaking Canadians. References to these two
communities are consistent throughout the report and help construct the two as being somewhat distinct, as in the example below, which delves into the differences between English and French-speaking painters invested in abstract art:

This new school contains both English and French-speaking painters, although artists recognize certain differences between them. The former, we are told, convey more clearly in their painting their intellectual experiences and their sense of the uncertainty of the times in which we live. Their French colleagues express more joyously their delight in life, in thought and in emotion. Both are equally remote from romantic naturalism. (The Massey Report 1951: 206)

While it is unclear how the commissioners came to these conclusions (which fail to account for some arts movement in Québec such as a group of painters and writers centered around Paul-Émile Borduas who painted automatist pieces and, in 1948, co-signed a manifesto, Refus global (1991), in which they rejected all forms of social constraints), we see here the commissioners reify the view, held by undisclosed members of the general public, that there is a fundamental difference between English-speaking and French-speaking artists in Canada. The commissioners, in their own ways, are straddling the tensions of nationalist discourse on two fronts: how to recognize the organized political entity which is French Canada while legitimating government investment in the production of a Canadian culture (which includes French Canada).

3.5 Two nationalisms: French Canada’s turn to State infrastructure

It comes as no surprise, then, that in a dialogical move, both the French Canadian nationalists and the commissioners of the Massey Report borrowed on the same definition of “national culture”, and struggled over the questions of how to construct national boundaries and who should be responsible for their protection. The policy war that ensued after the publication of the Massey Report between the federal government, French nationalists and, subsequently, the province of Québec also points to the
interconnectedness of the politics of nationalisms: that identities are as much the product of internal social processes as relational ones (Taboada-Leonetti 1999). My analysis of the Massey Report and the reaction of the journalists of L’Action nationale highlights the ways in which State investment in cultural policies was driven by and a part of social processes linked to modernity. It serves to debunk the myth, often reproduced today, that before the 1960s, French Canadians were massively and structurally oppressed by an all-powerful Canadian State. Claude Couture, for instance, studied liberal economic movements in Québec to show that economic modernity was a site of social struggle throughout the 20th century in Québec as elsewhere (1991). He also argues that the myth of oppression often obscures the fact that Québec was far from being “backward” as some commentators make it out to be. In that case, as in the reaction to the Massey Report, what emerges is a dialogue (albeit conflictual) as to how Canada, French Canadians and later Québécois and Franco-Canadian communities should enter modernity, with all the actors feeling that culture, be it Canadian or French Canadian, was in need of protection, and that nationhood was the organizing political unit for a State. What nationhood was, however, and how it should be instituted, was at the core of the debates.

By the time Québec nationalism became a stake for French Canadians (and the federal government), both the federal and Québec States had already accepted the premise that nationalism was a matter of education, immigration, population, language and folk and modern artistic expression. Both Canadian and French Canadian nationalists

20 Here is one such example of how the 1960s cultural revolution has been conceptualized: L’essor du mouvement nationaliste québécois dans les années 1960 a impliqué la destruction de la vieille identité canadienne-française, basée comme elle l’était sur ses trois piliers traditionnels : la langue, l’Église et l’agriculture. Cette identité s’était construite pour défendre la culture contre celle du Canadien anglais agressive, assimilatrice, moderne et puissante. (Morris, 1994 : 100).
relied on the idea that cultures were groups of individuals unified by some common
thread: be it language, geography, cultural habits, heritage, etc. As we have seen, the
commissioners of the *Massey Report* were highly invested in nationalist ideas when they
lobbied the federal government for a (fund-granting) Canadian Council for the Arts. For
them, it was a matter of offering a Canadian perspective to international civilization

The commissioners and French Canadian nationalists, of course, had not invented
nationalism. To establish a link between Canadian nationalism, culture, language and
artistic practices, they borrowed from historical academic and political understandings of
national and cultural differences which, themselves, were objects of study in post-
Second-World-War Europe: with civilizational and moralizing undertones of colonialism,
European and American scholars sought to understand Nation-States, as though nations
were entities that pre-existed social interactions, processes and institutionalization.
However, in 1951, Canada, to paraphrase the commissioners “did not have the luxury of
having its own language” and its culture was too much the result of migration to appear
‘natural’. Canadian identity was something to be forged, funded, and protected. In other
words – and far be it from me to grant the Commissioners any Deleuzian forethought –
Canada was in the process of becoming.

So is it any wonder that Québec and Franco-Canadian nationalists also sought to
protect culture from American and Anglo-Canadian influence? The picture painted by the
*Massey Report* of Québec and Franco-Canadian communities is one of relative cultural
dynamism. As I stated above, the Québec musical, dramatic and cinematographic arts
were portrayed as being protected by virtue of the fact that the majority of Québécois
spoke French. Is it possible then, that, from the 1970s, Québec nationalism was a
response to the increased urbanization and multilingualization of Québécois as well as to
the institutionalization of Canadian nationalism (albeit a Canadian nationalism that
included Québec)? No matter what, it is clear that by the time of the 1969 *Official
Languages Act*, Canada had an already established tradition of linking nation to culture,
to language and to artistic production.

So it is that two visions of nationalism were at odds at the time of the *Massey
Report*. One advocated for more State intervention, where the other advocated first for
less, then for intervention from a different type of State. One had to cope with diversity
while the other was grounded in homogeneity. These two visions created dissention even
between French-Canadians, as the conflicts that led to the dissolution of the Ordre de
Jacques Cartier, in 1963, demonstrated (McLaughlin and Heller forthcoming). This is to
say that the new urban French Canadian elite increasingly felt, like the commissioners of
the *Massey Report*, that the best way to protect French Canadian culture was through
State intervention. The question, for them, was which kind of State could best protect
French-Canadian interests (This, in turn, led to the consolidation of what was to become
the Parti Québécois and to the creation of the *Cultural Development Policy for Québec*).

What followed the *Massey Report* is that the Canadian State, in order to maintain
its claims over rising Québec and French Canadian nationalism, started investing in
bilingualism according to the terms of the French Canadian nationalists (protecting the
French language and communities on the homogenizing understanding of a culture) while
at the same time investing in a bilingual and multicultural metadiscourse.

In subsequent years, French Canadians and, later, Québécois and Franco-
Canadians, continued to harness the assimilationist argument to contest federal
interference in the field of culture, and argue for specific rights for linguistic minorities. In Québec, the policy war contributed to rising sovereignist sentiment. By 1963, the tensions were such that the federal government mandated the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in order to see how linguistic dualism could be institutionalized as an integral part of Canadian nationalism. Laurendeau (who was then directing the daily paper *Le Devoir*) was named as one of the two commissioners, along with Arnold Davidson Dunton (also a Montreal-based journalist). The result of this commission was the adoption, in 1969, of the *Official Language Act*, in which the federal government decided to invest, through the State Secretariat, in Franco-Canadian artistic activities and, eventually, to recognize, through Heritage Canada, that it had the obligation to “enhance the vitality” of francophone communities in minority situation (OLA 1988; da Silva et Heller 2009).

The unfolding of events raises a number of questions about the extent to which State intervention, in Canada, Québec and Franco-Canadians communities came about as a result of discursive practices: did the new secular nationalist ideology bring about Statism or were the new conditions of social organizations warranted by outside processes (industrialization, urbanization and mediatization?) Similarly, how do discourses of neoliberalism and globalization serve, today, to present neoliberalization and globalization as the inevitable conditions of the reproduction of social categories? What belongs to ideology, discourse and agency and what belongs to uncontrollable and unpredictable social and material processes? I argue, in the next chapter, that looking into the question of how government policy is thought out, carried out and appropriated helps understand the mediation between ideology and social structure.
4. “Merci pour la cash”: State Producing Community Producing State

4.1 Conceptualizing the State

The modernization of the Franco-Canadian community was based in large part on a movement which brought the recognition of language rights as part of the modern State’s mandate. Government action, be it that of Canada, Québec or New-Brunswick, was perceived to be an important catalyst of the redistribution of power relations amongst language communities. The basis for the rights-based movement stemmed from a colonial discourse which enshrined British and French descendants as Canada’s “two founding nations”. As Canada moved from being a part of the British Empire to being a State, religion and then language became the symbols of the transmission of francophone culture. The bicultural and bilingual literature of the 1960s took these language communities to be pre-existing, quasi-biological entities: study after study, after all, demonstrated that one’s life chances varied based on the first language spoken (where bilingualism did very little to buffer the inequalities between French as a first language bilinguals and English as a first language bilinguals).

The resources of the State were harnessed by francophone language communities to ensure the institutionalization and protection of French-speaking spaces. The absence in Canada of a unified territorialized francophone space was at the center of debates around how the resources of the State should be mobilized. Québec souverainistes, borrowing from the leading conception of States as entities either representing or producing homogeneous citizenships, felt that only Québec as a State could truly protect Francophones and the French language in North America. As a result, the Canadian State invested in bilingualism to maintain its legitimacy in the face of threats to its unity.
(alongside with an investment in the production of Canadian symbols, such as the Canadian flag, the Canadian national anthem, etc.). The 1969 Official Languages Act was Canada’s compromise: it would institutionalize linguistic dualism on terms that could neutralize the sovereignty movement’s claim that only Québec could protect French in North America, by granting rights to all Francophones within the territory. It would also borrow on the French Nationalist’s understanding of the links between language and culture to position itself as a producer of a minority francophone art scene. Under the welfare State, arts and culture were understood as a fundamental part of the project of community and nation-building.

Much has changed, however, in the mandate of the federal government since the economic crisis of the 1980s and the emergence of neoliberalism as an economic doctrine and political ideology. In an ideology where the economic market is understood to be the proper regulator of social life, the federal government now strives to rally neoliberal imperatives with a linguistic mandate that was mapped out under welfare regimes. As neoliberalism puts emphasis on individual “employability”, the tension, for federal and provincial governments, is how to do neoliberal policy for community purposes. I argue that, in order to resolve this tension, francophone communities and State involvement have moved, since the 1988 revision of the Official Languages Act, from a discourse of rights-based protection to one of economic community development. This is bolstered in part by the increased value of linguistic practices and multilingualism in the global economy; by neoliberal transformation in modes of governance from welfare to workfare (Bourdieu 1999; Wacquant 2009); and from a restructuration of the francophone associative network itself, as it responds to and fuels the two other shifts. Both the rights-
based and the new economic discourses share the same aim: ensuring the reproduction of francophone communities. Both discourses are taken up by the same set of State and associative network interlocutors. The difference between these two discourses is in the ways the State’s involvement can be mobilized and the effects the switch in discourses has on francophone linguistic communities. The shift to neoliberalism has rendered the art community sector even more vulnerable to State priorities.

Because of the rights-based history of francophone mobilization in the 1960s and 1970s, there has been a tendency, amongst researchers of Franco-Canadian studies, to conceive of the State’s intervention in the field of linguistic community as a rights-based intervention (see Martel and Pâquet 2008). Much research on Canadian linguistic policy delves into juridical texts, thereby placing the latest State intervention in 1988, when the Official Languages Act was last revised. As a result, some activists have levied critiques against the State: the State, it is felt, is disappearing from the management of Franco-Canadian communities (Nadeau 2009).

Under the means it implemented in 1988 with the revised Official Languages Act and with the growth of neoliberalizing discourse and neoliberalizing policy, the State has shifted from a regime that predominantly protected French by producing spaces for francophone publics to a regime that predominantly invested in marketable francophone products. In this, I argue, the State is now more invested than ever in producing Franco-Canadian identity as a commodity. Technologies of the State in this regard abound, as community consultations, strategic plans and concerted actions are the hallmarks of every government as they define their “Action plans” or “Roadmaps” for linguistic duality (Government of Canada 2003, 2009). This has meant that sectors which were targeted as
“culture-carrying” in the protective discourse are now targeted as “culture-producing” sectors in the community economic development framework. The Franco-Canadian artistic field is at the center of this shift, as the State has been and continues to be the primary funding agency and as community actors are increasingly becoming experts at grant applications. This shift has also boosted the emergence of tourism as a privileged site for State-community partnerships. As such, I would argue that the State is as present as ever in the (re)production of official linguistic communities, only, its mandate is changing and this, in turn, is changing the face of how language communities operate today.

4.2 Ethnographies of governmentality

Many theories of the State posit that the State is the institution which claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of violence over a definite territory and over the totality of the corresponding population (Weber 1965). Weber himself recognized the definition as situational, arguing that this concentration of the means of violence was a recent phenomenon in modes of government. Bourdieu borrowed on Weber’s definition of State to argue that states were institutions capable of naturalising, through reification, their own legitimating discourses (Bourdieu 1999: 57). Declaring that education was the main space where the state, in an act of symbolic violence, imposed its discourses as reality, he gave the example of the failed reform of French orthography of 1990, in France. The state standardization of a linguistic written norm had come to be such an integral part of everyday French lived experience that it felt natural to spell “nenuphar” with a “ph” instead of an “f”. Bourdieu’s analysis, however, conceives of the State as the will of the elite, striving to maintain its position by naturalizing its own practices.
While I recognize that elites within a State can willingly seek to harness the means of the State as a way to give their practices value on the symbolic market, a question remains: are State elites that monolithic? Is Bourdieu not going against Bourdieu in giving an institution an orchestrated will? And even if that were the case, how does one account for the unintended consequences of history, or for some State’s investments in the protection of minorities? For the most part, the concept of an orchestrated State-will fails to account for the Canadian State’s involvement in Franco-Canadian history and its current investment in the production of the Franco-Canadian art scene.

While I agree that States’ actions often result in the naturalization of discourses, I have chosen to take a governmentality approach to various modes of linguistic planning, primarily because governmentality links discourses to knowledge production, to policy making and to subjectivities without the necessity of an orchestrated will, but rather as contingent deployments of power and unintended consequences. The term governmentality originated in Michel Foucault’s work as a way of explaining State and government rationality – and as a way of understanding changes in political regimes (Foucault was interested in the emergence of neoliberalism) (Foucault 1991). Foucault rejected the idea that State power was inherent and that the State operated as a neutral and socially autonomous institution. Since, for Foucault, modernity is characterized by the fact that no power can be held outside of the production of knowledge that sustains it, State power could only be explained as the application of rationality to technologies of government. Foucault was interested in how the State maintained itself by legitimating its own action on social practices (legitimated its conduct of conduct) and what the effect of this continuous and always socio-historically (and economically) contingent legitimation
of power had on the administration and ‘production’ of populations and biopolitical subjects.

Exploring questions of governmentality in the field of language policy is, for me, a means of understanding the legitimating discourses for actions on linguistic grounds. In the neoliberal discourse, and as a result of the practice of community consultation, linguistic identities are established as being linked to the expression of one’s pride, as a way of accessing, maintaining and protecting one’s culture. As such, two notions of “community” collude and collide: one where communities are conceived as autonomous economic actors in the new economy and one where communities are conceived as psycho-social beings (expressed in ideas about the collective conscience). There is not necessarily a contradiction between the two conceptualizations, as neoliberal regimes favour an individualizing understanding of communities as competitive agents of a global economy.

Within the Acadian field, models of ‘healthy linguistic vitality’ rely on the idea that language is constitutive of ‘true monolingual selves’ that can be threatened by multilingual social environments. Tensions arise in the Acadian field between collective rights, “rationalized” economic actors and the construction of cultural identities. Indeed, ideologies of monolingualism are coming under tensions as the State shift from welfare to neoliberal governance of language communities. The global market dismantles ethno-linguistic territorialized linguistic markets by placing emphasis on multilingualism in multiple ways. It is on this ground that I will seek to understand the turn to the commodification of language and identity in Acadian culture by examining the data I collected while working with (and on) the agencies responsible for enhancing the

My approach to governmentality is anchored in Tania Li’s critique of Foucault (Li 2007). Weary of a sociology of rules that conceptualizes individuals as conscious agents of social change, Foucault limits his enquiries to programs and discourses and excludes ethnographic approaches. Li, for her part, integrates Foucault’s conceptualization of subjects as sites where biopolitical power is inscribed. Social actors, as such, can be simultaneously subjects or objects of deployments of power. Li calls for methods where the condition of the emergence of governmental programs are linked to “how programs take hold and change things, while keeping in view their instabilities, fragilities and fractures”. (Li 2007: 276) She also calls for ethnographies that take into account the question of how practices inform the formulation and implementation of governmental programs and finally, ethnographies that track the effects, intended and unintended, of acts and technologies of government. In other words, Li wants to bridge the gap between Foucault’s governmentality and what Foucault felt dominated and technicized contemporary social science: an individualizing understanding of social actors. Li bridges the gap between foucauldian governmentality and ethnography by inserting multiplicity and fluidity into the framework of observable governments and subjects.

Li uses the notion of “assemblages” to conceptualize power relations within governmentality. This notion is helpful to understand the relationships between government and struggles for social representation within the State:

Understanding governmental intervention as assemblages helps to break down the image of government as the preserve of a monolithic state operating as a singular source of power and enables us to recognize the range of parties involved in attempts to regulate the conditions under which lives are lived. (Li 2007: 276)
Li’s understanding of governmental intervention as assemblages situates government as a site of power among many, one that is in collusion and collision with other sites where the conditions under which lives are lived are topics of discussion, intervention and struggle. Operations of States are never monolithic, with unified goals and projects. Instead, States are assemblages of diverse societal projects. A series of these projects are understood, under democratic regimes centered on social inclusion, as culture-based. In Canada, for example, some of the culture-based projects are bilingualism, multiculturalism, indigeneity and anti-racism. These community-to-State agendas interact with each other as well as with other objectives of neoliberal modern States. One of these objectives is the regulation of economic markets.

While States are best conceived as assemblages, they remain, however, central in the institutionalization of types of intervention: where the State is, discourses – and the social networks that can mobilize them – have the means to intervene. I will show in chapter 7 that the involvement of the Canadian State in the production of an Acadian art scene structures who is included and excluded in that space. I would argue, also, that struggles within the State serve to reify the State as a site of power. Therefore, struggles for recognition within and across the various community assemblages within States serve one important effect in liberal democracies: to reassert the legitimacy of the State. This is not to say that State willingly strives to reassert itself, but rather that it is in the assemblages of different locales that State legitimacy is reproduced. In francophone Canada, the investment of the State in the production and protection of communities does indeed create sites of power as social actors struggle to position themselves as the
definers of that identity. Their legitimacy, however, enters in competition with other groups and networks lobbying the State for recognition.

Rather than envisage power as a thing stored in bureaucratic apparatus and the top echelons of the ruling regime from which it spreads outwards across the nation, and downwards into the lives of the populace, the analytic of governmentality asks “how different locales are constituted as authoritative and powerful, how different agents are assembled with specific powers, and how different domains are constituted as governable and administrable.” (Dean 1999: 29 in Li 2007: 276)

For Bourdieu, State policy naturalizes the inherent inequalities of struggles within groups in societies. Consequently, States and their agents are thereby players in the struggles around the reproduction of State legitimacy:

To understand the symbolic dimension of the effect of the state, and in particular what we may call the effect of universality, it is necessary to understand the specific functioning of the bureaucratic microcosm and thus to analyze the genesis and structure of this universes of agents of the state who have constituted themselves into a state nobility by instituting the state, and in particular, by producing performative discourse on the state which, under the guise of saying what the state is, caused the state to come into being by stating what it should be. (emphasis in original, Bourdieu 1999: 71)

In my view, there is no such thing as a single unified State nobility, rather an assemblage of State interlocutors. Yet, the intersection between struggles for access to State nobility and questions surrounding the production of performative discourses on the State leave the power of State as a fragile point of legitimacy – especially in the current transition of a national to a transnational or postnational regime of identities and citizenship. The assembled nature of States make them spaces of struggle and contradictions as agendas set by agents within the State enter into collusion and collision. These spaces of collision – where State intervention enters into tension with the Franco-Canadian associative discourse are what I will analyze in the next section of this chapter.


4.3 Neoliberalizing community

In chapter 3, I established that State intervention in the field of art and culture was first legitimated on the basis of a nationalist moral-educational imperative. A shift to neoliberalism is now observable in the way government works with Franco-Canadian communities (among other communities). The impetus has moved from establishing semi-stable, long-lasting sources of funding (granting operating budgets to community organizations), to flexible government spending that targets specific State-defined problems. This, I argue here, means two things. 1) the State is now more than ever invested in the production of culture 2) Community organizations increasingly need to rely on “project” funding (instead of operating budgets). In this community organizations are increasingly influenced by the priorities of the State. What is at stake is who gets to define culture, how, according to what criteria, established by whom.

Government programs and intervention are often premised on the idea of social progress. This means that priorities established elsewhere can transcend different spheres and spaces of government intervention. As such, local art groups can access funding from the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, for instance, by working with Neo-Canadian artists. Much the same way, immigration agencies can access Official languages funding by targeting francophone immigration. More significantly for my field work, certain programs favor the artistic activities that showcase indigenous artists... or that minimally make room for a positive representation of indigenous people in their work. These programs are premised on the idea that government is responsible for Canadian social cohesion.

Throughout my fieldwork, I attempted to track various documents pertaining to how associative networks ask for government grants. In the 1970s, when associative
networks started mobilizing the means of the State to produce modern francophone art and develop tourism, grants usually asked for a brief abstract of the event and an “amount requested”. The grant applications from the 1970s and 80s that I perused were never more than one legal size page and often involved writing directly to politicians in Ottawa or Fredericton so that they would themselves put pressure on the granting agencies. This, of course, raises many questions about the process of decision-making and lack of transparency. It was also common practice for these agencies to automatically give half the amount requested. There was no need to define results or public development.

Community organizations stayed relatively in charge of the events they organized.

Today, it is fairly common for grant applications to span from 6 to 20 pages, with specific questions about projects, mandates, public developments, etc. (See appendix 1 for a New-Brunswick Operational Grant Program application). Here is one anecdote, told by a participant as we were simply having coffee, which best represents the spirit of the change: in the 1980s, a gallery director allegedly wrote a short letter to the State Secretariat (the government agency whose cultural mandate was later replaced by the Ministry of Canadian Heritage). In it, he asked for a sum of money and signed off: “Merci pour la cash” (“thanks for the cash”). In contrast, the participant I was speaking with, herself a festival director, had just spent 70 hours working on a grant proposal, where she asked for $10 000. She had no means of lobbying, as it was now frowned upon, and she was hoping, but unsure, that she would be able to get the total amount of money requested because of recent changes to the program. In fact, because she was successful at her job, this might mean, according to what some government agents told me, that they would systematically cut part of her funding because, on the one hand, they
believed strong applicants could pull off successful events without full funding and, on the other, they wanted to make sure that community organizers sought funding outside of government. (In an argument reminiscent of neo-liberal cuts to welfare programs, not granting the amounts requested was perceived as a way to ensure that community organizers never relied solely on the State for support). The government’s shift from cultural to economic investment renders the action of government as producer of francophone communities more visible: far from being absent since the amendment of the Official Languages Act in 1988, government is an active partner in the production of francophone communities.

4.4 Harnessing the power of State

In the 1960s, the Canadian State was increasingly dependant on immigration to expand its workforce while simultaneously confronted with the emergence of Québécois nationalism, a discourse which emphasized that the only way North American Francophones, and more specifically Québec Francophones, could enter modernity was by creating an independent State within North America. Indeed, much was changing in Canada, Québec and within francophone communities, with increased urbanization and industrialization. The traditional ways of doing French Canadian identity were being undone by the modern economy and this put a stress on the French Canadian elite. This would lead a faction of them to argue for more State or recognition within the State (McLaughlin et Heller forthcoming; see Brubaker et al 2006, for a Hungarian equivalent). This was at a time when colonial and postcolonial struggles had participated in the advent of the recognition of individual and collective rights by the welfare State, through an investment in a politics of recognition:
The twentieth-century history of the modern nation-state in the Western world revolved centrally around protracted struggles for recognition of citizenship rights to wider sections of the population – women, the working class, nonwhite individuals and communities, immigrants and so on – but also the granting of a wider and deeper set of rights and entitlements. In T.H. Marshall’s classical account, the notion of citizenship began with civil rights, for example, rights to property and to a fair trial in which proper individual citizens could claim habeas corpus (…), which curtailed the exercise of arbitrary state violence by defining the body of the citizen as an integral part of the sovereign body of “the people” and thus entitled to the process. The next phase was that of formal and political rights to vote, to freedom of speech and assembly, in order to create political bodies representing the people and the nation; and the third phase was the social rights of the twentieth-century welfare states, in which citizenship meant access to an ever widening set of economic entitlements. (Blom Hansen and Stepputat 2005: 10, drawing on Marshall 1977 and Taylor 1994)

Confronted with an important francophone political lobby, the Canadian State quickly moved to redefine itself as a bilingual society, culminating with the *Official Languages Act* of 1969. The Québec sovereignty lobby also meant that francophone communities from outside of Québec were left to redefine themselves outside of the traditional bounds of the French Canadian Nation and its then-dominant – though often contested- ideology of *Survivance* (survival) which was centralized around the Church (Allaire 1993; Couture 1991). This ideology had kept Francophones at the margins of the Canadian modern economy and outside of State institutions (Juteau 1999).

The Province of Québec, which, in the late 1950s and 60s, had increasingly been mobilized by Franco-Québécois and Franco-Canadians to support francophone education and culture across Canada was in the midst of redefining its mandate from a French-Canadian policy approach to a Québécois and Francophone Hors-Québec one. This redefinition of Québec’s involvement was at the centre of much debate as to the possibilities of existence of Franco-Canadian minorities and the priorities of the Québécois polity. At the precise moment when, with modernity in the balance, ethno-linguistically defined communities needed State infrastructures, the Canadian State, in
turn, needed Franco-Canadian communities to sustain its legitimacy as it faced the threat of Québec sovereignty. The result? As Heller points out, the Canadian State suddenly had to produce Franco-Canadian associative networks out of the midst of the old French-Canadian elites and an emerging mobilized and educated Franco-Canadian population:

While some of the members of the old [francophone] elite struggled to preserve the older framework, most were quick to follow Québec’s lead as best they could, taking advantage of Québec’s threat to the Canadian Confederation to press the federal government for rights and resources. Indeed, the Canadian government understood rapidly that it needed to undermine Quebec’s argument by showing that it was possible to live as a francophone anywhere in Canada, not just in Quebec, and that that could mean living as a francophone in Quebec’s terms, that is, as a monolingual (at least as far as lay within the limits of State control). The Official Languages Act of 1969 Put French on a footing of equality with English as an official language and committed the federal government to the provision of federal services in both official languages. […] Finally, it developed funding programs, largely through the culture ministry, for the maintenance and development of French language, culture and identity outside of Quebec.

This system required the identification of interlocutors at the level of what came to be understood as the francophone minority community. (Heller, forthcoming)

The State was involved in the production of communities which in turn, would serve to (re)produce the State. The minority francophone communities emerged as the interlocutors, among other sets of interlocutors, of the Canadian (and eventually provincial) State.

Decision-making within francophone communities thus shifted from “L’Église à l’État”, from Church to State (Allaire, 1993) at a moment when Western States were invested in questions of welfare and social justice (as a way to reassert their legitimacy when confronted with an increased investment of differenciated political lobbies and collectivies for access to the powers of the State). What we are witnessing now is a reinscription of the “Politics of Recognition” (Taylor 1994; Fraser 2003) into neoliberal
economic regimes. From “protector” of minorities, the Canadian State has attempted, with the investment of francophone community actors, to become a “producer” of francophone community development (da Silva et Heller 2009.)

What has emerged from my fieldwork is a series of interlocking exchanges between agents of the State invested in promoting either Franco-Canadian art (often linked to tourism), the associative networks which emerged from the 1970s onward as a result of this political and politicized dialogue, and individuals invested in careers in the art or, eventually, in the development of tourism (or both). As private capital and the development of markets for francophone products remain unstable, it has meant that francophone communities have made themselves a little niche as agents and interlocutors of the State, but it has also left them vulnerable to the priorities of the State apparatus as it moved from welfare to neoliberal agendas. The communities themselves had to move from a discourse indexing economic and cultural oppressions as the legitimating principle for State involvement to discourses of economic development as their early mobilizations started showing results for some upwardly mobile Francophones.

4.5 Selling language communities

The Canadian State’s first forays into producing official language communities were based on a “culturalist” understanding of the links between language and identity (see chapter 2). Lobbies for francophone representation had a long-standing tradition of relying on the Canadian Constitution of 1867 which, in an attempt to resolve political tensions within Québec, had defined Canada as built on “two founding nations” (Levine 1990). The minority situation of French Canadians and the immigration laws up until the 1970s (which restricted immigration to Europeans and Commonwealth countries only)
produced a homogenization of French Canadian identity: French Canadians were positioned and positioned themselves as descendants of French European colonization.

In the shift from Church to State, the actors of the communities themselves felt that what needed protection was “French language” and so institutional emphasis was placed on protecting the language through education, and insuring its visibility through cultural animation activities. As a result, a series of modern art institutions were created in l’Acadie in the 1970s, from publishing houses like the now defunct Les Éditions d’Acadie, to theatre companies and art galleries, to the funding of local festivals (Farmer 1996). Since then, a series of interlocking changes in the State, the economy and the community has transformed the ways in which both State and community are invested in (re)producing Franco-Canadian communities (da Silva and Heller 2009).

One such change was an increased emphasis on government responsibility and accountability and the subsequent appearance of indicators and results in the ways State operates. The 1969 draft of the OLA did not contain any accountability measures. Up until 1988, when the law was reviewed to include specific governmental responsibilities, the success of Canada’s investment in Official Bilingualism was measured primarily by indirect results: were the policies helping to curtail language transfers – known in Canadian and Québécois discourse as assimilation? Calculating language transfers can be conceived as a tool of governmentality, one which has evolved in Canada since 1969 – but is used to measure the discrepancies between “maternal” language and the first language still used and understood today – with debates about what to do with self-declared “bilingual” applicants. Year after year, community actors requested more resources and more State involvement as language transfers rates remained in the vicinity
of 40% within most francophone minority communities – with the exception of New-
Brunswick, where it was approximately 8% - and has been decreasing (Roy 1993). Rates
of linguistic assimilation were objects of academic and lay debates: Québec sovereignty
advocates mobilized the data to index the failures of the federal State, Franco-Canadian
media published panic-ridden articles, associative networks lobbied for more diversified
kinds of funding and a body of research within francophone studies contested the
representativeness of the data.

In 1988, francophone community organizations lobbied so that the federal
government would be accountable for its commitment to protecting linguistic minorities.
The federal government revised the OLA to define the responsibilities of federal
institutions and to include Part VII, the Language Minority Act which stipulates that:

(1) The Minister of Canadian Heritage shall take such measures as that Minister
considers appropriate to advance the equality of status and use of English and French in
Canadian society and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, may take
measures to
(a) enhance the vitality of the English and French linguistic minority communities in
Canada and support and assist their development;
(b) encourage and support the learning of English and French in Canada;
(c) foster an acceptance and appreciation of both English and French by members of the
public;
(d) encourage and assist provincial governments to support the development of English
and French linguistic minority communities generally and, in particular, to offer
provincial and municipal services in both English and French and to provide
opportunities for members of English or French linguistic minority communities to be
educated in their own language;
(e) encourage and assist provincial governments to provide opportunities for everyone in
Canada to learn both English and French;
(f) encourage and cooperate with the business community, labour organizations,
voluntary organizations and other organizations or institutions to provide services in
both English and French and to foster the recognition and use of those languages;
(g) encourage and assist organizations and institutions to project the bilingual character
of Canada in their activities in Canada or elsewhere; and
(h) with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into agreements or arrangements
that recognize and advance the bilingual character of Canada with the governments of
foreign states. (emphasis added, Government of Canada, 1988
http://lois.justice.gc.ca/en/showdoc/cs/O-3.01/bo-ga:1_VI::bo-
From that moment on, Canadian Heritage, with the help of its community partners undertook a series of restructurations that would distribute (horizontalize in government-speak) the responsibility for language minority rights across federal departments and the provincial governments (da Silva and Heller 2009).

Meanwhile, the Canadian State increasingly invested in neoliberal economic ideologies, as it cut some social programs and increasingly invested in the production of economically competitive subjects (for a global economy). Doing government suddenly meant being accountable to tax payers by showing results, as the concept of sustainability, borrowed from environmentalism, was applied to the economy and to linguistic communities. The shift from discourses of well-being to economic discourses colluded with the agendas of some of the francophone actors, who felt that the missing piece to the language policy, the one that would ensure the retention of French-speaking bodies within francophone networks, was community economic development (www.rdée.ca). The failure of the language policies to actually counter assimilation had brought a group of francophone actors to take stock of the role of the economy in the processes that affected francophone communities, from urbanization to the languages required in the global economic market. The economy had indeed been one of the missing elements of the mobilizations of the 1960s and 70s and the implementations of the federal and New Brunswick language laws, all the while being one of the core issues affecting francophone communities throughout.

One of the results of the shift in priorities was that economic profit and public development were added to the State’s calculation of the results of its engagement with respect to linguistic policies. Under the impetus of francophone leaders and associations,
the State now conceived of its role not only as a protector of linguistic communities but also one of promoting economic development. Activities meant to bolster francophone identities, which once had to reach and mobilize ‘potentially francophone’ or ‘francophone’ bodies to the ‘francophone cause’, were now expected to turn a profit.

Under this new regime, arts and culture were no longer the priority that they had been in the past. There was, however, already an established network of associations working in the arts sector. And so, today, the minority francophone arts sector finds itself having to justify its funding on the basis of its positive economic impact (Association acadienne des artistes professionnel.le.s du Nouveau-Brunswick 2009).

In so doing, it is confronted to the laws of the economic market and it is witnessing the emergence of tourism as a privileged space for government projects with or against which it suddenly has to position itself. The Réseau de développement économique et d’employabilité, a federal agency specifically geared towards francophone economic development, has included tourism as one of its four sites of intervention (along with the knowledge economy, rural development and youth entrepreneurship). The Société nationale des Acadiens, along with the Atlantic Canada’s Opportunities agency, sponsored market development research for Acadian cultural tourism. This research led to the implementation of the Commission du tourisme acadien du Canada Atlantique, founded in 2001. Tourism is indeed one of the privileged sectors of the neoliberal turn to community management, as this sector’s commercial goals are seen to coordinate the economic imperative of the State with the cultural and rural priorities of francophone decision-makers.
One of the effects of the change in the State’s measures of its intervention is that it is broadening the criteria of how francophone intervention can be considered “successful”. Now, the State can measure the success of its investment by counting how many people attend events, by how many jobs are created or by the amount of products that circulate worldwide, for example.

As State discourses shifted from welfare to workfare, the basis for the legitimation of State investment in francophone communities shifted from a question of culture to one of economy. As this happened, francophone community organizations such as the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes and a group of francophone government workers justified the continued basis of government investment by stating that francophone communities were coming under challenge not because of oppression but due to a changing economy. The State’s neoliberal discourses are limited within a framework where it has to protect and produce linguistic duality, in virtue of its own constitution and for its own legitimacy. Originally, the art scene was left out of the new economic discourse, which led, as we shall see below, a francophone lobby to argue that art fostered economic development.

4.6 The State’s understanding of francophone communities

Contemporary theoretical literature on States, civil society and cultural diversity has shifted, in the 1990s from a discourse where States and institutions (health care, public schools, citizenship) were conceived as (ideally) neutral producers of civic life, to one where States are participants in the reproduction of inequalities (Bourdieu 1982, 2005). Indeed, at the end of the 19th century, the legitimating discourses of the State constituted it as a space of freedom and equality, one where individuals should be served
by the State regardless of race, religion, ethnicity or gender and, might I add, language (Gutmann 1994). In this framework, the post-second world war emergence of community politics could be cast as a service of a still neutral State to its communities (Taylor 1994). In the State-as-neutral-provider stance, cultural belonging was constructed as a basic need: cultural identity was a psycho-social concept that ensured the well-being of citizens. This supposed that culture and identity happened outside the State, and that the State did little more than enable the cultural expression of bounded collective consciousness. I argue instead that the emergence of a politics of recognition stems from the intrinsic participation of States in the reproduction and transformation of inequalities, and, as such, multiculturalism and multilingualism laws are not in contradiction with the State’s investment in offering freedom and equality to the bodies within the polity. States have never been neutral in deployments of power relation: even exclusion from State representation can in and of itself be the basis for the organization of alternative identities.

Yet, the omnipresence of a discourse of neutrality meant that (francophone or artistic) agents of the State were often positioned themselves as acting according to the voice of bounded and defined communities (Francophones, artists, tourism entrepreneurs, etc.). Maintaining the myth of the neutral State even as the State invested more deeply in the redistribution of power through the production of community has meant that States have had recourse to a series of State technologies. For Francophone Canada, the leading technology is community consultation: a process whereby government departments hire consultants to meet with key community leaders to access the priorities of the
community. These community leaders are usually chosen from the networks of associations that were instituted under the welfare regime.

While this serves to solidify and reify the established community network, it also enables public servants invested in the official linguistic minority communities to claim that the community was dictating the directions of State intervention. (Of course, how this community is itself a site of political struggle was not problematized – nor the fact that it was produced by the State). This positioning of the State in regard to its linguistic and economic action meant that agencies such as the Fédération des communautés francophones et acadiennes (FCFA), a francophone lobby which is also the leading interlocutor to the State, could present itself as the voice of the community. In 2006, the FCFA organized the Sommet des communautés francophones et acadiennes, which, significantly, was named: “mille regards, une vision” (a thousand gazes, one vision). This Sommet would become fundamental for the arts and culture sector. This sector lobbied to be recognized as a legitimate space for economic development by the Canadian State.

The goal of the Sommet was to produce a consensus around the directions the FCFA felt that it should take in its dialogue with government agencies. The whole event was therefore orchestrated to reify the direction that many associative and State francophone agents (such as the federal Réseau de développement économique et d’employabilité) had previously undertaken: « notre gouvernance: ensemble et efficaces »; « notre espace: vivre en français 24h sur 24 »; « notre population: au-delà du million en 2017 »; « notre influence: engagés, écoutés et entendus! »; and « notre développement: investir, innover, réussir ». (“Our governance: together and effective”);
“Our space: living in French 24 hours a day”; “Our population: beyond a million in 2017”; “Our influence: committed, heard and understood!”; “Our development: invest, innovate, succeed”).

Since the sectors identified as priorities by the FCFA excluded a specific space for art, an art workers’ lobby, spearheaded by the Association des artistes professionels du Nouveau-Brunswick and formed at the Chantiers généraux des arts et de la culture in Caraquet New-Brunswick, mobilized the economic development discourse, to contest what it felt was an unnecessary exclusion from the allocation of funds for economic development (and from the general priorities of the FCFA). Given the new economic discourses, artists and art associations felt it was important to recognize that the arts were a privileged space of economic development. Clearly, the voice of the FCFA, the privileged partner of the federal government, was understood to be representative of the means of government. The result of the lobby was successful, as “cultural industries” were included as a priority sector in the final draft of the FCFA’s Plan stratégique communautaire (FCFA 2008: 13) and as the Conservative government’s Roadmap 2008-2013 stressed the importance of francophone arts and culture as a privileged site of both francophone expression and economic development:

[The Roadmap for Linguistic Duality] invests in priority sectors, including:

- health;
- justice;
- immigration;
- economic development; and
- arts and culture. (Government of Canada, 2008)

In this case, government discourse (of economic development) prompted action from the part of francophone art community leaders which reified the discourse of the State. And yet, since the lobby was carried through the government’s community partner,
agents of government are wont to describe their own work as stemming from a series of consultations with “the” community. Fred, from the Réseau de développement économique et d’employabilité, a government economic development organization, legitimated all government action on the basis of the community:

Fred: moi j’ai vu / j’ai vu où est-ce que ça fonctionne bien / deux choses / des personnes engagées / du leadership et j’ai vu la communauté se prendre en main / les solutions que les gens apportent- là / ça marche pas / il faut que ça vienne de la base
Sonya: mm
Fred: il faut que ça vienne de la base X

Fred I have seen I have seen that where it really works well / two things / committed people / leadership and I have seen the community take itself under control / the solutions that people bring – là / it doesn’t work / it has to be grassroots
Sonya: mm
Fred: it has to come from the grassroots

The process of community consultations was perceived as giving legitimacy to the work of government, even as it erases and depoliticizes the role that government plays in producing its interlocutors. Few government agents, indeed, question the authenticity of the communities or the power dynamics within them. It also means that some community associations are positioned to be privileged interlocutors to the government. Yet, governmental conceptions of who the community is – or in governmentality speak, on how to conceive of population- do inform the orientation and application of programs. As such, funding agencies who have a population defined on broad criteria (such as, for example, Canadian artists), will not always take the particularities of the Franco-Canadian situation into consideration. Similarly, government priorities still permeate the reports, programs and documents as government buzz-words often guide the consultations (it is as simple, after all, as hiring a consultant who shares the government’s priorities). The consequence is that community organizations often find themselves at the
“mercy” of government guidelines. In the following excerpt, Diane, a media festival coordinator shares her experience:

Diane  c’est sûr que dans le secteur dans lequel on travaille on est très euh / dépendant des subventions / c’est pas un secteur qui va jamais être auto-suffisant là / faut pas se leurrer là // mais c’est ça c’est que ce qui arrive c’est qu’il y a pas nécessairement de complémentarité entre les programmes de financement

MM  ouais

Diane  mais à un moment donné il y a des trucs à la mode (…) dans le cas de FestiDoc / c’est une période un peu d’incertitude parce que / ben on saura qu’est-ce que ça va donner / (Leur bailleur de fond principal) s’est restructuré pis on était garanti le même montant d’argent pour les derniers trois ans / fait-que là cette année il y ont comme / changé leurs critères (…) c’est clair même si ils veulent pas le dire que / ils veulent financer essentiellement / ce qu’ils veulent c’est faire de l’argent

MM  ah ok ouais

Diane  si ils pouvaient juste pas financer les festivals / je pense qu’ils feraient / ils veulent financer les marchés / ils voudraient juste financer les très gros festivals où-ce qui se brasse de la grosse argent puisque tu fais des co-prod international pis si tu / finalement ils veulent financer le commercial / le cinéma d’auteur là / ils nous encouragent pas à en présenter parce que tout ce qui compte / c’est la performance la performance / combien d’auditoires que t’as souvent c’est chiant / parce que si t’es à Montréal ben c’est sûre que tu peux faire pas mal d’auditoire qu’à l’extérieur (…) mais en même temps quand tu regardes la façon dont c’est présenté leurs critères / il y a quand même deux critères sur trois qui touchent / c’est comme / faire du perfectionnement professionnel / mais c’est toujours dans l’optique de faire de la co-production pour faire de l’argent

…

Diane  on est à la merci des des modes des bailleurs de fonds / parce que tu regardes (le bailleur de fond) / pis je veux dire on va pas le faire au festival mais / (le bailleur de fond) c’est l’auditoire l’auditoire

MM  ok

Diane  ben / comment-ce que tu fais rentrer des salles pleines / tu mets des films populaires commerciaux (…) nous-autres on pourrait mettre juste du gros cinéma québécois gras / remplir les salles / pis on remplirait le mandat [du bailleur de fonds] / c’est pas le mandat de Festidoc ça

Diane  it’s true that in the sector in which we work we are very ah / dependant on grants / it’s not a sector that will ever be self-sufficient là / we shouldn’t delude ourselves là // but what happens is that there isn’t necessarily any complementary between the funding programs

MM  yeah

Diane  at one point certain things were fashionable (…) in the case of FestiDoc / it’s a period of uncertainty because / well we’ll see what’ll happen / [their major government partner] is restructuring and we were guaranteed the same amount of money for the last three years / so this year they’ve like / changed the criteria (…) it’s obvious even if they don’t want to say it that / they want to fund essentially / what they want to do is make money

MM  ah ok yeah
For Diane, who has long been involved in the Acadian cultural scene, community organizations do have to navigate the priorities of government agencies. Indeed, funding agencies establish their priorities through rounds and consultations that often involve a bigger set of interlocutors than just the francophone networks, so that it is easy for the cultural mandates of some organizations to get lost in the face of an economic mandate. As Diane states, the new programs of the granting agency which is one of the main funders for her organization are deviating from the mandate of her organization, by putting so much emphasis on turning a profit and reaching wide publics. Her organization was created in the late 1980s and has maintained, over the years, the mandate of providing francophone films to a francophone public while also supporting Acadian film makers (and giving them a platform where they can showcase their work). Yet, the example shows the extent to which community organization and government agencies are both involved in the structuration of the Acadian art scene. In the next section, I will
delve further into how government agents and associative leaders’ understanding of the field of art (and to some extent tourism) informs the very structuration of the field itself.

4.7 Structuring the field

Various levels of government are invested in the production of arts, of community or of tourism for multiple reasons – the leading trope of which seems to be “improving the quality of life” of its population. This section will be examine how different government agents at the federal, provincial and municipal levels envision their jobs as agents of francophone culture, how they set about implementing and defining their mandates and how, in turn, government priorities are intertwined in the structuration of the art scene and the development of francophone communities. Most of the agents interviewed in the course of my fieldwork had dossiers related either to arts, tourism or economic development (and sometimes to art and tourism). Few of them were dedicated specifically to the question of art for francophone communities, while many of the tourism agents did so specifically for the purpose of doing community economic development in francophone regions.

The government has an impact on how associations do their work in the implementation and distribution of grants. The government of Canada was a direct partner to all the Franco-Canadian festivals and events that were included in my fieldwork – even though this was not a criterion upon which I based my selection of events. Provinces often appeared as partners, as did municipalities. Every so often, the Bureau du Québec en Atlantique or the French consulate would be partners, this,

22 In fact, I soon developed a hobby of looking at sponsors everywhere I went, whether or not I attended the festivals, and only once did I find one where the government of Canada wasn’t involved. This festival, a city festival in a community that has been hard hit by the downturn of the lumber industry was funded by the regional and municipal level. The appearance of federal funding after the collapse of the local economy in 2008 makes me believe that soon, the government of Canada will most likely be a partner.
generally in Moncton where both offices are situated. What happens, of course, is that
government programs inform how associations think of their events (see, in particular,
chapter 7). One question I had, then, was how government agencies perceived of their
mandates in regards to identity categorizations.

For Mathilde, a government agent working on a population defined as a region
collections of community inform the attribution of government funding as well as the
types of projects she can, in her view, promote. As such, she herself understands her
work as ensuring a fair representation of the groups within her territory: in this case,
Anglophones, Francophones, Irish and Scot descendants, immigrants and First Nations.
Her work as an agent of a diversified community also impacts how she straddles the
divide between recognizing particular groups’ right to self-representation and the
agency’s region-building mandate. Indeed, economic development agencies,
municipalities and provinces have a mandate to serve the whole of the population,
without creating barriers and inequalities, a mandate that is often a site of debate as to
how to promote and do equality in the face of diversity.

Mathilde  Une des préoccupations que j’ai comme employée [d’une agence] qui dessert
plusieurs groupes linguistiques / c’est d’essayer de construire des ponts ou de
créer des liens entre ces groupes-là / pis j’ai remarqué // ou j’ai j’ai je /
j’avais l’impression qu’il avait pas beaucoup de liens / qui étaient / qui
existaient entre les deux principaux / la communauté francophone pis la
communauté Anglophone / pis en même temps [dans la province] on est
vraiment chanceux / parce que / oui ils travaillent de façon indépendante ou
séparée mais ils ont quand même une certaine volonté de travailler ensemble

Mathilde  one of the preoccupations that I have as an employee of [an agency] which
serves many linguistic groups / is trying to build bridges or create links
between those groups / and I notices // or I have I / I had the
impression that there were not a lot of links / that were / that existed
between the two major / the francophone community and the Anglophone

---

23 In order to protect the identity of the participants, I have blurred some of the boundaries that would make
them identifiable. In this case, what I mean to say is that Mathilde’s population is one informed by
delineated territorial boundaries, and not identity belonging.
Lise Dubois, working on the tensions around questions of bilingualism in New-Brunswick, has shown that francophone community building projects can often be perceived as sites of segregation by the Anglophone majority (Dubois 2003). Government agents therefore often find themselves walking a fine line between representing the perception of the State as a neutral agency (that should promote projects constructed as not favouring anyone in the immediate present) and that of promoting of equity, be that equity conceived as a psycho-social right, as economic social redress or as an intrinsic effect of government action itself. Consequently, government agents who didn’t have a specifically linguistic mandate had a tendency to present “bilingual” events as ideal-type events, which unite communities (The Frye Festival, a literary bilingual festival, often come up in interviews as a good example of an event which unites the population). This view is even inserted in Stéphane Dion’s 2003 Action Plan for Official Languages and Bernard Lord’s 2008 Roadmap for Linguistic Duality:

This Roadmap marks a new start, and invites all Canadians to participate. It aims at allowing Canadians, whatever their official language of choice, to participate fully in Canadian society and to take advantage of linguistic duality today and for the future. As an unprecedented $1.1 billion investment, the Roadmap enhances and expands action across the Government of Canada to increase the benefits of linguistic duality and extend them to all Canadians. It presents new, targeted measures that will have a ripple effect, promoting an approach that contributes to a better understanding among English- and French-speaking Canadians, and to their mutual enrichment. (Government of Canada, 2008)

4.8 Creating publics

Changing the legitimating discourses of the cultural scene, from reaching Francophones to fostering economic development (and ensuring Canadian bilingualism), has also meant that new publics have emerged for Acadian cultural products. On the one
hand, the commodification of culture requires that cultural entrepreneurs expand the
cultures for their product. This was the case, for instance, for the Acadian World Congress
2004, where I was able to observe, with my colleague Mélanie Le Blanc, that the
organizers of the event had been brought by the federal and provincial governments to
define l’Acadie on genealogical—rather than linguistic—terms (McLaughlin and Le
Blanc, forthcoming). This strategy expanded the market for the tourist event beyond the
borders of the 300,000 French-speaking Maritimers to the estimated 3,000,000 Acadian
descendants around the world.

Redefining publics also changes the dynamic of the art scene. In the following
excerpt, Nathalie, who oversaw a government-funded Acadian art exportation plan, tells
the story of how the changing nature of the field, from culture to business, meant that her
organization had a difficult time finding a replacement for her. In short, the challenge was
finding someone who would understand the business side of the globalization of the art
scene from among a plethora of applicants who were trained for the cultural “promotion”
side of it. This involved, for the hiring committee, finding someone who understood the
changing nature of the public for Franco-Canadian products—someone who knew how to
reach buyers and producers:

Nathalie [le plan] était là pour créer des opportunités de rencontre entre des acheteurs et
des producteurs / l’idée était pas de rejoindre le public c’était de rejoindre des
acheteurs donc ça prenait quelqu’un qui comprenait ce concept-là et qui
comprenait le concept des affaires
Mireille c’est pas comme ah on va faire
Nathalie (…) non non c’est pas comme ah on va aller faire des beaux spectacles
Nathalie moi qu’il y ait du public dans la salle c’était pas ma préoccupation / moi ma
préoccupation c’était qu’il y ait des acheteurs importants dans la salle

Nathalie [the plan] was there to create networking opportunities between buyers and
producers / the idea wasn’t to reach the public it was to reach buyers so we
needed someone who understood that concept and who understood the concept of business

Mireille  ah so it not like we will do
Nathalie  no no it’s not like oh we will go over there and present beautiful shows
(…)
Nathalie  for me having a large audience in the hall that wasn’t my preoccupation / my preoccupation was that there be buyers in the room

In chapter 7, I delve further into the complexities of defining «publics» in the new conditions. In short, the francophone associative networks, now reliant on government funding for their reproduction, also frequently had to juggle the different criteria of government programs. In the example above, the government agency and the association overseeing the plan for cultural promotion clearly put emphasis on economic development.

4.9 Who does culture belong to?

The questions surrounding the professionalization of the arts and the emergence of tourism as a site for the reproduction of culture are closely linked to the imbrications of various levels of State in the reproduction of francophone communities since the 1960s. While the involvement of the State in these structures positions State agents as responding to the needs of the community, ethnographic field work shows that the associative networks and State agencies are increasingly partners in the reproduction of francophone communities. The State, in other words, is not a neutral agent in the structuration of francophone communities, but rather an active producer of francophone identity. This isn’t without creating struggles around who gets to define how francophone culture will be reproduced, as arts and culture workers mobilize discourses of economic development to be included in State agendas.
What my ethnography of government has highlighted is how the constitution of identities, the production and reproduction of categories in everyday life are negotiated social processes, where agency is informed by the constraints of structures which are themselves the result of historically situated social processes. For me, this is important as it places the burden of social action and change outside the responsibility and consciousness of social agents conceptualized as liberal individual selves- outside of a frame of individual choice-, and, instead, it highlights social change as the result of the interplay between the subjectivity of governance and the objectification of agents of change. In short, francophone culture is increasingly mobilized and commodified to do economic development by government and community actors alike.

The emergence of government economic actors comes at a time when increasing numbers of Franco-Canadian actors are entering a post-nationalist phase. This impacts who gets to do what with State funding. Furthermore, as we shall see in the next chapter, it is also having an effect on how the field of art is structured at the francophone community level, as business expertise and market-readiness gain in importance for community coordinators and artists.
5. A new economy? The art of working in the arts under changing conditions

In this chapter, I analyze the complexities of doing francophone arts in the new government-community assemblages, under economic regimes that are being restructured by globalization and urbanization. My understanding is that the art scene still relies on its original “cultural” mandate to maintain itself, and that this involves reproducing nationalist ideologies of language in a shifting economic ideological terrain. By this I mean that the “ethnolinguistic” understanding of the purpose of funding the art scene isn’t coming into question. Indeed, I was able to observe that the Acadian art scene does create a demand for francophone workers and can even ensure that community workers can work predominantly in French, even in bilingual urban centers such as Moncton. Participants at all levels (from government to artists) felt that art was a way to ensure the reproduction of the Acadian identity on the global stage. As I discuss in chapter 4, what is changing are the discourses mobilized to legitimate investment in the arts: from one where funding was granted on the grounds of cultural promotion the discourse is now shifting to one of economic development. The shift to economic discourse neutralizes the “cultural” argument: Acadian artists now have to compete as equals with other artists for audience on the global stage. What this means for government agents and their interlocutors is a site of struggle.

Tensions arise because the shift to neoliberal discourses puts the question of economic benefits at the centre of community workers’ preoccupation and pushes forward an idea of the global market as an “equal opportunity” market and some actors argue that redistributive measures are therefore called for if Acadians are to compete on a
The problem for economic developers, art community workers and artist is, however, that the potential market for the Acadian art scene remains limited, even as community organizers and artists reach out to broader publics. Participants at all levels had to navigate the tensions between doing “cultural promotion” and doing “business”. Government agents and their interlocutors were the ones who struggled the most with the tensions that neoliberal governance created for them: the Acadian art scene is far from being able to sustain itself economically and, even with government investment, worker salaries remain well under the national average.

The shift in government discourse which pushes the community organization to rethink the art scene as an “economic development” mandate (rather than a “cultural promotion” one) is drawing in new types of actors into the scene. I begin by looking into the context in which discourses promoting the commodification of Franco-Canadian culture are emerging: the collapse of industrial and resource-based economies, the emergence of a knowledge economy heavily reliant on linguistic skills, and the subsequent increased mobility of francophone workers. I then turn to the structuring discourses of the field of arts, as it is being touted as a way to maintain the Franco-Canadian communities in the globalized economy. Next, I analyze how these discourses have, in turn, an effect on who gets to work the arts, who wants to work them, with what background, in what context and under what conditions, with what linguistic competence. Finally, I look at the tensions that the shift is creating for the government agents and their interlocutors, as they seek to continue to legitimate government investment in the arts and in francophone art in particular.
5.1 Context: from the old economy to changing identity

The idea that economic processes are linked to processes of social categorization and sites of struggle as to how to reproduce identities is far from being new. Pierre Bourdieu has tracked the effects of changing economic structures and regimes on the desperation of marginalized Parisians. In this excerpt, he focuses more particularly on an old working-class neighbourhood:

The inhabitants of Jonquil Street are not unlike the survivors of an immense collective disaster, and they know it. Their reason for existence has disappeared along with their factories: they started work quite naturally, often very early, at the age of 14, after a primary school certificate, following their parents’ footsteps, and they quite naturally assumed their children would follow them. (...) But it was above all their future lost, the continuation an justification of their past, that of their sons and daughters, who are now inevitably headed for an extended time in a secondary school that works just well enough to keep them out of the factory, but most of the time can only offer diplomas worth less and less – which, in this region in crisis, often means unemployment. (Bourdieu, 1999: 6)

If Bourdieu had been writing about the positional suffering of Franco-Canadian communities in the contemporary global context, the picture would have been slightly different: it wouldn’t be one based on a future lost, but rather on a future transformed. While working class Francophones are indeed following industry to other parts of Canada, much to the consternation of some francophone theorists and policy makers (Thériault 2007), many Francophones have had access to increased opportunities, both cultural and economic. After all, unlike working class Parisians, Franco-Canadians have recently accessed economic mobility and are constitutionally recognized as a linguistic minority. As a result, the commodification of culture is emerging as a priority economic sector as the inhabitants of traditional francophone bastions struggle to reposition their communities in the face of the restructurations of the resource-based and industrial basis

24 Bourdieu uses the notion of positional suffering to speak about the suffering that stems from the tensions that arises from any position within a system of domination. (This raises the question: what is domination?)
of their economies – restructurations that started out in the mid-1980s and has been on-going until today, with the collapse of the auto and paper industries. The future isn’t so much lost, as it is changing. As Heller reports (forthcoming), Francophones are well aware of this change… At the 2005 Tintamarre – as street celebration to mark Acadian national day on August 15th, in Caraquet New-Brunswick, a group held up a banner which stated: “Après 250 ans, on sait pas où on va, mais on y va!” (After 250 years, we don’t know where we’re going, but we’re going!)

Franco-Canadians have a long history traversed by two types of mobility. On the one hand, access to education has ensured a process of selection whereby some Francophones have been recruited either as part of a Franco-Canadian elite or part of a broader North American professional market. This process often leads to urbanization (Corbett 2008). On the other hand, working class labourers have historically followed industry across the North American continent. Nonetheless, as the fish stocks dwindled in the 1980-90s – even as their price as a global commodity rose - as modernization of the fisheries and agriculture created conglomerates that pushed out smaller fisherpeople and farmers, as the paper mills relocated to (tree) producing Guatemala and the quantities of minerals (as well as their value as commodities) diminished, the inhabitants of traditional francophone communities faced what can be described as an immense collective disaster. Certainly, the economic basis that had sustained small town and rural francophone communities and the discursive understanding of Francophone Canada was dismantling (Heller 2007). The pictures of the links between the economic restructurations and the reproduction and transformation of francophone identity, some 15 years into the
restructurizations is a complex one that speaks of resource diversification, mobility (geographic and social) and urbanization.

Faced with the collapse of big industries employing mass segments of the population, governments and community leaders are seeking ways to ensure the retention of francophones bodies within francophone communities by helping to fund smaller businesses that can easily target global markets. Where, before, whole segments of rural communities were dedicated to either one sector (the fisheries and all the house and family work that goes into sustaining the fisheries for example – see Johnson 1999), today, government agents speak of enterprises targeting global or local niche markets to replace the big industrial employers. This enables a flexible economy and produces a varied workforce increasingly reliant on and oriented toward the production of symbolic goods such as language-communication, art, culture and tourism. Simultaneously, educated bilingual youths are increasingly leaving the traditional bastions to pursue careers in urban centres (Corbett 2007). And yet, most policies and even analysis of Francophone Canada position urbanization as a threat instead of looking at it as the emerging condition of community reproduction (for people who perceive urbanization as a peril, see Thériault; for people who argue that urbanization has to be taken as a central part of the nouvelle Francophonie see Heller 2007; Langlois 2000).

These changes raise many questions with respect to how to approach the study of Franco-Canadian communities. My ethnography gave me insight into what these transformations meant for Francophones who either tried to work the arts, or chose different paths. It’s also a window into how economic processes structure social actor’s
trajectories, as the following vignette about Sophie, a marketing manager for a national corporation in Toronto, shows.

It was a beautiful day in April 2009, Toronto’s newspapers showing headlines about the economic crisis and the loss of full-time employment in industrial sectors all across Canada. I was meeting Sophie at her place of work in one of Toronto’s financial district high-rises. I was meeting her to do an interview for a research project I was working on, Mobility and Identity in the New Economy. The project’s focus was francophone youths, aged 18 to 35, who had moved from one region of Canada to another, or from one region of the world to Canada who were trying to enter or maintain themselves in the workforce. As Sophie spoke, it became clear that the very economic processes that were behind promoting art as economic development were also behind Sophie’s, and many other participants in the project’s, move to Toronto.

As is usual with participants from the private sector, I was meeting Sophie on her lunch break, so she had about an hour to share parts of her trajectory which had brought her from a town in New Brunswick to Toronto. As we ate our dim sum, Sophie told me she had quit her university studies in a music program in New Brunswick because, at the time in the mid 1990s, she felt it was not a viable career path. “I regret it now” she went on to say, “since all of my friends are making it [as musicians]”. Instead, Sophie’s trajectory brought her to Toronto, where, with absolutely no background in finance, she eventually landed a job for the francophone branch of a national investment company. According to Sophie, who is now the team leader of the branch, the one skill she absolutely needed and requires when hiring employees, is to be able to read, write and speak French. The rest, she contended, is simple enough that anyone can learn it on the
job. Her own bilingualism allowed her to climb the ranks of the corporation rather rapidly – and her employees’ bilingualism meant that the branch had a high roll-over rates, as bilinguals have a tendency to be 1) young and 2) highly in demand and therefore capable of quickly climbing Toronto’s national and global corporate ladder, or at least the rungs dedicated to customer care, advertising and any other language intensive field.

Sophie’s story is one that exemplifies the interconnections between Canada’s job markets and Acadian strategies for cultural promotion. She left New-Brunswick because her bilingualism had value and could travel with her, while others read the opportunities of the art scene differently and chose to stay. As the Acadian music scene, under increased government investment which allowed/pushed for a diversification of publics, flourished in the 2000s, many of Sophie’s friends did indeed manage to build careers in the field of arts. Meanwhile, Sophie’s is a problematic trajectory for territorialized conceptions of Acadian and Francophone identity, as she now resides in an urban center that falls outside of Acadian discursive space, is married to an Anglophone and, as of yet, doesn’t participate in francophone associative networks in Ontario. And yet, her trajectory, taking her outside of traditional Acadian areas and towards urbanization, is one that is representative of many other Acadians’ trajectories. The increased value of language skills in the economy and French-English bilingualism in Canada means that more and more white collar Francophones pursue careers in Canada’s major urban centers or elsewhere in the world. It is in this context that the Acadian art scene is both a space that creates employment in the traditional bastions, while enabling some to live elsewhere (as in Montreal perhaps) and still participate in Acadian cultural events.
In Franco-Canadian communities, the new economy has been touted as ways to create jobs locally in the face of what is mediatized as a collective disaster: that of depopulation as Francophones follow industry to Alberta or move to major Canadian urban centers to access higher level jobs in their field (see Corbett 2007 for an analysis of this discourse for Atlantic rural communities). In the following excerpt, taken from a roundtable organized in Toronto by the province of New-Brunswick, Julie, a bilingual Francophone, Greg, a bilingual Anglophone and Gwen a unilingual Anglophone explain why it makes more sense to them to build their careers in Toronto then their native New-Brunswick. While Julie, an ad executive, feels that it’s her bilingualism that grants her opportunities, Greg and Gwen, both in the film industry, feel Toronto offers much more then New-Brunswick in the way networking and job opportunities:

Julie: To me Toronto is like a candy-store / the only reason why I’ve had so many opportunities hmmm because everybody in advertising who can proof-read French / so hmmm / you know for me in Toronto I can quit my job tomorrow and get another job in two weeks and move around but I feel like in New-Brunswick that would be a lot more risky / I risk just being unemployed or working at home

Greg: I think to me touching on the subject / to me New-Brunswick feels like a beautiful means to the end / of what I’m doing up here / because you know I’ve surrounded myself by this ah / crazy idea of being a filmmaker

(laughter)

Greg: you know it seems to be crazy to put this on the table / but it’s crazy / hmmm it’s risky it’s really risky and I did not feel any of that risk in New-Brunswick / I felt like in order for me to be the best I can be / you know I have all these crazy ideas that I want to put on the table / but to get those drawn out by professionals / in the industry / which I’m finding in Toronto / which I’m networking with is just an amazing thing / so I think once I educate myself and learn and network / with worldly people because you know all sorts of people come to Toronto / I’ll be able to you know end that craziness by hopefully having my own / ah my own idea and take on it (...) [in Toronto] I can walk down the street and I can find someone (...) I guess it’s networking / it’s just / there’s so much opportunity here / it’s huge

Gwen: yeah and I think especially in the field world like / I’ve been given so many crazy opportunities that I probably like in New-Brunswick would have had to be toiling away // like I’ve never been a production assistant which is unheard of / I went right to being a coordinator on huge production // I was just given jobs that I was not qualified for in the least / but they knew it and it’s that whole networking thing and they’re willing to take chances on younger people so I have a stacked resume that probably would have taken me years to develop in New-Brunswick
Julie, like Nicole before her, and her co-New-Brunswickers Greg and Gwen, is an example of the challenges a shift towards the creative economy is for Franco-Canadian communities. The fact remains that urban centres are better positioned in the creative economy. At the same time, the creative enterprises usually require less capital investment than bigger industries (Florida 2002). This is precisely why Acadian artistic and cultural development comes into play: Acadian community leaders and New-Brunswick decision makers see it as one way to have a niche product in a competitive global economy. Economic developers are seeing Acadian identity as a marketable good on the global market, as Yves, an agent for an Acadian tourist strategy, remarks:

```
Yves au Canada Atlantique / on a deux choses que personne d’autre au monde a / pis
ce’est toujours ça qu’on essaie de faire / de se distinguer / la Baie de Fundy / il y a
personne d’autre qui a ça au monde (…) pis l’Acadie / l’Acadie il y a personne
d’autres qui peuvent se dire qu’ils ont ça chez eux
```

```
Yves in Atlantic Canada / we have two things that no one else in the world has / and
that’s always what we try to do / distinguish ourselves / the Bay of Fundy / nobody
else in the world has that (…) and Acadie / l’Acadie no one else can say they have
that at home (my translation)
```

The cultural investment of the 1970s, 80s and 90s to ensure Acadian “cultural promotion” have yielded an Acadian art scene, one that can now be mobilized as part of the creative economy in two ways: through the globalization of Acadian art and through the commodification of Acadian identity in tourism strategies. The two, art and tourism, are even often intertwined, as doing Acadian cultural tourism means showcasing Acadian artists on the one hand and as the circulation of tourists ensures a broader public for Acadian artistic product on the other. Commodifying identity through tourism and the arts is therefore increasingly perceived as, 1) a way to bolster the cultural recognition of
Acadian identity on local, provincial, regional, national and global stage 2) a way to do regional economic development and, as such, 3) a way to ensure the retention of Acadians in the Atlantic regions.

The restructurizations of the economy are an important facet of the emergence of tourism and the professionalization of the arts as potential sources of community economic development for francophone communities across Canada. In francophone communities as elsewhere, art is perceived as one of the key site of a competitive knowledge economy:

Human creativity, based on ideas and knowledge, rather than natural resources or manufactured goods, has become an essential economic driver, and governments at all levels are increasingly conscious of the need to advance the creative agenda. (Canada Council for the Arts 2007: 3)

As a result of investments in art, the debate around what constitutes francophone identity is accentuated: narratives of the past are reappearing with a vengeance, as some of the actors who were involved in the modernization discourses of francophone identity commodify folklore, tradition and even modernity for educational, artistic or tourism purposes (Pujolar and Heller 2008). Meanwhile, strategies to promote francophone art on the global stage have brought strategies of authenticity to the forefront as a way to produce cachet in an otherwise extremely competitive and precarious field.

What this all means is that confronted with the collapse of the resource-based industrial economy, Acadians are deploying diverse strategies to enter and maintain themselves in ever-changing economic structures. This accentuates a sentiment of crisis amongst francophone community leaders, as the modern and traditional ways of mobilizing Francophones are becoming undone in the face of increased mobility and a racially, economically, linguistically diversified francophone population. This is where
the production and promotion of francophone arts and culture meet discourses of the new economy, with its emphasis on knowledge, the central position of multilingualism and the mobilization of diversity as added value for niche markets are being mobilized by francophone decision-makers to ensure the reproduction of francophone identity in the new economy. The investments of the associative networks and government in this field are in the process of restructuring how people are positioned in the field of arts, giving those maintaining professionalization and economic development discourses the advantage in the Government-Associative nexus. This question is what I will analyze in the next section.

5.2 How to play the field

I have argued that the State, in collaboration with the associative networks, is becoming a producer of Franco-Canadian cultural commodities, as it switches from an ideology of welfare to one of workfare. The emergence of an economic discourse in regards to the professionalization of the arts is restructuring who gets to do what within the field: from which artists are considered “market-ready”, how “publics” are defined, to how grants are distributed and, also, who gets to work the arts. What I have seen is that two types of professionalism are being developed, both on neoliberal terms: for community organizers and government agents, the requirement of a business expertise. Acadian artists, meanwhile, are now expected to be able to compete at a global level. This brings the community sector and government agencies to promote business expertise at all levels, from the boards of community organizations to the career-planning of artists.

Nathalie, a community worker who ran a globalizing Acadian strategy (funded by a government agency), gives an example of how the new economic orientation is
changing hiring criteria. Below, she talks about the criteria the hiring committee established to fill a position she was leaving. Notice that her organization’s economic orientation, which she describes as doing “exportation” and not “cultural promotion”, meant that they had a hard time finding someone who could fit their criteria:

Nathalie: ben on cherchait quelqu’un c’est sûr que moi j’avais plus d’expérience euh mon expérience à moi je l’avais appris sur le terrain pis ce qu’était particulier avec le [Plan de promotion] c’est que les gens qui avaient des connaissances en exportation culturelle / en français sur le marché il y en avait pas

Mireille: ah ok

Nathalie: tu sais il y avait pas d’autres projets similaires où-ce qu’on aurait pu aller recruter quelqu’un (…) 

Nathalie: fait qu’on a / faiT un appel pis on a eu / pas mal de candidature / mais ce qui était / la raison pour laquelle on avait été avec Sophie à ce moment- là c’est que Sophie avait une formation vraiment d’affaire pis un des problèmes dans le secteur culturel c’est que souvent tu vas te retrouver avec des gens / [le but du plan] c’était pas de faire de la promotion culturelle / (…) c’était vraiment le but c’était de faire de l’exportation

Mireille: ok

Nathalie: pis c’était important de comprendre que / aller faire un show devant public à Paris c’est pas de l’exportation

Nathalie: well we were looking for someone it’s certain that I had more experience ah my experience I acquired it on the field and what was specific to the [Promotion Framework] is that people who had experience in cultural exportation / in French on the market there aren’t any

Mireille: ah ok

Nathalie: you know there just aren’t any other similar projects where we could have gone to recruit someone (…) 

Nathalie: so we did / a posting and we had / a lot of candidates / but what was / the reason why we went with Sophie at that moment is that Sophie had training in business and one of the problems of the cultural sector is that you’ll often find yourself with people / [the goal of the framework] wasn’t to do cultural promotion / (…) it was really the goal was to do exportation

Mireille: ok

Nathalie: and it was important to understand that / going to do a show in front of a general audience in Paris that isn’t exportation (my translation)

Here Nathalie alludes to the fact that most of the applicants were underqualified for the job advertised because their training and previous work experience might make them understand their job as one of doing « cultural promotion ». The Acadian art scene had long been, after all, a space for the promotion of identity. This meant some of its workers
had more experience working at Acadian cultural promotion than as agents of the exportation of the arts and the commodification of Acadian identity for economic benefit. Moreover, Nathalie mentions that, at the time, there weren’t many francophone companies where they could go to recruit coordinators for cultural exportation. Consequently the recruiting committee hired Karine, a young woman who had business training and expertise. Months after the hiring, however, Karine was scooped by a non-linguistically defined dance company – to work as their cultural promoter.

The shift to business expertise is appearing everywhere in the community sector. This excerpt, taken from a grant proposal submitted to a government agency (given to me by the submitting association). In it the program coordinator stipulates that in order to remedy the financial crisis the organization underwent, the board of directors felt it was important to invite people with an expertise in business:

Pendant longtemps, l’association a été gérée par un conseil d’administration composé de huit membres dont faisaient partie principalement des [amateurs d’art] et des universitaires. Suite aux sérieux problèmes financiers qu’a connus l’organisme, plusieurs membres ont quitté et les membres restants du conseil ont réalisé que, pour bien gérer l’organisme, il était important d’avoir au sein du conseil non seulement des gens du milieu [des arts] et de la culture, mais aussi des gens possédant une expertise en affaires. Désormais, les postes au sein du conseil sont répartis en fonction des compétences et des forces de chacun et nous nous assurons d’avoir autour de la table toute l’expertise dont nous avons besoin pour gérer l’organisme de façon efficace. (Grant application, Multimedia organization)

For a long time, the organization was managed by a advisory board consisting of eight members, most of whom were [art fans] and academics. Following the serious financial problems the organization encountered, a lot of the members quit and the remaining members realized that, to manage the organization well, it was important to not only have members from the cultural and [art] scene, but also people who have expertise in business. From now on, the positions within the board are allocated according to the skills and the strengths of each and we make sure that we have, sitting at the table, all the expertise we need so as to manage the organization with efficiency. (Grant application, Multimedia organization, my translation)

Examples such as these abounded in my fieldwork as community participants themselves recognized the importance of having an “expertise in business” to succeed in lobbying for
funding, whether writing a budget or looking for sponsors in the private or for
government grants in the public one. Léo, a festival organizer who also works as a
research and development consultant (specialized in the new economy), points out that he
greatly benefits, when asking for funding, from his background in economics (his
degree):

Mireille: ce que le travail auprès des bailleurs de fonds quand tu montes un festival
Léo: d’abord c’est euh / c’est de même titre qu’un plan d’affaire / donc il faut avoir un produit final très clairement défini / puis euh / c’est pour ça qu’avec Lissa [directrice d’un organisme artistique] ou moi-même venant du monde des affaires / c’est un peu plus facile c’est-à-dire on peut on peut définir ce qu’on recherche / exactement ce qu’on veut proposer / quelles sont les dépenses / ne pas assumer de trop grands risques / après ça ben c’est de c’est d’être très méticuleux donc remplir toutes les demandes / euh de façon très professionnelle pis aussi d’aller plus loin / comme l’année dernière en guise de rapport // de nos activités ben ce que j’ai fait de supplémentaire ben j’ai créé un DVD avec des capsules des performances / c’était pas nécessaire / mais ça démontre du sérieux finalement

Mireille: what’s the work you have to do with the sponsors when you run a festival
Léo: first it’s ah / it’s it’s the same thing as a business plan / so you have to have a clearly defined final product / and ah / that’s why with Lissa [coordinator of an art organization] or with me who come from the business world / it’s a little bit easier in other words we can define what we’re looking for / exactly what we want to propose / what are the expenses / not take on major risks / after that well it’s being very meticulous meaning filling in the applications / ah in a very professional manner and also to go the extra mile / like last year by way of report // of our activities well I did a supplement I created a DVD with some of the performances / it wasn’t necessary / but it demonstrates seriousness in the end (my translation)

The background in business allows Léo and his colleague Lissa to “go the extra mile”
when it comes to dealing with government sponsors: they know how to draw up a
business plan and how to market their organizations. Note that Lissa acquired her

---

25 I attended a meeting where a consultant took five minutes to explain to an association how to write a good budget. She said that she had noticed that in previous years, budgets were based on guesstimates instead of estimates and insisted that any budget should include “real price quotes” from “real businesses” (field notes, August 2008).
business expertise through her family. Her dad founded and owns a chain of restaurants that has franchises in the Maritimes and Québec.

A stronger orientation to working the arts as a business is noticeable, especially when contrasting the participants from my fieldwork in 2007-2009 to the ones led by Annette Boudreau and Lise Dubois in Prise de Parole 1 in 1998. In Prise de Parole 1, the participants working in the arts were often experts in the arts or in community mobilization: they had done drama, or were involved in the first artistic expressions indexing the oppression of Franco-Canadians and creating an autonomous Acadian modern art field (some of these actors, I should point out, still hold active roles in the professionalization of the arts today). They would, of course, discuss issues of funding and economic development, but the political mobilization and the “vitality” of Acadian identity were still part of the dominant discourse in the mid-1990s interviews. And since the goals were still predominantly linked to political mobilizations, the main public remained the Acadian public.

la seule façon de pas mourir c'est d'être le / le pluS vivant possible / le présent possible partout euh / tu sais euh / alors je sais pas / je peux pas dire que je suis / d'un optimisme là / tu sais je suis quand même réaliste par rapport à ce qui se passe / pis je me dis bon / tu sais on a beau dire on est là depuis euh trois siècle on va continuer d'être là itou mais c'est qu'on / pis je veux dire un moment donné / qu'est-ce que tu veux c'est peut-être le / tu sais les individus meurent / les peuples meurent aussi je veux dire un moment donné / on s'intègre on se transforme ça devient autre chose ça (...) je pense que moi que / la

---

26 Prise de Parole 1 was led by Normand Labrie, Monica Heller and Jurgen Erfurt. The project “Prise de parole” ran from 1996 to 2000. It was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. (Main investigators: Normand Labrie, Monica Heller, Université de Toronto, et Jürgen Erfurt, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main; collaborators : Annette Boudreau and Lise Dubois, Université de Moncton. The project also received funding from the transcoop program of the German-American Academic Council Foundation, from the Agence universitaire de la Francophonie (Main investigators: Patrice Brasseur et Claudine Moïse, Université d’Avignon et des Pays du Vaucluse), the International council for Canadian studies, the graduate assistantship scholarship program of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the stipend program of the Université de Moncton and the Grant-starting program for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada granted by the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education and its departments: Curriculum Teaching and Learning and Sociology and Equity Studies in Education and the Centre de recherches en linguistique appliquée de l’Université de Moncton.
revendication / en Acadie / c'est une / c'est / d’abord c'est une revendication sur le plan psychoculturel c’est / c’est pas une Acadie folklorique / c'est pas une Acadie de déportation / c'est pas une Acadie de drapeau / c'est une Acadie actuelle / c'est-à-dire qui met en / tu sais je veux dire où les artistes expriment une réalité / qui se passe ici mais qui pourrait se passer euh / partout ailleurs (PP1 C-01-003 1998)

The only way to avoid dying is to be / as alive as possible / as present as possible everywhere ah / you know ah / so I don’ know / I can’t say that I am / optimistic / you know I am realistic after all as to what’s happening / and I say well / you know in spite of what they say we’ve been here ah for three centuries and we continue to be here too but it’s that we / so I mean at one point / what can you maybe it’s the / you know individuals die / nations dies too at one point I mean / we’re integrating we’re transforming it’s becoming something else (...) so I think for me the mobilizations / in Acadie / it’s a / it’s / first and foremost it’s a mobilization on the psychocultural level it’s / it’s not a folk Acadie / it’s not an Acadie of the Deportation / it’s not an Acadie of the flag / it’s an contemporary Acadie / meaning one that puts in / you know I mean where artists express a reality / that’s happening here but the could be happening / anywhere else (PP1 C-01-003 1998, my translation)

The stress on community mobilization of the mid-1990s could be the result of the type of the focus of each project. The Prise de parole team wanted to know how the participants contributed to reproducing francophone communities, whereas I study the links between the art scene, governance and francophone identity. Still, both projects asked similar questions about participants’ trajectories, their work and what their work entailed. And while, in my own project, I definitely followed through when participants brought up questions of funding, I never once had to bring up the topic of funding myself, as it was an integral part of their work. Also, the trajectories of the actors interviewed in the two moments differ. In 1990, most of the artistic participants had been active as cultural lobbyist for quite some years. By 2007, some of the same participants had changed their discourse to include “artistic economic development”. Others were simply no longer present in the events and activities that were central to the art scene. In other words, the emergence of a discourse where art became a means to do community economic development meant that some people were better positioned to enter or sustain themselves in the field.
In 2007-2009, participants in both the government and the associative side of the production of culture often-time had a background in business – whether in sales or marketing, either through school or through their own work experience. There were a few exceptions, like Janie, a community worker who did fundraising and event coordination, who held a degree in hard sciences. Janie herself recognized that getting ahead in the field meant having a good head for business and was likely the reason why organizations kept approaching her to help them out in times of crisis. Yet, trying to shift the Acadian art scene from one of political mobilization to one of economic development created a great many challenge for its workers and government agents alike.

The lack of job security characteristic of the scene is one of the reasons why community workers and government agents agreed that having business experience in the field was an important asset. Even for the artists, the business expertise was touted as necessary for the professionalization of the arts: “Les artistes,” said a (music) agent, “ils s’imaginent qu’ils peuvent se foutre du côté business de l’affaire. Mais c’est nous, le business side qui leur mette du pain sur la table” (Agente d’artistes, Note de terrain, 2007). This is currently a site of tension for community organizations. Their success in lobbying for economic development funds depends on their ability to rely on « professional » artists. The ideal artists are portrayed as artists who have thought out their careers in particular profit-making ways.

Yet, artist participants favored a conception of art that was linked to the cultural promotion discourse. They usually still conceived of their work a means of denouncing cultural oppression or at least of promoting cultural authenticity. They remained

---

27 Artists believe they can ignore the business side of the field. But it’s us, the business side who put bread on their table (my translation).
ambivalent about switching so openly to a money-making discourse. Art, for many of them, should not be dictated by economic imperatives but stay true to cultural expression. Artistic inspiration, in other words, should not concern itself with economic matters.

A few of the government economic planners and government art agents felt that artists would benefit from an increased awareness of how to run the business side of their career. In the following excerpt, Léo, who worked in both the artistic side and the economic side of the commodification of Acadian culture, outlines the importance of a change of mentality amongst Acadian artists. Léo reports that certain agencies try to do artistic career development, but that there is still a prevalent “bohemian” ideology which prevents artists from participating in the workshops.

Léo pis aussi on organisait / avec deux autres consultants / des ateliers de planification de carrière d’artistes / [le Plan de promotion] le faisait aussi un peu / mais le taux de participation était très très bas / donc c’est comme si encore / si t’es artiste / ben t’es artiste bohème

Mireille oui il y a une résistance à / il faut que tu fasses

Léo oui c’est ça / il faut que tu fasses un plan d’affaire il faut que tu respectes tes échéanciers / c’est sûr qui en a plein qui le font / qui travaillent très très fort / pis en pense à (nomme artiste) / beaucoup de gens comme ça / donc c’est comment est-ce qu’on prend ces modèles là / pis comment est-ce qu’on transmet ça

Léo and also we would organize / with two other consultants / workshops on artist career planning / the [Promotional Framework] would also do it a little bit / but the participation rate was very very low / so it’s like still / if you’re an artists / then you’re a bohemian artist

Mireille yes there’s a resistance to / you have to do

Léo yes that’s it / you have to do a business plan you have to respect your deadlines / there are plenty that do it / who work really really hard / like when you think about [names an artist] / a lot of people like that / do the question is how do we take those role models / and how do we pass that on (my translation)

The community participants who worked for the associative side of the field increasingly felt that the new opportunities they were creating on a global stage warranted that artists learn how to be « market ready ». At a consultation for an Acadian
art exportation plan, Nathalie, the coordinator of the program, narrated her organization’s evolution in this regard since its inception, five years earlier. She said their first year was a flop for two reasons: one, many of the artists were not prepared for exportation. So the organization is now more demanding in regards to career plans (mostly by looking at resumes and references). Two, the artists who were popular in the Atlantic region did not necessarily match the European market’s taste. To remedy this, the organization has put measures in place to ensure that the selected artists be marketable in Europe. In an interview she granted me a year later, Nathalie tells me how they relied on European judges to help them make their selection:

Nathalie: pis / euh / pour [Le Paris Acadie] c’est qu’on mesurait / on demandait aux délégues qui étaient venus [aux showcases francophone] qui avaient vu les artistes acadiens / tout / en général une quinzaine de vitrines / okay ben lesquels selon vous parmi ceux-là sont les sont les dix / qui ont le plus de potentiel par ordre d’importance

MM: ok ouais
Nathalie: donc souvent c’était presque identique

MM: ah ok
Nathalie: tu sais comme les un deux trois quatre cinq six là c’était les mêmes six mais pas nécessairement dans le même ordre / donc on faisait un pointage avec ça pis c’est comme ça qu’on sélectionnait / la programmation au [Paris-Acadie] / pis ça nous est déjà arrivé que [des organisateurs de festivals en Europe] ait sélectionné un groupe pour son festival pis qu’on dise ben okay / toi tu peux le prendre c’est ton festival / mais / [le plan] va pas assumer les dépenses / parce que soit ce groupe là / comme / je pense que c’est arrivé avec [groupe musical] / c’est que [groupe musical] ils allaient se dissoudre c’était leur dernière tournée européenne

MM: ah right
Nathalie: donc on avait dit (...) nous on va pas investir de l’argent faire venir un groupe / qui va pu tourner

MM: ouais
Nathalie: il y est p’us à vendre ce groupe- là donc c’est de l’argent gaspillé dans la / le principe du Plan culturel donc on va payer pour eux-autres

Nathalie: an ah / for [Paris-Acadie] what we would measure / we would ask the the delegates who had been to the [francophone showcases] who had seen Acadian artists / all / generally speaking about fifteen showcases / okay well which ones are according to you the ten who have the most potential in order of importance

Mireille: okay yeah
Nathalie: and often it’s almost identical
Mireille: ah okay
Nathalie: you know like the one two three four five six were the same six just not necessarily in the same order / so we would make a count with that and that’s how we would select / the program for [Paris-Acadie] / and it’s already happened that [festival coordinators in Europe] picked a group for their festival and that we say okay / you can have them but it’s the festival / [the Framework] isn’t going to be responsible for expenses / either because that group / like / I think it happened with [musical group] / the thing is that [musical group] was going to dissolve it was their last tour

Mireille: ah right
Nathalie: so we said (...) we’re not going to invest money and send out a group / that isn’t going to tour any longer
Mireille: yeah
Nathalie: that group isn’t for sale anymore so it’s wasted money in the / the principles of the [Cultural Framework] so we’re not going to pay for them (my translation).

Examples of the increased value of business expertise abound: Béatrice, the director of a government agency directly involved in funding the arts, worked four years as a marketing agent for a big Canadian corporation. Diane did part of her undergraduate studies in business and subsequently worked as a travel agent. Her first forays in the associative networks were in fact linked to book-keeping and logistics, skills she had acquired as a travel agent. The younger generation, Luc, Roxanne and Brigitte, for instance, have specific training either in tourism, accountability and logistics. Indeed, the new ways of producing culture in neoliberal agendas means that the most successful applicants – and the ones who manage to maintain their career in the arts-, tend to have acquired business skills somewhere along the way. This is increasingly true of artists themselves, as managers and community agents prefer to promote artists who have visions and career-plans, this as a means of ensuring the sustainability of their own organization in a landscape where community development is increasingly economic development.
Yet, the legitimating discourses of the art scene are creating a shift in the founding nationalist discourses as Acadians harness the power of the State to foster economic development and expand their publics. After all, funding Acadian art is no longer so much a matter of doing “cultural promotion”. In the next section, I investigate how the turn to economic development fosters two types of responses: one based on a neoliberal individualizing perception of artists – which positions the global market as an area of equal opportunity – and the other is based on redistributive measures. The question is: are Acadians equally positioned as individual artists and as a community to enter the global art field?

5.3 Development: community or economic?

The State and associative network –fueled inclusion of discourses of economic development as a way to reproduce linguistic communities has introduced capitalist techniques of expansion, from discourses around the professionalization of the arts to the development of tourism as a way to expand publics for cultural products. Discourses of professionalization have come to replace discourses of community mobilization.

According to Béatrice, who runs a State agency funding the arts, too much emphasis had been placed on discourses whereby funding was allocated to “poor artists” instead of professional ones. This, according to Béatrice, fails to convince the Canadian public to invest in the field of arts. What sells, pun intended, is a shift to discourses of professionalization:

Béatrice: il faut qu’on crée un conseil des arts pour s’occuper des arts / pas de petites politiques du gouvernement / ça appartient au ministère de la culture / c’est à eux-autres de faire de la politique / nous-autres / c’est les arts

Mireille: ok

Béatrice: ce qui arrive souvent c’est qu’on dit / c’est que l’augmentation du budget des arts prend tellement de temps à se faire / parce que les gens disent / ben / pourquoi que le public devrait payer pour ça / tu comprends / pis tout le
Béatrice responds to the tension between art as a global business and art as cultural expression by presenting her agency’s role as fostering a globally competitive local art scene, one that will leave a “leave a mark of our [the community she represents’] time here”. Béatrice has a specific idea of who the professional artists are: they are talented, accredited and career-oriented people who actively choose to do art. For her, artists arrive equally positioned in the game when confronted to the global stage:
Béatrice on n’est pas regardant nous-autres pour la région / en autant que ce soit de l’art de qualité / que ça soit réfléchi qu’il y ait de la recherche qui ait tout ça derrière 

(...) Béatrice un de nos meilleurs peintres / qui vient du Nouveau-Brunswick / un jeune je suis pas sûre qu’il a trente ans c’est [nom du peintre] / il est né à [ville du Nord-Est] il a beaucoup travaillé l’été il travaille à [autre village du Nord-Est] 

Mireille ah oui oui c’est / 
Béatrice il fait des études à Montréal 
Mireille oui 
Béatrice c’était un peintre de déjà de / haut niveau pis il a pas trente ans 
Mireille oui 
Béatrice alors pour nous autres là / [nom du peintre] c’est une perle rare là / tu vois / il vient de [village du Nord-Ést] / alors c’est pas parce qu’il vient de c’té région-là / c’est pas parce qu’il vient d’une région plus isolée qu’il est pas capable là // donc on peut pas rentrer dans le jeu de / on va les financer parce que les pauvres / petit chouchou qui viennent de [village du Nord-Est] 

Béatrice so for them / when you work for the arts / you say // we want art to develop [for the State] / it can come from anywhere / we don’t care 
Mireille yes 
Béatrice we don’t look regions up / as long as the art is quality art / that it be well thought out that there be research behind it 

(...) Béatrice one of our best painters / who comes from New Brunswick / a youth I don’t even think he’s thirty [name of the painter / he was born in [North Estern New-Brunswick village] he’s done a lot of work in the summer he works in [other village in North Eastern New-Brunswick] 

Mireille ah yeah he’s 
Béatrice he studied in Montréal 
Mireille yes 
Béatrice he’s already a painter / of top level and he’s not even thirty 
Mireille yes 
Béatrice so for us / [name of the painter] he’s a real gem / you see / he’s from [town in Eastern N.B.] / so it’s not because he’s from that region / it’s not because he’s from an isolated region that he’s not capable // so we can’t start playing the game / so we’re going to finance them because poor souls / poor little pets who come from [town in North Eastern N.-B.] (my translation)

Echoing neoliberal discourse, Béatrice dismisses the idea that « redistribution » is a legitimate means of funding the arts. In her view, funding artists on the premise that they are disadvantaged only discredits local artists. She thereby mobilizes the example of an Acadian artist who is making it big even if he is originally from a small village. This allows her to reinforce the idea that the global art scene is one that offers equal
opportunities to all, even as she herself is involved in the selection of artistic projects and therefore in artist’s trajectories. In a way, claiming that art exists outside of political considerations, that art is art, also allows her to depoliticize her own actions and position herself as a neutral agent of the State.

This shift in discourse is itself representative of the shift in discourse in the State, from ensuring equitable practices in the face of unequal conditions, to conceiving of individuals as “employable”. The discourse of employability focuses on harnessing the skills of francophone communities (being bilingual, hardworking and educated) to attract global businesses. In this discourses, individuals are positioned as having equal access to the required skills in a competition oriented market. A shift from culture to market also occurs at a community level, as communities – and countries – are perceived as equally positioned groups competing for “economic viability” in the new economy. This discourse positions the new economy and globalization as inevitable realities that must be tackled by francophone community leaders in order to ensure the reproduction of the community. In other words: leaders and States are seeking to ensure the reproduction of modern francophone communities in new economic conditions. Cultural economic competition thereby appears alongside welfare discourses of anti-oppression. There is continuity between the employability discourse and the community as economic agent discourse: a competitive and “vital” community is one populated with savvy and skilled economic agents.

As Béatrice, the government agent, and other participants have noted, while tensions remains in the field as to what the purpose of art should be, the professionalization of the arts was touted by many participants as the way to make the
field and francophone communities economically sustainable. This meant, in essence, that the State should be moving from a community mandate to an individual career promotion one (albeit one that would ensure the reproduction of the community, as professionalization was also linked to the expansion of markets).

Béatrice nous on est vraiment axés sur l’art professionnel / sur l’art
MM oui
Béatrice et / euh ça ça cause des problèmes parce que sur un conseil d’administration t’as tout sorte de monde hein
MM oui
Béatrice donc t’as du monde qui veule aider le pauvre artiste / pis t’as du monde comme moi qui s’en fout du pauvre artiste // c’est pas notre problème / pas parce qu’on est pas sympathique mais c’est juste pas notre problème / donc on se fout de / la notion / qu’on doit aider le pauvre artiste / [à l’agence gouvernementale]
MM ok
Béatrice nous / le / alors on est divisé donc c’est toujours des tiraillements / j’arrive d’une réunion qui a commencé à cinq heure hier soir / faite ma journée d’ouvrage je suis partie de la réunion à onze heure / six heures
MM sur la question de
Béatrice ben différentes affaires / mais si on a des tiraillements c’est c’est là-dessus / on a des communautaires pis on a des / du monde axé sur le développement de la profession
MM ok
Béatrice et on veut faire avancer les arts professionnels au Nouveau-Brunswick pis on pourra jamais le faire si on reste dans le communautaire

Béatrice we are really focused on professional art / on art
Mireille yes
Béatrice and ah / that can cause problems because on a board you have all kinds of people right
Mireille yes
Béatrice so you have people that want to help the poor artist / and you have people like me who don’t give a damn about the poor artist // it’s not our problem / not because we’re not nice but because it’s not our problem / so we don’t give a damn about the notion / that we’re here to help the poor artist / at the [government agency]
Mireille ok
Béatrice for us / the / so we’re divided there’s always some conflict / I just got here from a meeting that started at five last night / did my whole day of work I left the meeting at eleven / six hours
Mireille on the question of
Béatrice well different things / but if have conflicts it’s it’s on that / we have community oriented people and we have / professional development people
Mireille ok
Béatrice we want to help professional arts advance in New-Brunswick and we can never do that if we stay in the community sector (my translation).

For Béatrice and other “economic development discourse” participants, what distinguishes professional art from community art is the idea of research and innovation, and this, in turn, will enable international recognition of local art. This recognition itself would serve to stabilize a competitive and sustainable field. So while she may present her position as “not caring for the poor artists”, her vision implies that the State has a role to play in the economic sustainability of the artists who can compete in the international art field. Interestingly though, Béatrice doesn’t articulate this discourse on an economic basis, but rather on the notion of “art for art’s sake”: professional art will benefit the region by granting it international recognition – economic sustainability is nothing but an effect of art-professionalization capacity building.

Yet, as Samira, a gallery coordinator, points out, State discourses of art as an autonomous field can masks the power dynamics behind the age old question “what makes it art?”, (which, as Bourdieu has shown, is more of a question of who decides what makes particular pieces art (Bourdieu 1977)). Samira heads an artist-run centre and sits on the board of a francophone art association. This latter organization lobbied government agencies to take the effects of various forms of contextualized and historicized linguistic discrimination into account when devising policy and granting funding.

Samira pour les arts visuels ouais / parce que avant les arts visuels euh / tu sais les les chefs de service disaient ah ben / la seule raison que les artistes francophones reçoivent pas d’argent de notre service c’est parce qu’ils sont pas assez bons Mireille ouais (rires) (...) Samira ouais le critère de qualité artistique était / euh amené sur la table [d’une agence subventionnaire] pour défendre le fait que / il y avait pas d’artistes francophones
d’artistes visuels qui se faisaient financer / et donc euh / [un organisme francophone] était quand même un organisme jeune et / comme le discours de [l’organisme francophone] a quand même changé depuis les dernières années / comme au début euh / tu sais la réflexion était peut-être différente / l’[organisme francophone] répondait [à l’organisme subventionnaire] que au contraire / les artistes visuels francophones étaient bons mais c’était juste / ils étaient juste mal compris

Mireille

Samira alors ça c’est des arguments qui marchaient pas très bien / avec [l’organisme subventionnaire]

Mireille

et je pense qu’on a quand même entamé une réflexion un peu plus poussée sur le problème pis là on a changé un peu notre discours sur / sur le problème / on on a dit que on a vraiment mis l’accent sur les contextes de production / les contextes de création / pis tu sais on a regardé comme l’éco-système de de / des arts visuels tu sais dans différents milieux pis tu sais on a vraiment parlé de comment / tu sais tout ce qu’il y a / au Québec / ou / tu sais dans les grandes villes du Canada ou tu sais tout le réseau pis euh / tu sais les écoles et les les les occasions de présenter les occasions de financer / tu sais existe pas / dans les milieux francophones plus isolés / puis euh on a vraiment mis l’accent sur le contexte des centres francophones de l’extérieur du Québec puis on a aussi euh / pa/ tu sais on a aussi parlé de comment le processus de de / tu sais le processus supposément / objectif [de l’organisme subventionnaire] tu sais d’évaluation des demandes / étaient pas nécessairement aussi objective [qu’ils le] voulaient

Mireille

se laissait entendre là

Samira se laissait entendre oui / parce que tu sais / dans le choix des membres de jury / tu sais / il y a comme tu sais ça influence les les décisions pis les gens dans les jurys / eux ils reposent sur leur connaissance de leur propre milieu à eux / et donc euh / si les francophones sont exclus du réseau national des arts visuels en général / c’est un cercle vicieux / fait-que eux ils vont pas reconnaître le travail d’artiste francophone parce qu’ils connaissent pas nécessairement / le milieu de ces artistes ou le réseau de ces artistes qui sont comme déjà exclus

Samira for the visual arts yeah / because before the visual arts ah / you know the the department heads would say ah well / the only reason why francophone artists aren’t receiving money from our departments is because they’re not good enough

Mireille

Yeah (laughter)

(...) Samira yeah the criteria of artistic quality was / ah brought to the table [of a funding agency] to defend the fact that / there weren’t any francophone artists that we receiving funding / and so ah / [a francophone organization] which was still a young organization and / like the discourse of the [francophone organization] has changed a lot in the last few years / like at first ah / you know the reflection was maybe a bit different / [the francophone organization] would answer to the [funding organization] that quite the opposite / the francophone visual artists were good but it was just / they were just misunderstood

Mireille

Samira so those weren’t arguments that worked really well / with [the funding agency]

Mireille
Samira and I think that we have begun a reflection that goes a bit deeper on the problem and now we’ve changed our discourse a little bit on / on the problem / we we said we really put the emphasis on the contexts of production / the contexts of creation / and you know we looked at the like eco-system of of / of visual arts you know in the different situation and you know we really talked about how / you know everything there is / in Québec / or / you know in Canada’s big cities or you know all all the network and ah / you know the schools and the the the opportunities to present and the financing opportunities / you know don’t exists / in remote francophone communities / and ah we really put the emphasis on the context of francophone centers outside of Québec and we also ah / no/ you know we also talked about how the process of / you know the process supposedly / neutral [of the funding agency] you know the evaluation of applications / wasn’t necessarily as neutral as [they] would like it to be

Mireille that they would let themselves believe

Samira let themselves believe yes / because you know / in the choice of the members of the jury / you know / there is like you know that influences the the decisions and the people in the juries / they fall back on their knowledge of their own scenes / and so ah / if Francophones are excluded from the national visual art network in general / it’s a vicious circle / so they won’t recognize the work of francophone artists because they don’t necessarily know / the situation of those artists or the networks of those artists who are like already excluded (my translation)

Two things stand out in what Samira says: 1) that the francophone organization she belongs to had to shifts its discourse from one of “cultural misunderstandings” (and therefore specificity) to one of context-specific differences resulting from and reproducing inequalities to manage to convince the government funding agency to include linguistic equity in its mandate. The organization shifted its argument away from questions of “cultural specificity” to one which argues on the basis of “resource” inequalities. The end product would be the redistribution of resources so that francophone visual artists would be “equal” to other, more privileged artists. Yet, the tensions observed on how to legitimate the arts on a community or economic basis speak to nationalist tensions: while the equity perspective reified the Canadian “moral national” obligations, the “art as autonomous field” discourse positions all artists as equally capable of great art, regardless of their social positioning or their trajectory. Yet, even in this view, individuals become tokens of their communities. Communities are, in turn,
understood as bonded (and equally powerful) entities on the world-stage. In other words, the shift to an economic discourse reorganizes minority language politics: Franco-Canadians are represented either as “equal artistic and business partners” or as “resource-deprived communities” requirement support for access to the global arena.

In the next chapters, I will look into how 1) the ideology of nationalism comes under tension as some Francophones gain social mobility 2) how authenticity becomes a site of struggle for the community workers involved and 3) how a new, postnationalist ideology of language is emerging, one that reifies the view of bilingualism as “two monolingualisms”, yet mobilizes multilingualism as the new way to do culture in the global economy. In the next chapter, I analyze how the current structuration of the art scene calls attention to ideological tensions in regards to nationalist and postnationalist ideologies of language.
6. Linguistic nationalism in global markets

6.1 Acadian identity beyond nationalism

What do the restructuration of the modes of governance and the new conditions of
the economy mean for the structuration of the Acadian symbolic market, and, more
specifically, its art scene? What ideologies of language do its actors mobilize to position
themselves in the new globalized economy? What does the (sometimes conflictual)
collaboration between government and community leaders mean for young new artists?
And finally, what tensions does the emergence of the commodification of culture raise in
regards to question of artistic authenticity? These are the questions I tackle in this
chapter, which looks at the changing ideologies of language in the Acadian art scene. Let
me start with a few fieldwork examples.

I am volunteering at a Festival event. This festival, like the city (Moncton), the
province (New-Brunswick) and the country (Canada) in which it is being held, is
officially bilingual. For the organizers, this means that some of the events are being held
in one of the official languages, with, occasionally, simultaneous translation being
offered, while presenters in other events switch from one language to the other. Other
events are simply being held in either English or French, with no translation offered. In
all, it usually means that the members of the public are exposed to a fairly high degree of
bilingualism, a thing which might be a source of stress for some of the members of the
public who do not quite master the other official language. One member of the public, for
instance, attending a presentation by John Ralston Saul, approached me (since I was
wearing a Bénévole-Volunteer T-shirt) to ask: “this event is going to be held in English
right?” I did not know, and it turned out that Saul, touring the translation of A Fair
Country from English to French (*Mon pays métis*), had prepared his notes in French – but did switch to English every once in awhile.

One day, at this same Festival, I was prepping an event with two fellow volunteers. The event was going to be held in French. My two colleagues were both Anglophones whose second language was French. The casual conversation we had while setting up the room happened entirely in French, with very little prompting from me. In fact, as the conversation centered around kids (I do not have any) and as I was setting up the box office away from my two colleagues, I was a peripheral partner in the conversation as they shared stories about their children. The conversation happened so seamlessly that it took me awhile to realize that it was happening in French, even when my two colleagues were clearly addressing only each other. Both my colleagues also knew, from previous conversations we had had, that I speak English. While the setting of the event made French the official “on-stage” language, I was left with the impression that even my colleagues did not really realize which language they were using “off-stage”.

This example, although in appearance banal, speaks to some important shifts in the value of language practices in Canada: one, the increased value of bilingualism in the Canadian context means that bilingualism is increasingly a shared commodity; two, events and festivals are spaces that increasingly allow, in the context of Canadian bilingualism, for the inclusion of “other” linguistic categories, this in many different forms and for many different reasons – most of which having to do with the constitution of broader publics; three, the increased value of language in the globalized economy is undoing territorialized understandings of language: this reterritorialization of language
means that the ways in which linguistic communities relate to each other are changing and that dichotomic discourses of opposition and domination cannot fully account for language dynamics today.

Two Anglophones casually conversing in French in a French dominant event may not in and of itself seem odd: their presence in the space spoke to the fact that they obviously mastered a high level of bilingualism, that they enjoyed conversing in French and that they sought out opportunities to practice it. But it does index the changing value of bilingualism in Canada. It speaks to the ways in which middle class Anglophones have accessed French and/ or “bilingual” spaces through learning French and raises questions as to the new sources of legitimacy and authority they’ve acquired. In fact, it contradicts comments to which I had been privy during the same week, where francophone colleagues working in the field of arts casually spoke about their understandings of contemporary language dynamics.

The day after the Festival event for instance, I was sitting with a group of friends (community program coordinators, journalists, academics) and I reported the anecdote. We launched into a discussion about the changing face of Canadian language politics. They mostly felt that, in general, things had not changed that much since 1989, when the Confederation of Region party was elected as the official opposition in New-Brunswick, on a populist mandate that also contested bilingualism (see Belkohdja 1997 for an analysis of the CoR party). Some even dismissed the two other volunteers as clearly atypical, as they hung onto a scenario that kept linguistic categories divided, with English being the dominant language and French being a language to protect and defend. Their basic premise reiterated one of sociolinguistics’ understandings of diglossia: in situations
of language contact, one language will dominate over the other in most public spheres. In other words, two languages in contact are in fact two languages in conflict (Boyer 1991). Linguistic ideologies linked to nationalism are at the centre of the shift I wish to observe, as the new conditions of the economy are pushing artistic community actors towards multilingual practices and changing the ways in which language is policed and valued within linguistic markets. Indeed, the biggest shift regards the value of multilingualism, who has access to it, how it should be mobilized, how it is managed, and with what purpose.

There are new spaces, challenging the monolingual ideologies of language, emerging within Acadian communities. Francophone community organizers have responded to the need for broader publics by mobilizing multilingualism as a resource. While mobilizing English to reach broader public ran counter to the mandates of “promoting” French, the new economic and political conditions allowed community organizers to do so. Some did this while consciously aware of the tensions thus raised, but would mobilize the Acadian art scene’s privilege position in Atlantic Canada to counter monolingualizing discourse. Indeed, in New-Brunswick, and especially in Moncton, there was a discourse that held that the francophone art scene was at the forefront of the broader artistic and cultural scenes, as a result of the cultural and artistic mobilizations that sprang up from the 1970s onward. Indeed, during my field work, government agents told me of examples where the Anglophone community lobbied or was encouraged to model their own artistic community on the existing models of francophone organizations: from the Association acadienne des artistes professionels du Nouveau-Brunswick, to the Centre culturel Aberdeen to Atlantic Canada Opportunities
Agency encouraging local artists organizations, such as the East Coast Music Awards, to develop an exportation strategy based on the Société nationale de l’Acadie’s Stratégie de promotion des artistes acadiens sur la scène internationale\textsuperscript{29}.

Many francophone community organizers held the view that this situation attested to the fact that “necessity is the mother of invention”: the francophone community was a frontrunner in the field of arts and culture because they had had to mobilize for the rights and means to express a modern francophone identity. Forthy years after the first movements organized, the privileged positions of Francophones as experts of art and culture gives them the opportunity to hold an increasingly ‘bilingualizing’ discourse, where their own community identity can hold strong, even as they opened up their events to Anglophone artists and Anglophone publics. In other words, in the art scene, an ideology is emerging where the use of English is no longer a threat. Léo, a federal consultant who also organizes a contemporary music festival in affiliation with a francophone art gallery, here mobilizes a discourse that legitimates bilingualism within the art scene:

| Léo | ben nous sommes des francophones / qui organisent des festivals de musique / avec un volet anglophone et francophone / donc dans la mesure du possible on essaie d’être quitte / pour pour les deux / parce qu’on a quand même des conférences / pis des ateliers / ça on est sensible à cette réalité-là |
| Mireille | fait-que vous êtes une structure / le festival c’est plus ou moins |
| Léo | plus ou moins bilingue |
| Mireille | pis à partir de la galerie j’imagine que / la galerie |
| Léo | la galerie est francophone |
| Mireille | donc à partir de là c’est là ou tombe l’organisation |
| (…) | donc ça ça marche super bien / pis encore là / c’est de pouvoir dialoguer / il y avait / donc le la / la personne-contact principale c’était des francophones / mais deux des musiciens c’étaient des anglophones dont un bilingue / donc encore là / c’est de voir que / on avait pas besoin d’exiger que tout le monde |

\textsuperscript{29} Roughly translated, these acronyms mean: Acadian association of professional artists of New Brunswick, Acadie’s national society and Framework for the promotion of Acadian artists on the international stage.
Léo finds there is no contradiction in a francophone organization putting on a bilingual festival. The goal for him is dialogue and equitable exchanges. Léo feels, as we shall see, that in current conditions, English is no longer the threat it was when the francophone gallery he works with first opened its doors with a francophone mandate.

The bilingual discourse also enabled a diversification of publics, and matched the federal, provincial and municipal (in the case of Moncton) pledge to bilingualism, where doing language is increasingly about promoting bilingualism. This promotion of bilingualism, enshrined in the 1988 Official Languages Act (as a way, amongst others, to assert a unique Canadian identity as well as a way to promote harmony between the linguistic communities), was given impetus by liberal member of parliament Stéphane Dion’s 2003-2008 Action Plan for Linguistic Duality and was repeated by Conservative commissioner Bernard Lord’s 2008 Roadmap for Canada’s Linguistic Duality:

Every year, the Government of Canada carries out a range of activities to promote English and French in Canadian society. Although all Government actions on official languages, including the initiatives presented in this Roadmap, aim at emphasizing the
value of this asset for all Canadians, this will be the specific focus of three new initiatives in particular.

(...) the Government will continue to support initiatives that allow young Canadians to put the languages they have learned to use – in cultural, sport or other activities outside the classroom. Measures are also planned to support community radio and other local media that promote cultural and community activities among youth. For young Canadians, this will mean greater availability of local media and activities in the minority official language. (Government of Canada 2008)

In other words, the government’s investment in promoting bilingualism for its population meets its commitment towards the vitality of francophone communities in minority situations when the festivals and events being organized allow for the “other” official language community to learn and participate in the culture of the minority.

The opening of other publics, through new media and the consequent availability of the means of production and reproduction, has seen the emergence of the exoticization of Acadian community for the global stage, one where it is precisely local vernaculars and linguistic hybridity that indexes an authentic Acadian identity. Locally, Acadian artists and products, especially the multilingual ones, speak to niche markets where alternative ideologies of language are being touted. As I show in this chapter and the rest of this work, this new discourse is a source of tension for the State-community nexus that has been mobilized to protect and produce Franco-Canadian communities as both State and decision-makers are trying to reinscribe Franco-Canadian identity in the new economy. The tensions are indeed exacerbated as the State drives a neoliberal push towards the commodification of culture. From being funded for their role in protecting Acadian culture, community organizations are now asked to foster economic development. In this, the State is at times in collusion with the emergent discourse: when the State starts to measure its involvement in Franco-Canadian communities in terms of
economic benefits and exportations to global publics, it is no longer the protection of monolingual spaces that is central to funding, but rather the ability to position one’s art on a global stage.

To understand this trend within Francophone Canada, I follow the co-structuration of linguistic and governmental ideologies from the production and circulation of Acadian artistic products by paying particular attention to how State and community work out the continued legitimation of State funding for ethnolinguistic minority art in a global context and under regimes of neoliberal governance.

6.3 From prescriptivism to multilingualism: the multiple ideologies of the Acadian art scene

As I stated in the introduction, the Acadian art scene is a ripe terrain for studies of ideology as it has been targeted as a site for the production of both Franco-Canadian and Canadian nationalism (see chapter 4) by the federal government and the Acadian associative networks alike. Once the federal government adopted official bilingualism as a way to curtail the Québec sovereignty movement, it became interested in protecting francophone communities within Canada. The art scene has been and continues to be, in a co-structuring move, a site for the institutionalization of language and, therefore, language ideologies.

In Canada and Francophone Canada, the art scene and its funding have been linked to the production of nationalism. Borrowing on ideologies that linked nationalism to linguistic and cultural homogeneity (the stance of French Canadian nationalists, to which Canadian nationalists adapted under threat of Québec sovereignty), the emphasis within francophone spaces has been on the creation and reproduction of “monolingu
spaces” (Heller 2002). The production of these spaces was seen as the only way to curtail language transfers from French to English in a linguistic landscape which was perceived as favoring English: English was the predominant language of work, business and social life. Maintaining the community became aligned with protecting the French language. Language and linguistic competency (in French) became the center of State intervention. Language was understood as a social object capable of effecting social change (Duchêne 2009). This structured policy-making in particular ways. Language and language mobilizations were understood, under this paradigm, as transformers of social life: lobbying for more French in public spaces would create a demand for monolingual and bilingual employees (Bertand 2001). The increased demand for French on the marke was perceived as a motivating factor which could convince Francophones who needed to be persuaded not to let “language transfer” take place.

In the 1960s, the economy was already a site of struggle for Acadian community leaders, as more and more Acadians left family farms and fishing economies to enter the waged economy in Moncton, St-John, Montreal, the United States and elsewhere. This urbanization was a site of struggle for Acadian leaders, who sought to reproduce linguistic homogeneity in multilingual contexts. Indeed, they understood homogeneity to be the “normal” linguistic and cultural conditions for groups and individuals. Handler shows that in Québec, this increased mobility of rural Québécois towards English-dominant Montreal was at the core of the emergence of the nationalist movements, as French-Canadian elites and Québécois workers faced barriers in an industrial workplace where workers handled machinery and administrators ran business in English (Handler 1988). In Acadie, the language-as-object paradigm prompted the institutionalization of
francophone spaces within urban contexts and rendered code-mixing and code-switching problematic.

Yet, as we shift from an industrial to a knowledge-based economy increasingly reliant on language activities, the political, social and economic conditions that enabled the reproduction of a nationalist, territorialized and diglossic understanding of francophone communities are unraveling. This shift puts emphasis on multilingual linguistic competence as a way to better serve a global clientele (Heller 2002). It is therefore no surprise that as States, such as Canada, seek to position themselves as “economically competitive entities” in the global economy, they are pushing forward policies and strategic plans which are meant to tap into the “added-value” of bilingualism on the one hand and of multiculturalism on the other. This is a site of tension for Franco-Canadian communities as their bid for representation within State structures relied on the protection of French as an official language of Canada and the recognition of their identity.

Increased mobility, increased access to new media and the means of artistic production, new publics and new private resources for funding all mean that the policing of linguistic ideologies and practices increasingly falls outside of the control of the instituted elites, at least when it comes to the kinds of linguistic products that will be put forward and adopted. Simultaneously, these new conditions create new elites, modes of surveillance and control – some of which are recuperated by the instituted elites and within government networks. The new economy and new conditions for access to federal funding mean that some of the producing community workers and artists themselves are adopting new language ideologies: one that increasingly values multilingualism: variation
within French for the authentification of products and multilingualism for the outreach to broader publics. In the following excerpt, Léo, a consultant specialized in sectors of the new economy, speaks about the work he’s done with a francophone government agency and counters what he feels is the central concern of instituted organizations as government shifts from protecting language to producing community: the danger of bilingualism.

Mireille le [agence gouvernementale de développement économique francophone] / pourquoi ils s’intéressent à la culture et comment ils la définissent
Léo ben pour / [l’agence] sera probablement mieux placé pour te dire ça mais / il y a aussi // changé / légèrement le tir / à un organisme associatif à un agent vraiment de développement économique / dans le sens un peu comme je te disais plus tôt / difficile d’aller voir une pièce de théâtre si t’as pas d’argent
Mireille oui
Léo ça fait / [l’agence] est un peu sensible à cette réalité-là // ça peu créer certaine tensions par rapport aux organismes traditionnels / que ce soit la SAANB ou euh / l’association des maires francophones etcetera
Mireille quels genres de tensions
Léo ben dans le sens qu’on a peur que / pis moi je partage pas cette insécurité-là / que si tu travailles en anglais tu vas forcément t’angliciser
Mireille the [francophone economic development government agency] / why are they interested in culture and how do they define it
Léo well for / [the agency] would be better positioned to tell you this but / there is also // a slight change in direction / from an associative network to really an agency of economic development / in the sense of what I was telling you earlier it’s hard to go see a theatre production if you don’t have any money
Mireille yes
Léo so / [the agency] is aware of that reality // it can create some tensions for the traditional agencies / be it the SAANB30 or ah / the association of francophone mayors etcetera
Mireille what kind of tensions
Léo well in the sense that we’re afraid that / and I don’t share that insecurity that if you work in English you will inevitably anglicize yourself

Léo feels that the shift in government priorities and the resulting increase of multilingualism is a site of tension for the « traditional » community organizations representing Acadians. According to Léo, the fear for traditional agencies is that francophone communities are underprivileged partners in multilingual workplaces and

multilingual markets. However, Léo considers the conditions are such right now that working in English (or partly in English) no longer means that speakers will automatically abandon the practice of French. This could be particularly true for language and knowledge workers who mobilize their bilingualism to gain access to jobs and whose work is primarily language-based. This tension, as to the nature of language relations, is at the center of most participants’ apprehension of the shift.

As multilingualism, geographic and social mobility and cultural hybridity gain economic and symbolic value on the global market, the way State funding is granted according to territorialized language categories is coming under challenge. Dominant (nationalist) ideologies of language (as a bounded entity that needs protection and saves community) can still be reproduced, but they, along with the State policies that promote them, are also increasingly targeted as sites of contestation. So what we are seeing is not so much a rupture with nationalist discourse, but a transformation of its basis.

None of the participants in this thesis questioned the importance of the reproduction of Francophone Canada as a socially salient category. Positioning oneself in the Acadian art scene required adopting some of the nationalist premises that legitimate it. But the ways of reproducing that category, through linguistic prescriptivism and normalization, were being contested by borrowing on principles of authenticity which served to reify the naturalizing effects of nationalist discourses. From being true to one’s identity by speaking French, participants were now being true to their identities by speaking their local varieties of French. This authenticity meant, for some of the new producers, placing multilingualism at the center of their production and as an integral part of Acadian identity.
6.3.1 Creating a space for French

Language politics are a stake in the structuration of the art field. The original mandate of government in producing an art scene was to produce spaces where French could be practiced. As such, French and French-English bilingualism simultaneously gained value in the national art scene. All of the associations I worked with either had an officially francophone or an officially bilingual mandate. The “status” of the mandate could influence who got to apply for what type of State-funding, but did not exclude bilingual associations from applying to “francophone” programs if they could build a “francophone vitality” component in one of their activities, for example by offering French literacy workshops to Francophone and Francophiles. The programs themselves are often divided on such grounds, where some will specifically target “francophone” mandated agencies, and others target “bilingualism”. The current valorization of bilingualism, both in the economy and government policy, affects the structuration of the art scene.

As the strategic plans (Government of Canada 2003, 2008) meant to address Canada’s commitment to the *Official Languages Act* increase funding for “bilingual” events (events meant to give unilingual access to spaces operating with the other official languages or events meant to showcase Canadian bilingualism), some art institutions in Canada have become interested in bilingualizing their operations. This is creating a certain demand, as in other fields, for bilingual cultural workers. Vithuy says, for instance, that she and her colleague Nathael landed their jobs at a gallery thanks to the board of director’s desire to portray Canada’s official bilingualism. This desire could have been the result of two contingent processes: a desire for equity and an understanding
that operating in both languages opens funding opportunities and is a way to reach a broader public. Vithuy and her colleague were hired specifically so that they could help the gallery operate bilingually:

Vithuy ben c’est que / quand on est arrivé ici on a aidé le centre à devenir officiellement bilingue // euh avant qu’on arrive il y a eu un peu de discussion sur / comment ils allaient le centre bilingue étant un centre de [Ville]

Mireilleok

Vithuy avant qu’on arrive ici il y a / Laurent qui est le frère de Nate qui était à [ville] lui aussi / lui était sur le CA de la galerie [nom] pendant quelques années puis lui il avait aidé à à / à pousser l’idée de rentre le centre bilingue / et euh / avant nous il y avait pas d’employé bilingue ou francophone / et donc euh c’était pas possible de vraiment officiellement devenir bilingue

Mireilleouais fonctionner

Vithuy fonction/ fonctionner euh / tu sais de façon euh réelle (rires) en tant qu’organisme bilingue comme ils ont fait traduire les statuts et règlements du centre et tout / ils ont fait les premières étapes pour rentre le centre bilingue / mais quand nous on a été embauché / ça faisait partie de / des critères que / des critères d’embauche

Vithuy well it that / when we arrive here we helped the center to become officially bilingual // ah before we got here there was a bit of discussion on / how they would the make the center bilingual seeing as it was a center of [City]

Mireilleok

Vithuy before we got here there was / Laurent who’s Nate’s brother who was already in [City] too / he was on the board of the gallery [name] for a few years and he had helped to to to / promote the ideal that the center should become bilingual / and a / before we came there were no bilingual or francophone employees / and so ah functioning in an officially bilingual way wasn’t possible

Mireilleyeah functioning

Vithuy function/ functioning ah / you know in a real way (laughter) as a bilingual organization like they had translated the statutes and regulations of the center and all / they had done the first steps to make the center bilingual / but when we were hired / it was a part of the / the hiring criteria (my translation)

Simultaneously, the culturalist engagements to foster « francophone identity » instituted from the 1970s onwards, have created an important domain of cultural expertise in francophone networks (albeit one that, as I have shown, increasingly needs to be complemented with business expertise). It is clear that the Acadian art scene, even as it enters a stage where multilingualism gains value, has been successful at establishing a space where French is the dominant language of work. At the Centre Culturel Aberdeen, for instance, a cultural art centre which was first established by a group of French-
speaking artists and art organizations in Moncton, continued participation in the space requires the ability to speak French. As such, many first language Anglophones who work there predominantly use French while in the space and also in conversation with Francophones (even outside of the space).

In the broader Acadian art scene in general, if bilingualism is required for certain functions (especially in communications as outreach to a wider public increases), some workers admit they never really use English. Roxanne, for instance, has emigrated from France to pursue her career in the field of art. She landed her first position in Canada thanks to contacts she had made while working at a Festival in France. Even though she’s been living in Moncton for three years, Roxanne reveals, as we discuss her permanent citizenship application, that she doesn’t consider herself to be “bilingual” in the way the Moncton market understands bilingualism (as mastering two languages as if there were “maternal” languages). This is the result, she contends, of the fact that she works in French. What’s more, Roxanne has held different positions since moving to Moncton, and, every time, was “recruited” by the organizations (meaning that her perceived lack of “the right kind” bilingualism wasn’t at all a hindrance in the Acadian art scene):

Roxanne pis ma demande de résidence permanente / je stress pas trop là parce que je rentre dans les critères / tu sais je travaille / pis j’ai une éducation / pis je suis avec Luc en plus pis
Mireille t’as passé deux hivers au Canada
Roxanne c’est ça / je suis toujours ici (rires)
Mireille est-ce que t’es bilingue?
Roxanne euh / comme / je parle français pis je comprends vraiment bien l’anglais là / parce que je suis Française je parle français (rires)
Mireille tu parles français? Get out!
Roxanne ouais (rires) je le parle // et je comprends vraiment bien l’anglais là mais euh j’ai pas vraiment l’occasion de le parler je vis en français mon chum est Français31 / comme / dans les magasins tu sais je peux parler en Anglais là / mais / je suis pas bilingue // je me fais comprendre en Anglais là / mais c’est pas comme une seconde langue maternelle là

31a Here she means that her boyfriend speaks French. He was born and raised in Moncton New Brunswick.
In sum, the Franco-Canadian art scene creates a redistributive space, wherein French becomes an asset and a value.

State investment in artistic production has also allowed for the creation of opportunities (in terms of scholarships, grants and employment) where French is required. As such, French and the ability to speak and write it have been and continue to be central to the deployment of the art scene. Yet, this was a site of tension for many artists and community workers, as they sought to position or maintain themselves within the Acadian art scene though the State-funded structures available to them. For one, the peer-reviewed process of State funding ensured the reproduction of prescriptive ideologies around linguistic norms of standard French: as such, the legitimate holders of standard French in geographic, classed and educational ways, held privilege in the communicative fields of the Art scene. As other forms of regional French have been constructed as ‘deficient’ in regard to standard French, the valuation of standard French entered into tension with regional varieties. Using a framework of linguistic insecurity, Boudreau has shown, for instance, that youths often devalue chiac, even when it is the form of French they claim to speak with the most ease (Boudreau 1998).
In fact, in Franco-Canadian communities, cultural policies are so closely interwoven in linguistic policies that language has played an important role in the trajectories of certain artists. Mathieu, for instance, reports that he was refused a scholarship to study music in France on the basis that “his French wasn’t good enough”, this, in spite of being highly regarded by his music professors. This scholarship, la Bourse France-Acadie, has been mobilized by the Acadian elite to recruit and reproduce itself, especially in the academic world. So, instead of continuing his studies in France, Mathieu moved to Montreal where he soon became a well-known musician in the contemporary and world music categories. This, in turn, paid off: through friends, he was able to do an “unofficial” internship in music networks in Eastern Europe (where he learned a bit of a Slavic language). Mathieu still participates in the Acadian scene; in 2007, for instance, he came to New-Brunswick for an Acadian underground music festival where he performed, with some of his fellow musicians from Montreal, contemporary pieces he had composed. This festival’s aim was specifically to challenge the territorialized, nationalist understanding of Acadian culture.

But the fact remains that the prescriptivist ideologies of the field meant that Mathieu’s trajectory brought him to seek support from alternative sources and to move to Montreal. In a sense, he was excluded from the central mechanism of the reproduction of Acadian culture. This example indicates that the field does still suscribe to prescriptive ideologies of language and this on two fronts: in the selection of artists (as in the case of Mathieu) and also in the ability, for artists and community workers alike, to produce normative communications in “proper” French.
Because of the original nationalist basis of federal funding in the Acadian and Franco-Canadian art scene, the space serves to maintain linguistic ideologies of normative language. Francophone spaces are indeed mobilized by community members as central to the reproduction of “good French” and linguistic norms. Take, for instance, the following excerpt where the workers of a Festival discuss complaints they received about “mistakes” that people found in the program of their event. This conversation happened during a post-event meeting of the organizing committee of a multimedia festival:

Valérie (…) moi j’ai entendu dire qu’il y avait beaucoup de fautes de français par contre 
Diane (rires) il y en a mais pas tant que ça mais il y en a 
Valérie (…) c’est-ce que je me suis dit 
Luc on a des profs d’Université qui viennent juste pour dire ça je pense ils vont pas voir [les œuvres] ils se virent de bord pis ils s’en vont chez eux là 
Diane oui / chaque calice d’année / l’année passée c’est Jacques qui m’a fait 
Luc qui vivent dans leur bulle de 
Diane l’année passée Jacques m’a fait une scène parce qu’il y avait des fautes dans mon mot / pis finalement comme j’étais comme ok montre moi / pis c’était comme style il manque / lui il s’obstinent qu’il y avait pas de virgule à telle place pis moi je m’obstinais qu’il y en avait une 
Rachelle les synopses / on a beaucoup [d’œuvres] qui viennent de [distributeur français] / un je l’ai soit sur des sites du Québec ou du ou de la France / pis c’est leur c’est leur job so / normalement c’est les synopsis officiels qui a des fautes dedans / deux / je relis comme trois fois chaque synopsis / so / trois / en plus moi je viens de la France pis c’est pas forcément les mêmes choses qu’ici / so / j’ai du mal à voir que c’est cousu de fautes là comme d’après moi il y a peut-être comme 
Diane il y en a / non moi j’en ai vu après mais pas il y en a pas 
Rachelle il y a peut-être dix fautes dans tout le programme 
Diane qui-ce qui a dit ça 
Valérie hein 
Diane plusieurs personnes ou une 
Valérie non il y a une personne qui m’a dit ça 
Luc je trouve des fautes dans des romans là 
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Valérie mais c’est des histoires de virgules pis de lettres majuscules pis de participe passé là / c’était surtout ça là

Rachelle ah ben là ça

Diane ouais / il y en a une couple mais c’est pas

Diane c’est pas un par page là

Rachelle c’est ça / pour moi ça c’est pas des fautes de français (rires) une majuscule pis comme ok là

Diane participe passé oui mais

Rachelle ouais participe passé mais comme vient le finir le programme ici à quatre heures du matin sans avoir dormi depuis comme un mois pis t’auras le droit de critiquer le programme

(...) (rires)

Rachelle ça me fâche assez là (soupir)

Valérie I heard there were a lot of mistakes in French however

(...) Diane there are some but not that many

Diane yeah every goddamn year / last year it was Jacques who made/

Luc where they live in their bubble of

Diane last year it was Jacques who made a scene because there were mistakes in my foreword / so finally like I was like ok show them to me / and it was like a missing / he was arguing that there was no comma at this space and I was arguing that there was one

(...) Diane the resumes / we have a lot of [pieces] that come from [French distributor] / first I get either from the Québec sites or from France / and that’s their that’s their job so / normally it’s the official resumes that have mistakes in them / second / I reread each synopsis like three times / so / third / on top of that I’m from France and it’s not necessarily the same thing as here so / I have a hard time believing that it’s filled with mistakes like according to me there might be some like

Rachelle there are some / no I have seen some after but there aren’t

Diane there might be like ten mistakes in the whole program

Valérie who said that

Diane a lot of people or just one

Valérie no one person told me that

Luc I find mistakes in novels

Valérie but it’s stuff about commas and capital letters and past participle / it was mostly that

Rachelle ah well then

Diane yeah there are some but it’s not

(...)
Linguistic prescriptivism is central to the unfolding of this discussion and how the participants are brought to position themselves. While they critique de prescriptivism of others, they do not challenge the underlying prescriptive ideology behind Valérie’s comment. On the one hand, Luc brings up the comments of “University Professors” who derive pleasure from finding mistakes in Festi-doc’s program. Yet, none of the participants question the ideology which links “good French” to cultural legitimacy or even to competence. Diane asserts that, sure, there are mistakes, but really not that many – and that the ones people find are often “not even mistakes”. Rachelle corroborates this comment and distinguishes between “real mistakes” and other kinds of mistakes (which we are left to understand stem from inattention and not lack of linguistic competence). Luc and Rachelle enter a game where they each affirm their French linguistic competence. Luc finds mistakes in novels. Rachelle states that since she, originally from France, reviews texts that are themselves originally from France and Québec, she has a hard time believing that the program could be “filled with mistakes”.

So what is going on here? Why would a comment about mistakes in a program cause so much discussion and exasperation? I mean, after all, as Rachelle and Luc themselves point out, most printed texts will contain a few mistakes. Diane, Luc and Rachelle all felt compelled to defend themselves as they criticized the linguistic police.
The answer lies, I believe, in who Diane, Luc and Rachelle perceive to be the “French” police: an Acadian group which, from political activists to journalists to academics, is very much linked to the reproduction of Acadian identity itself. The comment about mistakes found in the program, and subsequent defense of linguistic competence, is linked to the original nationalist mandate of the art scene: to produce a space where Acadians can practice and acquire standard French.

The Acadian art scene continued to reproduce nationalist modern and traditional understandings of francophone identity, reproducing lines of inclusion of exclusion where some trajectories and not others continue to “fit” dominant understandings of who belongs within the community. This means that even as a shift from a culturalist discourse to an economic development one occurs (and creates tensions as to how to legitimate funding), the scene’s original linguistic mandate (that is, the idea that promoting French would help Acadians be “better” at French and therefore be “proud” of their identity) remains one open for commentary and defense.

Not only does the process of applying for grants or scholarships itself require linguistic skills (understood to be as close as possible to monolingual norms), the selection by jury allowed for the reproduction of the “peer’s” ideologies of language and culture. Peers have the right to decide which projects, using which formats, should get funding. According to some participants this structures the legitimate languages of the field and excludes their own multilingual practices. Here, however, is a site where postnationalist ideologies are starting to emerge.

34 Valérie’s network involved a lot of people in this group.
6.3.2 “Moi je suis point activiste”\textsuperscript{35}: linguistic variation and multilingualism in postnational Acadian art production.

Speaking at a public conference on language and artistic creation in 2004, the multidisciplinary artist Georgette LeBlanc narrated the role of languages in a trajectory that led her from her hometown in rural Nova Scotia to the University of Louisiana (LeBlanc 2004). LeBlanc explained how she grew up feeling inhabited by three cultures, all linguistically defined as Acadian/Acadjonne (a local linguistic variety mixing French, some French archaisms by European standards and English), standard French and North American/English. She even felt limited by the Franco-Canadian University programs and the government funding programs which themselves favored production in French (for the same legitimating reason of saving the culture).

She goes on to say that she was very aware of the “French” world. She had the impression that this was the world in which she had to position herself. It is true that for many artists, the Acadian art scene is highly receptive: a literary editor I spoke with in 2000 told me that he actively recruited new writers for his publishing house, offering to

\textsuperscript{35} “I'm not an activist” (my translation).
guide them through the publication of their first novels if they could produce five or six “quality” poems. For Georgette this meant that as a budding writer, she felt the milieu was definitely pushing her to choose French. Indeed, the legitimating discourses of the scene (and the funding it received) mandated that writers and artists work to save the language and save the culture (through French).

But I was really aware of that world / and I was under the impression that I had to prove myself in that world for many years ah so I really feel like I am inhabited / by those three worlds / ah cultural and linguistic / ah I’ve published poems in those three languages / ah in English in French / n/ normative and in Acadian French from la Baie / ah and euh / to be honest I feel very comfortable in those three linguistic and cultural worlds / ah / however / I don’t know it was often the case oth/ some artists in any case were encouraging me to / to choose French ah / there was one man who / he liked to encourage me / you really must Georgette you must chose French / stop writing in English stop ah / persisting with that (laughter Georgette and members of the public) because we absolutely had to save Acadian culture we had to save our language ah bla bla bla (laughter from members of the public) and then writing poems in English wasn’t / wasn’t interesting at all / it didn’t lead / it didn’t lead anywhere (my translation)

The purpose of artistic production, in LeBlanc’s narrative, is perceived as a response to the linguistic ideologies of the community. Only in this way can writing in English be perceived as “not leading anywhere”. Georgette, however, could never limit herself to choosing « one » of the three languages that were, according to her, part of her everyday life. She could never restrain her writing within a linguistic conceptual framework and this, she revealed later in the speech, is part of the reasons why she decided to do her
Ph.D. in Louisiana, where she felt that the linguistic considerations that were constraining her in Nova Scotia were not quite as present. She mobilizes the idea of artistic integrity to justify her multilingual stance and puts the onus of monolingualism on “activism”.

Ah / I accept / and I understand that / ah / it’s okay / ah // s/ I find it’s important I want to be able to express myself in French but / ah / I find that as an artist / ah / it’s like impossible to chose one language at the expense of another / ah // I tried / to chose French to to like start from a linguistic conceptual framework and to sit myself down and tell myself allright well I’m going to write like this / and / I didn’t find that intellectual exercise that interesting / ah if I am an artists it’s because I am free / according to me / if I am an artist / I don’t censor myself / I let flow what must flow from my experience to the page / and ah I don’t understand how to write / how to create something real and honest ah by imposing some / some linguistic constraints on myself / ah I am not an activist / (laughter) / I’ve decided (laughter from Georgette and the crowd) I understand that we have to speak of (xxx) ah and that school curriculum and grants and all that has to keep going but for me as as an artist / ah I simply want to be honest / ah and to express myself / express myself in the whole array / ah of possibilities and worlds that inhabit me / language in the end is nothing but a tool / it’s a road one follows which helps to tell a story / I love words I find them fascinating / ah I find it fascinating seeing images created on the page by using words (my translation)

This brings Georgette to simultaneously advocate for authenticity and cultural hybridity and multilingualism, a wager she feels is somewhat dangerous: who is the public for her particular kind of multilingualism? Will Franco-Canadian activists, the very ones who
share her linguistic and cultural upbringing, follow her lead and want to read pieces in the multilingualism they have been trying to contain for decades? Is there a global public for multilingual literary pieces?

"mes personnages reflètent aussi toutes les langues qui m’habitent depuis mon enfance ici à la Baie / euh il y a de l’anglais du français des accents peut-être difficiles à comprendre / pour les autres / euh mais pourquoi réduire ce réseau complexe / euh quatre groupes culturels / en un seul / en un seul monde / je trouve que : l’hybridité (rires) l’éclatement / des rencontres / culturelles et linguistiques sont plus intéressantes et et honnêtes (ibidem)

"my characters also reflect all the languages that have inhabited me since my childhood here at la Baie / ah there is some English some French some accents perhaps hard to understand / for others / but why simplify that complex network / ah for cultural groups / in one alone / in one world / I think that : hybridity (laughter) / fragmentation / of encounters / cultural and linguistic are more interesting and and honest (my translation)"

Moreover, for LeBlanc, the success of her work was not only a matter of reception, but of access to government funding programs. She struggled to define herself from within the confines of the government funding which required that she define herself and her work according to the linguistic categories, and priorities, of the State (co-defined, as I argue in chapter 4, by the associative network):

"en tout cas dans mon cas / ça fait que je sais point qui-ce qui va vouloir regarder mes créations et lire mes mes affaires / euh je me sens de plus en plus seule euh / dans mon petit monde / euh artistique / je (ne) suis plus trop convaincue que je vais me trouver une place dans un monde artistique géré par des bourses gouvernementales des conseils qui insistent à diviser et à répertorier les artistes et l’art selon la langue / euh / mais c’est point grave (rires et rires de quelques membres de la foule) / tout ce que je peux euh affirmer aujourd’hui c’est que je refuse / d’exprimer autre chose que ce que j’entends et ce que je vois dans ma tête / euh ce qui m’arrive de la source / comme je dis / euh si la communauté acadienne les autres ne s’intéressent pas à ce que je vois ben tant pis (rires dans la foule) (ibidem)"

"anyway in my case / it means I have no idea who will want to look at my creations and read my my things / ah I feel more and more alone ah / in my own / ah artistic/ little world / I’m no longer convinced that I will be able to find some room in an artistic world managed by government scholarships of councils that insist on dividing and classifying artists and art according to language / ah / but it’s not the end of the world (laughter and laughter from some members of the public) / all I can ah state today is that I refuse / to"
express any other then what I hear and what I see in my head / ah what comes to me from
the source / like I say / ah and if the Acadian community and others don’t find what I see
interesting well too bad (laughter in the crowd) (my translation)

In 2004, LeBlanc was at the cusp of the emergence of using multilingualism to
represent Acadian identity. While there had been many writers, such as Antonine Maillet
Herménégilde Chiasson, Gérald LeBlanc or Guy Arseneau LeBlanc who mobilized
multilingualism in their work, these writers usually did so in the framework of cultural
homogeneity. In *Mourrir à Scoudouc* (1974), for instance, Chiasson’s use of English was
meant to represent the social domination of English in everyday life in Southern New
Brunswick. Guy Arseneau’s *AcadieRock* (1973), for its part, framed “Chiac” as the
language of the growing Acadian urban working class (in Moncton New-Brunswick)
while Antonine Maillet’s *Sagouine* (1971) represented the local dialect of a rural Acadian
working class community. Gérald LeBlanc would glorify this variety in later years as the
emblem of the emergence of an urban Acadian art scene (LeBlanc 2004). With the
exception of Chiasson, these writers maintained that English was somehow the language
of the other, and framed Chiac as being “French” and therefore part of Acadian identity.
It all served to maintain an idea of Acadian cultural homogeneity.

Georgette LeBlanc’s argument brings her elsewhere (literally and figuratively):
she mobilizes English, Acadjonne and French as integral parts of her identity. LeBlanc
won the Prix littéraire Antonine Maillet in 2008 for *Alma*, a storytelling collection of
poems she wrote entirely in a regional variety of French (identified by the editors as the
local variety of Chicaben, Nova Scotia) which tells the story of a working class Acadian
woman (a cleaning lady) growing up in the 1930s, intrigued by the world, but constrained
by her seminary educated lover. Since the book is in fact written in only one variety, it is
hard to tell whether the milieu LeBlanc felt was so constraining is opening up to multilingualism and cultural hybridity or if, instead, *Alma* reifies the homogeneous and territorialized links between language and identity.

Another example speaks more clearly of the expansion of the art scene in ways which allow for the representations of multilingualism: the use of multimedia and private capital from a global media corporation has allowed Alex, a multimedia artist to make a living, employ workers and gain national and international recognition thanks to his web-based popular art. But like Georgette, the shift from political activism to post-national multilingualism is a source of anxiety for Alex. Alex, like LeBlanc, also felt for a long time that he had to choose a language, preferably French, in a political climate where his multilingual production was not recognized as legitimate within the modernizing networks of the art scene. While he had tried his hand at literature, Alex felt that the medium, and its funding basis, were limiting his capacity to do the kind of work he wanted to do:

Alex: ben moi au début [le projet] c’était vraiment c’était une joke right
Mireille: yeah
Alex: c’était kind of comme / pis c’était pas une joke c’était kind of une joke pis un fuck you en même temps parce que / j’étais tellement tanné de / comme d’être forcé d’écrire dans une langue ou un autre quand-ce que je faisais de la création
Mireille: ok
Alex: tu sais là / j’ai juste dit fuck it / tu sais là / je va faire cecitte pis / ça me donne la liberté de faire whatever que je veux / j’écrirai en anglais si je veux j’écrirai en français si je veux / pis j’écrirai en chiac si je veux so / tu sais là
Mireille: ok parce que / quoi-ce qui te forçais à choisir l’une autre langue
Alex: ben je veux dire / si t’applique pour des bourses / ou n’importe quoi / il faut // ça ça a beaucoup affaire avec pourquoi je suis tombée dans le privé aussi je pense tu sais là / parce que : moi qu’est-ce que je fais ça tombe un petit peu plus comme dans it’s not considered high art tu sais là / c’est de l’art populaire

Alex: well for me at the beginning [the project] was really it was like a joke right
Mireille: yeah
Alex, by turning his back to the way the Canadian State funded language community art, by investing new media and receiving funding from the private sector, has won acclaim. Apparently there is a public –especially from within Francophone Canada– for linguistic variation, one that is especially interested in products that contest the normative linguistic ideologies of Francophone Canada. Much to his surprise, Alex found a part of the Acadian intelligentsia was quite receptive to his work (once it had found a national public). Yet, his work has been at the centre of much public debate. Alex even reported receiving, on top of the letters telling him he was a traitor to his culture, a series of menacing death threats. Apparently, there is a public out there for multilingualism, one that often escapes and dismantles the nationalist ideologies of the modernizing elites and is a cause for linguistic panics for some members of the community. This is likely because a part of the legitimating ideologies of the scene remains anchored in nationalism: the protection of French is still perceived as central to the reproduction of Franco-Canadian communities and so ideologies of language within the art scene are running in two parallel lines: protecting French on the one hand and representing authentic identity on the other. As such, both Alex and Georgette discuss potential perceptions of their multilingual stance as “apolitical”: their multilingual work, as

Alex: it was kind of like / and it wasn’t a joke it was kind of a joke and a fuck you at the same time because / I was so fed up of // like to be forced to write in one language or another when I was doing creation

Mireille: ok

Alex: you know / I just said fuck it / you know / I’m going to do this thing and / it gives me the freedom to do whatever I want / I’ll write in French if I feel like it / I’ll write in French if I feel like it / and I’ll write in Chiac if that’s what I want so / you know

Mireille: ok because / well what was forcing you to choose one language or another

Alex: well I mean / if you apply for scholarships / or anything / you have // it it has a lot to do with why I ended up in the private sector too I think you know / because what I do is a little bit like it’s not considered high art you know / it’s pop art (my translation)
Georgette reports, is perceived as “leading nowhere” from within the parameters of a nationalist ideology. Simply put, their mobilization of authentic practices is unrecognizable as “political” by mobilized community activist who are used to conceiving of linguistic activism in nationalist terms.

Where it is leading, however, is towards the expansion of publics for Acadian products in a global and governmental context that favors economic imperatives over linguistic-cultural ones. Alex’s art, for instance, received international acclaim by publics who identified with his work’s use of linguistic variation and rejection of language prescriptivism. As such, Alex’s art has been mobilized by community tourism and media organizations to help them attract a broader public: mostly Acadian and Franco-Canadian youths but also tourists in quest of “exoticism”. Much the same way, the rap group Jacobus et Maleco, which started rapping in Acadjonne, soon starred alongside folk rock singer Edith Butler as the Acadian elite made room for the linguistic varieties it perceived as being authentically part of Acadian identity. In other words, nationalist modernizing ideologies are becoming more varied; but it remains a change that has to reify the link between linguistic authenticity and cultural identity.

This is where the functioning of the art scene under neoliberal regimes enters into tension with the leading nationalist ideology of the scene. Multilingualism is mobilized in other ways by community workers; not to reify the links between authentic languages and cultural identity, but as a way to reach broader, multilingual, publics. As elites and the government adopt discourses of economic development, they create the need to expand the markets for Acadian products. This brings community workers to mobilize multilingualism to market their products.
6.3.3. New conditions: new practices.

Because of its link to linguistic mobilizations, the Franco-Canadian art scene is a site where languages are mobilized in multiple ways. In productions, such as the opening ceremonies of the 2009 edition of the Acadian World Congress, multilingualism is mobilized in the productions to show an Acadie that is open to otherness. One of the opening events invited, for instance, a Micmaq chief who addressed the crowd in his language, and a Scottish-Acadian who spoke in Celtic. That evening, during the opening show, Oumou Soumaré, presented as being from both Moncton and Mali, sang and performed in a Malian language (that I could not identify) while performing African dance to an African rhythm.

Multilingualism is increasingly mobilized, however, in more practical ways. As the global public remains elusive in the commodification of culture, economic planners and community organizations are starting to explore ways to expand into local publics. As Léo states, this has meant opening up the markets and the art scene to an Anglophone public:

Léo   pis la culture dans ce sens-là pis le tourisme en fait partie aussi
Mireille
Léo   on se rend compte que il y a juste un certain montant / il y a juste un montant de population fixe ou en déclin / le tourisme est à la baisse / à cause des / prix du pétrole / etcetera / donc euh / donc c’est ça c’est / c’est essayer de voir si on peut pas redéfinir notre marché interne
Mireille
Léo   c’est-à-dire ah ben il y a peut-être des anglophones qui seraient intéressés / c’est pas une menace

Léo   and culture in that sense and tourism is a part of that too
Mireille
Léo   we’re becoming aware that there is just so much stable population or in decline / tourism is in decline / because of the cost of oil / etcetera / so ah / so that’s it it’s / it’s trying to see if we could redefine our internal market
Mireille
Léo   in other words ah well maybe there are Anglophones who are interested / it isn’t a threat (my translation)
Many organizations are realizing that catering to a multilingual public is a great way to tap into broader publics. Vithuy, for instance, who runs an art gallery in Ottawa (their mandate is not linguistic), is tapping into multilingualism both as a way to dismantle leading language ideologies and as a way to tap into broader markets. Of course, this is possible in a multilingual city that has organized multicultural organizations:

Vithuy Ce qu’on fait c’est que quand l’artiste sa langue première est pas le français ou l’anglais on va traduire / le texte critique sur son travail / vers la langue maternelle / de l’artiste / et donc on avait par exemple [nom d’artiste] une artiste de [localité dans le sud des États-Unis] / elle aussi théoricienne assez connue en / en cinéma et en études culturelles (...) elle est venue pour [cet événement-là] pis on a traduit son texte en vietnamien pis ça a été distribué par le centre culturel vietnamien ici à Ottawa (...) pour chaque différent artiste qu’on a accueilli on a fait ça (...) comme par exemple on a eu des artistes d’origine chinoise qui ont présenté dans cette biennale-là pis on a euh / fait traduire / les textes critiques sur leur travail en chinois vers le chinois pis ça a été publié dans dans les journaux communautaires chinois ici / à Ottawa

Mireille ah wow ça permet donc

Vithuy oui ça c’est le genre de lien qui nous intéresse pour faire venir des gens de diverses communautés pis / tu sais [nom de l’artiste] nous a dit que / c’est la première / c’est la première fois dans sa carrière de je sais pas combien d’années qu’elle a eu tant de gens de la communauté vietnamienne qui sont venus à un de ses événements (...) tu sais il y a d’autres centres qui vont dire on n’a pas les ressources on n’a pas de temps pour le faire / ben nous on / on met pas beaucoup / ben on met du temps là-dedans là / mais on met pas beaucoup d’argent comme / tu sais comme on n’a pas beaucoup de ressources ça fait qu’on il faut qu’on pense à des moyens créatifs de faire venir les gens / pis tu sais / c’est à travers des communiqués ciblés qu’on arrive à / à faire notre xx

Vithuy What we do when the artist’s first language isn’t French or English is we translate / the critical text on their work / in the maternal language / of the artist / and so we had for example [name of the artist] an artist from [locality in the Southern United States] / also a well known theorist / in cinema and cultural studies (...) she came [for this event] and we translated her text in Vietnamese and it was distributed by the Vietnamese cultural centre here in Ottawa (...) for each different artist that we’ve received we did that (...) like for instance we had artists of Chinese origins who presented in that biennial and we [had] ah / translated / the critical text on their work in Chinese toward Chinese and it was published in in the community newspapers here / in Ottawa

Mireille ah wow so then it allows

Vithuy yes that’s the kind of connection we’re interested in to make people from diverse communities come and / you know [name of artist] told us that / it was the first / it was the first time in her career of how don’t know how many years that she had
so many people from the Vietnamese community who came to one of her events (...) you know there are other centers who will say that they don’t have the resources or the time to do that / but we we / we don’t put a lot of / well we put some time in it / but we don’t put in a lot of money like / you know like we don’t have a lot of resources so that means that we have to think of creative ways to make people come / and you know / it’s through targeted communiqués that we manage to / to do our (xx) (my translation)

Vithuy and her gallery’s mobilization of multilingualism allows them to tap into a broader public. As such, Vithuy considers the financial and temporal cost of translation well worth the investment. This allows her gallery to fulfill two goals: 1) its mandate of reaching out to communities marginalized from the mainstream art market and 2) meet the sponsor’s requirement requesting that the organization reach broader publics.

At a local Acadian level, Diane was also thrilled to find that multilingualism was a way for her to tap into broader publics. The Festival she runs has recently started showing subtitled productions and therefore decided to start producing a “mini-program” in English (all in English with a description of the subtitled movies). As a result, a local newspaper now carries the program and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation offers coverage of the event (this is added to the coverage the organization gets from French media). While she does not get a sense that this has impacted the number of anglophone “Francophiles” who attend the festival, showing subtitled movies and producing an English program allows the organization to reach a broader public, many of whom are, according to her, Francophones who do not read the French newspapers or listen to French media. Subtitled movies also allow, she states at the end of the following excerpt, for the inclusion of mixed couples:

Mireille  pis pourquoi il y a beaucoup de films / vous essayer d’avoir des films en / sous-titrés souvent
Diane   en anglais /
Mireille  ouais
Diane on essaie parce que dans même dans nos objectifs c’est pour / notre clientèle est francophone / et francophile
Mais pendant très longtemps ils voulaient pas de film sous-titré / nous on s’est dit ben il y a un potentiel de public anglophone / francophile qui peuvent venir à nos films si les films sont sous-titrés en anglais / donc pourquoi pas / donc on a commencé à faire un programme en anglais pour le festival avec juste les films sous-titrés on a une partie de notre synopsis avec les films sous-titrés en anglais / toutes nos activités continues se passent en français pareil / tu sais on n’est pas en train de s’en aller vers un festival bilingue / euh / c’est juste qu’on est ouvert à cette clientèle-là pis on s’aperçoit que / il y a pas / ça nous a donné beaucoup de couverture médiatique // de la presse anglophone / pis c’est une couverture dont on avait besoin parce qu’il y a beaucoup de francophones

Qui ne qui ne qui ne lisent que les nouvelles qui n’écoutent que la radio en anglais ici

Fait-que même pour rejoindre ta clientèle francophone / il faut que t’aie une certaine couverture médiatique dans les médias anglophones / mais tu sais on a eu des capsules à CBC tous les jours on a eu plein de couverture en anglais / euh / ce que ça a fait surtout / moi j’ai pas vu beaucoup de purs anglophones se présenter

Peut-être qu’il y en a eu là mais je veux dire c’est pas ça qui a rempli les salles / par contre on a vu beaucoup de couples exogames

Qui normalement irait peut-être pas au cinéma ensemble / mais là parce qu’il ya des sous-titres à certains films

And why are there many movies / you try to have movies in / subtitled often

In English

We try because in even in our objectives it’s for / our clientele is francophone / and Francophile

But / for a very long time they didn’t want subtitled movies / we told ourselves well there is a potential for an Anglophone public / Francophone who can come to our movies if the movies are subtitled in English / so why not / so we started producing a program in English for the festival with just the subtitled movies we have a part of the resumes with the film subtitled in English / all our activities continue to be in French anyway / you know we’re not becoming a bilingual festival / ah / it’s just that we’re open to that clientele and we’re noticing that / there isn’t / it gave us a lot of press coverage // the Angophone media / and that’s a coverage we needed because there’s a lot of Francophones

Who only read the news or listen to the radio in English here

So even to reach a francophone clientele / you have to have coverage in Anglophone media / but you know what had capsules on CBC everyday we had a lot of coverage in English / ah / and what happened mostly / I didn’t see a lot of pure Anglophones show up

Mmm
Diane: maybe there were some but what I mean is that it isn’t what filled the theatres / what we did see however are a lot of exogamous couples
Mireille: ok
Diane: who maybe wouldn’t normally go to the movies together / but now since there are subtitles to some movies (my translation)

Diane, like Vithuy, sees bilingualism as an opportunity rather than a threat, in a context where the mandate of her Festival is not compromised.

### 6.4 New Boundaries: reterritorializing linguistic practices

Language and linguistic ideologies are interwoven with the diversification of trajectories for Francophones in the cultural and art markets, as they fall in or out of the traditional nationalist networks. Simultaneously, the increased value of bilingualism in the Canadian market has meant that many Anglophones have invested in French immersion and bilingualism. This creates competition for bilingual positions and raises the stakes for struggles around questions of “authentic” bilingualism. Meanwhile, even the Anglophones who haven’t invested in bilingualism still generally perceive linguistic diversity to be a positive thing within Canadian society (Government of Canada 2008). Binary models of linguistic domination can no longer account for the complexities of the ways in which language participates in the production and reproduction of inequalities. Linguistic dominance can no longer be perceived as a conscious result of agent choices, but rather as emerging out of differentiated positions for individuals in the Canadian linguistic market. The art scene has been restructured and mobilized within these processes, as a producer of different kinds of capital: it also reflects, as a result, the differentiations happening in Francophone Canada, as the arguments indexing social justice give way to the creation of francophone products for multicultural and multilingual publics.
The post-nationalist ideologies favour multilingualism, hybridity, fluidity and ‘market efficiency’ over monolingualism and territorality. Concepts of identity and culture are still at the core of the Acadian post-nationalist ideology, with an increased emphasis on self-hood (the argument goes something along the lines that an emancipated self is one that partakes fully in his or her identity). As social mobility is increasingly within the means of Acadians, ideas about social justice are shifting from a regime where redistribution was predominant to one where recognition takes the forefront (Fraser 2003).

Institutions and individuals alike can shift fluidly between one discourse and the next as they position themselves in the new conditions. In fact, the post-nationalist points of view often rely on the nationalist view in order to function: the premise is to save Franco-Canadian communities. The nationalist view advocates doing so by “protecting” the language and therefore the community, the post-nationalist standpoint proposes to do so by “developing” the community through economic criteria. While there is a shift, it is a shift that is predominantly lived as continuity – even as some of the aspects of postnationalism, like added value to bilingualism, enter into tension with nationalist discourse and its emphasis on monolingual practices and its understanding of language politics as fundamentally diglossic.

To better understand the dynamics of this shift and its complexities, it is important to grasp how ideologies of art, culture and nationalism inform the positioning of actors in the contemporary art scene. Community partnerships with the State raise questions as to the nature of culture, language and nationalism. As I will show in the next chapter, these
concepts are terrains of social class struggle that inform the reproduction and transformation of the Acadian community.
7. The production of class: art and the reproduction of social markets

In *L’Amour de l’Art* and *La Distinction*, Bourdieu argues that “taste is first and foremost the distaste of the taste of others” (Wacquant 1998: 223, emphasis in original). Bourdieu’s approach to museums, museum attendance and the appreciation of art is meant to show that taste is acquired (as part of one’s habitus), making symbolic products and their producers participants in the struggles around the definition of legitimate symbolic capital. This chapter will tackle the interplay between the (re)production of symbolic capital and the (re)production of social categories within and across francophone communities. Here I focus on the struggles around who gets to define Acadian and how this act of definition structures the possibilities of inclusion and exclusion within the Acadian art scene. In other words, I want to look into how struggles around the valuation of particular forms of symbolic capital are also struggles around the (re)production of Acadian identity and contribute to building particular types of social networks, and particular definitions of how to do Acadian identity in a global economy. My argument is that the institutionalized Acadian elite managed to reproduce itself by participating in the shifting neoliberal discourses of the State. This means that the legitimating discourses of Acadian identity themselves are changing and that this change is a source of tension for Acadians, one that the elite strategically erases by arguing that its discourses of economic development are in line with earlier discourses of cultural recognition.

I analyze the struggles the shift is producing in two ways: first, I look at how the elite’s participation in discourses of economic development is a site of tension for
Acadian artists and emerging community projects. I focus more specifically on how some actors are advocating for the commodification of Acadian culture by collapsing the art scene with tourism. The emergence of tourism as a site for the promotion of artistic products is, again, a site of tension for Acadian artists and cultural workers, especially around notions of authenticity, as the imperatives of tourism favour artistic products that somehow “brand” themselves as Acadian. Second, I analyze how this shift in governance is a site of tension around questions of authenticity for the organizers and the public of Acadie Rebelle, a contemporary music show. Access to public funding has changed the mandate of the show. This change is a site of struggle for both the public and its organizers. Finally, I look at events that happened at a showing of a documentary in a film festival, as Jackie Vautour, otherwise an Acadian hero, denounced the betrayal of the Acadian elite in regard to his understanding of the original Acadian cause: representing the oppressed. The commodification of culture and the lines of inclusion and exclusion it creates raise questions about the shifting ideologies legitimating action on Acadian identity.

My approach to culture is anchored in political economy: for me, social categories and their reproduction result out of the diverse struggles for access to resources – and access to the spaces where valuable resources are defined. One of the questions Francophone Canada faces today is linked to its economic diversification: Franco-Canadian and Québécois nationalisms were mobilized as discourses to index and denounce unequal power relations in Canadian society. This denunciation relied and participated in reproducing a myth of cultural homogeneity. The structures of the economy made it so that it was fairly easy to conceive of francophone identity as being
predominantly rural and linked to traditional resources (such as the fisheries and lumber) or the industries these resources provided (such as fish plants and paper mills). Today, however, for multiple reasons linked to the diversification of the economic sectors in which Francophones circulate, ideologies that construct francophone spaces as homogeneous are coming under challenge. The conditions of the economy are changing, and with this, the legitimating discourses for States, such as Canada and ethnolinguistic identities, such as l’Acadie.

Also, as we shall see, discourses within francophone spaces function very much on the idea of what is receivable and conceivable and what isn’t. Foucault conceptualizes this phenomenon as a metadiscursive element to discourse that serves to sustain established power dynamics, or at least, to disarm potentially dangerous discourse:

I am supposing in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers, to cope with chance events, to evade its ponderous, awesome materiality. (Foucault 1972 : 216)

In other words, some ideas are receivable within discourse and others not. The question is: what happens to nationalist discourse once the conditions of its emergence have changed?

Bourdieu shows that taste is often the misrecognition of classed struggles. Postnational Franco-Canada is struggling with the diversification of its own class subjectivities. The modernization of the 1960s in Québec and, subsequently in Francophone Canada, were in great part struggles around access to economic mobility: at the time, mobility within the Canadian economy was anchored in a cultural mosaic, where Franco-Canadians were over-represented in the lower rungs of the economy. This
enabled a vision of Franco-Canadian struggles as being struggles around social equity and of Franco-Canadians as being homogeneously oppressed within the (ever-changing) structures of the economy. In other words, Franco-Canadian mobilization was first and foremost a political struggle, one that eventually came to be shrouded in discourses of pride and identity as the “oppressive” basis for the mobilizations were transformed.

The art scene of the 1960s and 1970s was invested in unveiling how oppression had structured a collective identity that was described as authentic yet impoverished (if not authentic because it was marginalized). As a result, the movement circulated constructions of an oppressing other, the British then Anglophones who were perceived to be benefiting from the ethnolinguistic and racialized division of the Canadian labour market. The image of the oppressive other still remains in both casual discussion, associative network discussion and in the products Acadians put forth: for instance, in the mega-show l’Odyssée, an Acadian mega-production that retells Acadian history for a local and tourist public, the British speak in arrogant tones and their characters are cold, mechanic and violent reproducers of imperial power. Yet, this play was pre-empted by a little foreword in English, to welcome the Anglophone public that had made its way into the audience. In these depictions of power, domination is the result of conscious processes of linguistic discrimination.

While the image of the oppressive other remains salient, much has changed since the 1970s in the Canadian economy. The creation of a demand for products and services in French in an increasingly linguistic economy and the apparition of bilingualism as a modus operandi of the State has meant that some francophone Canadians, more specifically, the bilingual ones, have had access to various types of mobility (social or
geographic), depending on the type of capital they could access, produce and legitimate. Inequalities remain as many Francophones continue to work the lower rungs of the service sector (see Dubois 1994 for an analysis of this process in the public sector). Yet, Francophones have been active in creating an alternate francophone symbolic market, namely through the institutionalization of francophone spaces. This alternate symbolic market is itself a site that structures Franco-Canadian symbolic capital. While language certainly played a big part in the structuration of that market (with monolingual competence in French and English placing one in an advantageous position), the art scene also serves as a space of reproduction and struggle.

7.1.1 Who does art? To whom does art belong?

The social meaning of art production was mobilized in various ways in my field work. Since art was linked to the cultural reproduction of Acadian identity, the central questions for conceptions of Acadian identity were: how is the art scene structured, mobilized by whom, to do what? These questions became grounds for the reproduction and contestation of power within Acadian networks. The questions are even more pressing as State and community leaders start conceptualizing the community in terms of economic development. In the next section, I pay attention to debates over the commodification of culture, namely in the emergence of tourism as site of State investment. Various visions of l’Acadie and its “truths” were mobilized by participants to position subjectivities within or outside the boundaries of the community.

The arts’ space dependence on government funding and the precariousness of Franco-Canadian means of financial capitalization mean that the Franco-Canadian art field remains highly defined by the conjoined interests of the instituted elite and of the
Canadian State. This happens because the associations and artistic groups who got funding in the 1970s and 1980s remain central players in the structuration of the art scene and, therefore, the reproduction of its legitimating discourses. As Hubert, a theatre director, points out, limited (State) resources means that the established organizations play an important role in recruiting and enabling the emergence of new projects and new types of creations:

Hubert  il n'y a pas énormement de place pour beaucoup plus d'infrastructures moi je pense / il peut mais il / je veux dire / sur le plan euh / de la gestion / pis euh sur le plan du financement pis et cetera je veux dire euh / de toute façon moi je considère que ce serait peut-être plus euh // il y a de la place pour que naissent d'autres compagnies sauf que je sais que en ce moment / il y a pas de subventions gouvernementales pour eux / il y a pas de / tu sais ils sont pénalisés à beaucoup de secteurs / à beaucoup de niveaux / alors le défi de compagnies comme nous autres c'est vraiment de travailler pour intégrer des jeunes créateurs

Annette mm
Hubert leur permettre de faire leurs projets (PP1 C-01-003 1998)

Hubert there isn’t a lot of room for a lot more infrastructures I think / it can but it / what I mean to say / on the level ah / of management / and ah on the funding level and etcetera I mean ah / and in anyway I believe that it would maybe be ah // there is room for more companies except that I know that at this moment / there aren’t any government grants for them / there isn’t / they are penalized in a lot of sectors / at a lot of levels / so the challenge of companies such as ours is to really work to integrate younger creators

Annette mm
Hubert allow them to do their projects (my translation)

Consequently, artistic innovation in the current conditions involves being able to mobilize identity discourse and fall in line with the established structure and with the goals of a neoliberal State. The State and the community structure what is possible within the Acadian art field.

The study of social actors’ positioning gives insight into the reproduction of power dynamics within l’Acadie. In the next section, I investigate how the institutionalized elite’s discourse, and its collusion with State agendas structures the field
in such a way that certain projects are more receivable within the field then others. These projects are in line with the nationalist movements that have emerged from 1883 onward and so serve to reify the discourses that lie within, even as the identity in question is increasingly commodified for global publics.

7.1.2 Commodity Acadian identity: theoretical background

In *Nationalism and the politics of culture in Quebec*, Handler (1988) documents the emergence of the objectification of culture: he focuses on “Folk” tradition to show how modern Québec suggested a generational “displacement and self-awareness” of what used to be a dominantly family oriented way of living. In much the same vein, he observes that this objectification can be mobilized in two ways: to foster a sense of nationalism (to construct Québécois culture as a palpable, bounded and individualized thing) and, paradoxically, to market Québécois identity to Québécois and non-Québécois alike. This second process, the commodification of language and identity, is full of consequences in the new economy.

Drawing from political economy, Heller uses the term “commodification of language” to document this shift in discourse in Franco-Canadian communities (Heller 2003). As, from the 1990s onward, community discourses shifted, much like government discourse, to a focus on economic development, more and more of the Franco-Canadians Heller interviewed were invested in presenting language – and especially bilingualism - as an asset in an increasingly symbolic economy. The shift permeated two fields: the language industries (Roy 2002, da Silva et alii 2008) and tourism (White 2006, Malaborza et McLaughlin 2008, McLaughlin and LeBlanc in press, Moise et al 2006). The first put emphasis on the commodification of language, where the other mobilized
language and ethnonationalist discourses to market Franco-Canadian identity to Franco-Canadian and global publics alike. I argue here that as art positions itself as a site of economic development, it is also increasingly struggling with the tensions that arise out of the commodification of Acadian identity. This struggle, as in the field of tourism, articulates itself around questions of authenticity and modernity, as the art scene shifts from discourses of cultural promotion (producing “true Acadian selves”) to economic development (fostering profits and integration in a waged economy).

While in both the language industries and tourism one can observe the alienation of language as a value on a market (instead of being linked to identity, language becomes a competence one can mobilize for profit in the capitalist job market) the ways language is commodified in the language and tourism industries are quite different. In the language industries, communication is the product, whereas in the cultural tourism and art industry, language is part of the “ethnicizing” package. Similarities between the language and cultural industries do abound, however: Franco-Canadian communities and governments have been targeting both as privileged fields that would ensure the reproduction of the communities by creating symbolic and economic markets where French can gain value. Both rely on current dominant linguistic ideologies, grounded in ideas about authenticity (and authentic speakers) (Coupland 2003, Lindholm 2008), standardization and “global” languages (Calvet 1999) and the territorialisation of language (da Silva et al 2007, McLaughlin and Le Blanc in press).

A focus on commodification is part of a body of literature within sociolinguistics that approaches language through the lenses of social theory and political economy (a departure from sociolinguistics’ original groundings in linguistics, where the focus was to
explain language itself, and not how language was mobilized to interpret, construct, reproduce or contest social inequalities) (Woolard 1989; Gal 1979). As Heller points out, theories of globalization are bringing forth a focus on flows, processes and social practices in politically informed sociolinguistics (2007).

Commodification dismantles modern ideas about language territorialisation and “ownership”, as call-centre agents are valued when they master the valued linguistic practices of their market, and as tourist workers perform their accents for a global public. Indeed, ideologies conceiving of linguistic practices as ‘properties’ of groups are simultaneously reified and challenged by their promotion on a global stage. These reconfiguration of what it means to speak a language transcend the field of the language and tourist industries. In the field of art, language functions much like it does in the tourism industries: as a way to mark authenticity and to position one’s polished presentation of self on the global stage. It is also a site of contention for artists who are excluded from the government-funded globalizing networks, as they strive to position themselves as representing the “real”, contemporary and urban Acadie: the true descendants of Acadian modernity.

7.1.3 Culture is economic development

In the mobilizations of 1960s and 70s, Acadian actors felt that “modernity” was the stake for the reproduction of Acadian identity; today, it is globalization that is perceived as the imperative. In art, “modernity” was often mobilized to position oneself and others in regards to the nation-building project (Heller et Labrie 2003; Farmer 1999). Heller and Labrie point out that from the 1950s onward, French-Canadian and subsequently Franco-Canadian intellectuals and community leaders relied on a
modernizing strategy to ensure the reproduction of the communities. “Le discours modernisant cherche à se servir du pouvoir politique afin de faire progresser la collectivité, et plus précisément afin qu’elle ait accès aux ressources du monde moderne (Heller et Labrie 2003: 18).” If modernity itself was a site of struggle, the current globalization of networks and the economy unsettled the constitutive discourses of Acadian modernity.

Madeleine and Fernande, two Franco-Canadian tourism development officers (working for the federal government), are waiting for a training session on cultural tourism to begin. As they do so, they look at the handout in front of them and Madeleine chants out: «Le tourisme c’est de la culture. Le tourisme c’est du développement économique.» she then adds «Est-ce que la culture c’est du développement économique? (rires) » (“Tourism is culture. Tourism is economic development. Is culture economic development (laughter) (my translation”). Fernande and Madeleine continue playing with the dictates, trying to tease out how culture, tourism and cultural development can be harnessed to work together.

These links, between tourism, culture and art, bring some actors to frame the project of modernity (1960s-1990s) and the current attempts to inscribe Francophone Canada in a global economy as being one and the same. After all, the modern political project and the global economic project both share the same goal: the reproduction of Franco-Canadian identity. In some of the artistic productions as well as in some of the interviews, participants and producers collapsed economic conditions with the evolution of Francophone Canada to produce a cohesive discourse of community reproduction. The

36 “Modernising discourse seeks to mobilize political power to help the collectivity evolve and more specifically to help it access the resources of the modern world.” (my translation)
Franco-Ontarian megashow L’Écho d’un peuple, for instance, a theatre production first intended as a cultural tourism development project, narrates the show’s global economic production as being itself the continuation of modern actor’s political project (the show indeed metanarratively speaks about the show). Only, now, the problem is that the economic viability of the project, as a global public failed to materialize.

A group of Franco-Canadian leaders also see the inscription and commodification of Acadian identity as being in line with the modern political project. One clear example of this positioning is offered by Jean. Jean, a man in his seventies, is mayor of a town in Northern New-Brunswick and was also involved, since the 1960s, in the development of cultural tourism in l’Acadie. Jean presents himself and his evolution as having links with the Acadian elite. Since the 1960s, he has been approached on various occasions by the powers that be to take responsibilities both within his community and the federal government. He was approached as a young man to be chief of police for his community with no formal training, and was recruited, thereafter, in the federal public function. He oversaw, in the 1970s, the start of the first major Acadian tourism project, the idea for which, as he states, originated from within the Acadian mobilized circle. In the following excerpt, Jean collapses doing art and culture with doing tourism and education. For him, this is possible since the objective of it all is to promote Acadian identity. Here, Jean is participating in an interview where I was joined by Joan Pujolar, who studies the development of cultural tourism in Catalunya, Spain.

Jean ah ben oui nous ici nous / ça marche à l’année nous ici les arts et la culture hein (...) on est une ville / au niveau infrastructure / il y a une étude qui a démontré / que nous avons des infrastructures de ville de quatre-vingt mille habitants et plus (...) Jean ils ont créé une entente qui s’appelait ARDA / ARDA ça voulait dire à ce moment là / euh ARDA / agence régionale ARDA de développement agricole et
il y avait autre chose avec ça (...) et euh cette entente là il fallait présenter des projets

Mireille

Jean et c’est là que nous ici entre la chambre de commerce et la ville on a créé ce comité pour justement voir qu’est-ce qu’on pouvait faire au niveau touristique / et monsieur Patrick Cormier qui a été le fondateur de la fédération [d’une institution financière acadienne] (...) alors lui il nous dit qui est un un patriote Acadien il nous dit on devrait démontrer au monde notre culture non seulement démontrer au monde notre culture / mais l’importance de créer un projet pour euh s’assurer que les générations qui vont nous suivre en Acadie se souviennent d’où on vient pis de qui on était / en d’autre mots un musée vivant qui va être là pour démonter aux jeunes génération notre histoire notre appartenance ces choses là

Mireille

Jean alors à la fois il y avait deux volets dans ce projet là / il y avait l’aspect éducationnel pour notre peuple acadien

Joan hmm

Jean et l’aspect touristique pour démontrer au monde qui on est

Jean ah well yes we here we / it runs all year round arts and culture here for us eh (...) we are a town / at the level of infrastructure / a study has shown / we have the infrastructures of a town of eighty-thousand inhabitants or more

(…)

Jean they started a partnership / called ARDA / ARDA meant at the time / ah ARDA / Regional agency for agricultural development and there was something else with that (...) and ah that partnership we had to present projects

Mireille

Jean and that when between the chamber of commerce and the city we created a committee to see what we could do at a tourism level and mister Patrick Cormier who was the founder of the [Acadian financial institution] (...) so that man says to us who is a a an Acadian patriot he says we should display our culture not only to the world our culture / but the importance of creating a project that insures that the next generations in Acadie wil remember where we came from and who we were / in other words a living museum that’s going to be there to demonstrate our history and our sense of belonging and all those things to the younger generations

Mireille

Jean so there areis two facets to that project / there is the educational aspect for our Acadian people

Joan hmm

Jean and the tourist aspect to show the world who we are (my translation)

Here, Jean positions himself as being in line with a leading Acadian patriot – and thereby, as being one of the central decision makers of Acadian identity (as his position as mayor and resume prove that he indeed is). He also maintains a discourse where there is no contradiction between doing tourism and doing identity. This eventually brings Joan to
raise the question of some of the tensions he’s observed in regards to the commodification of Catalan culture: can culture simultaneously be commercialized and remain “true”? Jean responds that in Acadie there is no contradiction. He maintains that Acadians are proud of having achieved economic mobility.

Jean le secteur culturel par exemple à la Catalogne / oui la catalinité c’est dans notre cœur / mais quand on va faire des affaires / on le laisse à la maison / ou / euh / aussi on dit que utiliser la catalinité dans le tourisme c’est un peu comme euh / je sais pas je trouve pas les mots

Mireille ah c’est le le vendre?

Joan oui le vendre / qu’on te vendre

Mireille qu’il faut avoir méfiance de commercialiser son cœur

Joan oui c’est comme une euh prostitution / il y a il y a / il y a quelques gens qui utilisent cette métaphore

Jean oui oui non

Joan c’est un peu fort / c’est parce qu’il y a ces choses catholiques de de

Jean hmm

Joan l’argent c’est là et la maison et la famille c’est autre chose

Mireille oh

Joan mais ici il n’y a pas de problème on / on il y a quelques façons de gérer les contradictions

Jean pas que je connaisse vraiment / non j’ai jamais vraiment euh euh /

(le téléphone sonne)

(…)

Jean l’évolution au niveau économique de l’Acadie / tu sais euh / moi quand je suis devenu fonctionnaire / en soixante et onze on était à peine 1 pour cent de la fonction publique Acadienne ou francophone / il y avait un député Acadien (…) alors qu’aujourd’hui on a pratiquement 50% des députés et ministres qui est Acadien et francophone / la fonction publique on est à 34 % francophones / on avait jamais eu à venir jusqu’à ce moment là d’entrepreneurs Acadiens ou Acadiennes euh majeurs / tout était controlé / par les Anglais même ici au niveau de la pêche c’était les Anglais qui appartenaient les usines / mais avec l’arrivée avec l’évolution majeur qui a été produite par Louis J. Robichaud notre premier ministre Acadien qu’on aurait jamais pensé qu’un jour on aurait un Acadien comme premier ministre du Nouveau-Brunswick / l’arrivée de Louis J. Robichaud a tout changé l’aspect socio-culturel économique au Nouveau-Brunswick / ses politiques ont entièrement changé l’aspect du Nouveau-Brunswick(…) ce qui fait que avec ce changement politique de Louis J. Robichaud (…) t’as eu un mouvement de développement professionnel ici qui a fait qu’aujourd’hui nous avons des Acadiens et Acadiennes qui possèdent des industries majeures qui sont multinationales maintenant // qu’on avait pas auparavant (…) alors ça a créé ici en Acadie / une fierté économique (…) alors t’as à la fois une évolution au niveau économique et socioculturel qui se sont faîT en même temps // et qui prend de plus en plus de place / et qui fait que ça donne une valeur euh à la fois touristique culturelle économique // c’est un ensemble maintenant / qui fait notre force

Joan oui
Jean: alors c’est pour ça qu’au niveau nous-autres de prostitution de notre héritage ça existe pas ici / au contraire on est fier de faire partie de démonter au monde qu’on est toujours là pis qu’on est fier de notre héritage tu sais.

Joan: the cultural sector for example in Catalunya / yes Catalanity is in our heart / but when we do business / we leave it at home / or / ah / also they say that using Catalinity in tourism is a bit like ah / I don’t know I can’t find the words.

Mireille: it’s sel/ selling it?

Joan: yes to sell / that they sell you.

Mireille: that you have to be weary of commodifying your heart.

Joan: yes it’s like a ah prostitution / there are there are / there are a few people who use that metaphor.

Jean: yes yes no.

Joan: it’s a bit strong / it’s because there are these Catholic things of of.

Jean: hmm.

Joan: money is there and the home and the family is something else.

Mireille: but here there aren’t any problems they / they there is some ways of managing the contradictions.

Jean: not that I’m aware of really / no I never really had ah ah / (the phone rings)

(...) Jean: the evolution at the economic level of l’Acadie / you know ah / when I became a public servant / in seventy one we were hardle one percent of the public sector Acadian or Francophone / there was one Acadian member of parliament (...) whereas today we have practically 50% of the members and the ministers who are Acadian or Francophone / the public sector we are 34% Francophone / we never had up until this point any major Acadian businessmen or businesswomen / everything was controlled / by the English even here the fisheries it was the English who had all the plants / but with the arrival with the major evolution that happened with Louis J. Robichaud our Acadian first prime minister that we never could have thought that one day we would have an Acadian as premier of New Brunswick / the arrival of Louis J. Robichaud changed every aspect sociocultural economic in New-Brunswick (...) and so what happens with the political change with Louis J. Robichaud (...) you had a wave of professional development here which makes it so today we have Acadian men and women who own major industrial plants who are multinational now // which we never had in the past (...) so that creates here in Acadie an economic pride (...) so you have on the one had an evolution on the economic level and sociocultural that happened all at the same time // and that takes more and more room / and what happens is that it gives tourist cultural economic value all at the same time // it’s a whole now / that makes our strength.

Joan: yes.

(...) Jean: so that’s why the question for us of prostituting our heritage it doesn’t exist here / quite the opposite were are proud to show the world that we are still here and the we are proud of our heritage you know (my translation)
Jean therefore links the history of social mobilization to the current commodification of Acadian culture. Jean’s positioning echoes that of other participants who were involved in the governance side of economic and community development. The position that art is culture is economy is interesting because, on the one hand, it discursively erases the tensions around authenticity that might arise from selling identity on a global stage. In this view, economic development is authentically Acadian. The culture-is-economy stance also positions one network as the dominant network when it comes to the structuration of Acadian identity in neoliberal regimes. As such, there is continuity, for Jean and other participants, between the political struggles of the 1970s and the current professionalization of the arts and development of tourism for a global public. The goal of all of it remains patriotic: to ensure the reproduction of Acadian culture.

And yet, because Acadian cultural tourism is converging with artistic production, the emergence of tourism is a site of contention within the artistic community. As tourism becomes one of the legitimate ways to fund the production and circulation of artistic products, it is necessarily impacting the structuration of the art scene. On the one hand, it means that artists can mobilize tourism networks to access global publics. On the other, this new geographic mobility is only available to those artists who can help sell Acadian culture and Acadian traditional regions as a viable destination for national and global publics.

Yves is an Acadian tourism agent (mandated by a government economic development agency) who spends a lot of time doing “product awareness” in international cultural and music festivals as well as tourism fairs. As we talked, he mentioned that he generally uses musicians to market his product, Acadian tourism:

Yves pour nous / un de nos meilleurs ambassadeurs / c’est les musiciens
Mireille: okay
Yves: comme dans le [Festival en France] / comme dans le [Festival en Louisiane] où on a participé / moi pratiquement tout / parce que des fois je commandite des événements aussi / comme au salon il y a des dîners ben je commande des dîners / [autre groupe musical acadien] s’est produit là / [troisième groupe musical] s’est produit là / c’est eux-autres qui offre une vitrine / d’une demi-heure un heure / à ces gens là parce que la musique / ça a pas de langue / tu sais je veux dire / le monde écoute du violon pis quelqu’un qui est dedans pis tout ça ben même si ils comprennent pas les mots / ça leur donne un avant-goût d’un petit peu ce qui va se passer chez nous / avec les productions qu’on a au [festival en France] / à la fois ça permet aux artistes de se faire connaître / de se faire voir un petit peu / pis pour nous-autres ben ça nous aide

Mireille: vendre le cachet
Yves: ben à vendre le cachet pis à donner l’information parce que c’est beaucoup un affaire d’information / si les gens connaissent pas (...) si je te dis juste viens voir les Acadiens / aucune idée qui-ce qu’est les Acadiens / ben les Acadiens on a notre histoire / pis on vient de Poitou Charente / ah oui / tu sais ça fait que là il y a des liens pis il y a un intérêt qui se développe / pis les artistes ben / par leur musique il faut des fois qu’ils expliquent leurs chansons parce que ça parle / des affaires de par chez nous ça fait que ça les met dans le contexte pis tout

Mireille: fait que ça permet de faire connaître les artistes
Yves: les artistes pis / par défaut quand tu dis on vient de l’Acadie ça intéresse les gens / les artistes aussi sont invité les gens à venir les visiter pis dire garde nous-autres c’est : on parle comme ça pis / pis beaucoup de monde / pis beaucoup d’Acadie sont musiciens aussi là

(...) Yves: tu sais encore la musique qui parle de nous-autres avec notre langage
Mireille: mm
Yves: du chiac pis tout ça tu sais ça fait partie de notre identité / pis c’est un véhicule par excellence tu sais parce que comme je te dis ça éveille des émotions là tu sais

Yves: for us / one of our best ambassadors / it’s musicians
Mireille: okay
Yves: like in the [Cultural festival in France] / like in the [Music festival in Louisiana] where we go / we participated in the [Festival in Louisiana] / [Acadian musical group] came with us for that one / in my case basically every / because sometimes I sponsor events too / like at the exhibitions there are some luncheons well I sponsor the luncheons / [Another Acadian musical group] performed there / [A third Acadian musical group] performed // they’re the ones who host the showcase / half an hour or an hour / to the public because music / has no language / you know what I mean / people listen to the violon and someone who’s into it and all that and even if they don’t understand the words / it gives them a little taste of what will happen here / with the productions we have at the [Cultural festival in France] / on the one hand it allows the artists to get known / to be seen a little bit / and us well it helps us too

Mireille: to sell the cachet
Yves: to sell the cachet and to give out information because it’s a lot of information / if people don’t know it (...) if I just tell you come si the Acadians / and you have no idea who the Acadians are / well Acadians we have our history / and we come from Poitou Charente / ah yeah / you know so then that creates links and it
develops interest / and artists well / with their music sometimes they have to explain their songs because it talks about / things from around here so it puts the public in context too

*Mireille* so it let’s people know the artists
*Yves* the artists and / by default when you say you’re from Acadie it intrigues people and / the artists also invite people to come visit them look for us it’s: we talk like this / and a lot of people / a lot of Acadian musicians are also there

(...) 
*Yves* you know again the music talks about us in our language 
*Mireille* hmm
*Yves* in chiac and all that you know it’s part of our identity / and it’s an excellent vehicle you know because like I say it awakens the emotions you know (my translation).

For Yves, music is the best way to generate interests for his product outside of l’Acadie. Marketing tourism relies on the expansion of markets. Providing information to people who generally know very little or nothing at all about l’Acadie is Yves’ biggest challenge. He has to find compelling ways to provide this information. Music, an art form he later contends is abundant and traditional to l’Acadie, is the best way he’s found to do so. The musicians he’s hired are a hit on the tourism circuit: they narrate Acadian history when they contextualize their song and also “showcase” their language, apparently a compelling difference for European and Québec Francophones who understand cultural difference as being linked to language. Here, language variation (specifically distance from “standard” French) becomes a symbol of exoticism.

Yet, mobilizing musicians for the promotion of tourism raises concerns: clearly, Yves will be more interested in promoting artists who somehow “Acadianize” themselves in their production, be it through their accents or the use of musical instruments or musical genres traditionally associated with Acadian culture. As tourism marketing always strives to meet the expectations of the public in order to sell itself, Yves himself
contends, on the topic of standardization, that he must mobilize particular types of symbolism when marketing Acadian culture.

Yves tu sais parce qu’on a fait / c’est quoi qui représente l’Acadie pour vous / c’est-y un phare / c’est-y un drapeau / et puis tout le monde était unanime c’est // un phare oui mais il faut qu’il y ait un drapeau Acadien ou un symbole Acadien quelque part parce que sans ça c’est un phare qui peut être n’importe où // ça fait qu’on a développé du visuel

Yves you know because we did / what represents l’Acadie for you / is it a lighthouse / is it a flag / and everyone was unanimous it’s // a lighthouse yes but there has to be an Acadian flag or an Acadian symbol somewhere on it or else it’s a lighthouse that could be anywhere // so we started developing some visual (my translation).

And so it was no surprise that the artists Yves mentioned either had explicit references to Acadian identity in their songs or were “folk-rock” bands, showcasing violin and tap-dancing (albeit in a contemporary way). In this way, tourism mildly participates in the folklorization of culture and benefits those Acadian artists who showcase their identity in their work.

Yves and I then proceeded to talk about the interests for musicians in being funded by tourist agencies. This topic raised another area of concern: can doing art for tourism really help artists achieve their career goals? Here Yves admitted he struggles with one of the contradictions inherent in the activity of doing tourism through music: the musicians are offered low wages to travel to Europe, on the premise that representing l’Acadie on the tourism circuit will be good for their career development by giving them access to global publics. So, while tourism creates opportunities for some artists, it also reproduces the economic precariousness characteristic of most art scenes.

Yves souvent je trouve que les artistes / on va leur dire / venez ça va vous faire une bonne promotion / ok / vous allez vendre des disques / on va juste vous payer vingt-cinq piasses par jour / vous allez jouer trois fois par jour / fait-que là l’artiste dit ben / ouais / c’est vrai que ça me donner une belle visibilité / j’aurai pas la chance d’aller en France peut-être
MM  (rires) / ouais la promesse du voyage en France
Yves  tu sais / ça fait / ça fait en sorte que à un moment donné je trouve qu’il y a un abus là / tu sais pis on on / souvent on prend pour acquis que les artistes ils aiment ça / jouer / c’est vrai qu’ils aiment ça jouer
MM  [sarcasme] oui / pis ils sont pas supposés de vouloir de l’argent
Yves  [sarcasme] non c’est ça parce c’est le fun c’est le fun jouer de la musique /
MM  [sarcasme] c’est une passion c’est pas une carrière
Yves  [sarcasme] oui ben c’est ça ils joueraient tout le temps / [normal] ben à un moment donné / c’est leur job / ils sont fatigués (…) souvent on pense que eux-autres ils font ça pour le fun mais il faut qu’ils vivent avec ça / pis / tu seras d’accord avec moi qu’il y a pas beaucoup d’artistes qui
MM  qui vivent riches
Yves  qui vivent riches qui drive des Mercedes ces affaires là / il y a peut-être Roch Voisine mais / c’est quand même limité

Yves  often I find that artists / we’ll tell them / come it’ll be great promotion for you / ok / you’ll sell albums / we’re only going to pay you twenty-five bucks / you’re going to play three times a day / so then the artists says well / yeah / it’s true that it gives me great visibility / I won’t have the chance to go to France maybe
Mireille  (laughter) / yeah the promise of a trip to France
Yves  you know / so / what happens is that there comes a point I find where there’s abuse / you know and we / often we take it for granted that the artists like / playing / it’s true that they like playing
Mireille  [sarcasm] yes / and they’re not supposed to want money
Yves  [sarcasm] no and that’s because it’s fun playing music
Mireille  [sarcasm] it’s a passion not a career
Yves  [sarcasm] yeah that’s it they would play all the time / [normal] but at one point / it’s their job / they get tired (…) we often think that they do it for fun but they have to make a living with that / and / you’ll agree with me that there aren’t that many artists who
Mireille  live richly
Yves  who live richly who drive Mercedes those kinds of things / maybe Roch Voisine but / it’s still limited (my translation)

Yves’ concerns are doubly legitimated, as unlike with the Acadian Art Promotional Plan, where the organizers try to get European distributors and producers to see the shows, the tourism circuit only functions as a general public awareness and is rarely part of a bigger promotional campaign.

And yet, the emergence of a global Acadian cultural tourism scene is thus converging with the promotion of Acadian art on the global stage. As it is clearly the desire of an Acadian network to promote Acadian culture through art and tourism, the artistic community does have to position itself in the face of tourism. Some have no
problems developing products that are at the convergence of both. Others, meanwhile, feel that tourism, like commercialization in general, reproduces a folklorized image of Acadian identity. In the next section, I will look at some of the tensions that the new convergence of economic development, tourism and artistic promotion have caused for Acadian artists.

7.1.4 Working culture under ideologies of capitalism

Faced with the emergence of tourism as a privileged site of government intervention, many community workers and artists took position in regards to the “folklorizing influence” of the commodification of Acadian culture for global networks. Léo, a man in his thirties, lobbied from within the discourse of economic community development to access funding for his performance festival on the very premise that contemporary performances of Acadian identity were vital to the reproduction of the community. As a private research and development consultant, Léo is one of the top tier workers of the new economy – if not in salary, at least in lifestyle. He gets my jokes about Richard Florida’s notion of the creative class (the concept that the economy is now driven by creative entrepreneurs (Florida 2002)). Léo even cites Florida in his interview and has worked as a consultant for some of the State agencies I have interviewed in the course of my thesis fieldwork – namely on the topic of cultural tourism.

Léo has a globalizing view of arts today, one which makes room for cultural specificities and economic development: he organizes a festival of experimental music which targets a very specialized niche public, but puts local musicians in a global network of the experimental genre. He also has a globalizing view of ethnolinguistic boundaries: Léo contends that the festival, open to a bilingual – if not multilingual
public- also serves to keep local art at the forefront of creative innovation, enabling a
diversified and contemporary Acadian culture along an innovative non-ethnically defined
art scene. He contests the discourses which position French as a vulnerable language in
North America, and instead, sees the new economy as an opportunity for Franco-
Canadians. He aligns himself with the idea that “all Canadians” should benefit from
Canada’s linguistic duality (Government of Canada 2008) and that government and
community organizations should foster networks which bolster local artists onto the
global stage.

And so Léo is well positioned to harness the discourses of economic development
to position his products in accordance with the discourses of the State. For this, he banks
on the idea of global networking: pitting local artists with global celebrities, thus creating
economic networking opportunities and public development for globally competitive
Canadian and/or Acadian artists.

Léo fait-que nous autres c’est vraiment sans compromis pis on n’a pas besoin de / de
modifier nos attentes / si le public est pas toujours / au rendez-vous parce que
cest c’est quand même un peu plus marginal / mais c’est correct parce qu’il y a
un volet très pédagogique donc on charge rien / ou à peu près rien pour que les
gens viennent

M hun hun / pis un volet échange entre les artistes aussi

Léo échange entre les artistes / il y a des ateliers / aussi on a commencé à aller dans
les écoles maintenant / euh donc qui a été grandement apprécié à la fois des
jeunes qui faisaient de l’improvisation pis des / des enseignants

(…)

Léo pis là ça fonctionne bien / puis / du même coup on essaie de développer ce qu’on
appelle le réseau de l’Est // (…) pour encore là créer un espace où les gens
peuvent se présenter à de multiple occasion / pis encore là / de réduire les coûts
parce que si on a des des musiciens qui viennent de New York ou de / là on
regarde à / l’Angleterre ben / il faut leur donner des occasions de jouer

Léo so for us it’s really a compromise and we don’t need to / to adapt our
expectations / if the public isn’t always / present because it’s it’s still a bit more
marginal / but that’s all right because there’s a very pedagogical aspect so we
don’t charge anything / or almost nothing so that people will come

Mireille hun hun / and there’s an exchange aspect with the artists too
Léo exchanges between the artists / there are workshops / we’ve also started going in schools now / ah so that was greatly appreciated by the youths who were jamming and the / the teachers

(...) and now it works well / and / at the same time we’re trying to develop what we call the East network // (...) to there again create a space where people can perform on multiple occasions / and there again / reduce the costs because musicians who come from New York or from / right now we’re looking at / England well / you have to give them lots or opportunities to play (my translation)

In his practice, then, Léo is mobilizing federal funding to position artistic products globally in a way that dismantles the folklorizing tendencies of mass publics (who, as Yves mentioned earlier, are usually interested in purchasing their understanding of Acadian culture as being above all traditional). Along with networking benefits, Léo has embedded another of the government Franco-Canadian communities’ priorities: youth. The question, for Léo, is to ensure that Franco-Canadian youth continue to develop contemporary musical taste (and that they can, as Franco-Canadians, have access to the global stage through other means than language transfers or folklorization).

Léo pour [le festival] ben c’était un peu de remettre en question notre héritage folklorique
Mireillehmm
Léo puis de dire que oui d’accord les violons ça a sa place pis la Sagouine aussi etcetera / mais si on veut retenir surtout les plus jeunes pis même ceux qui ont faiT le tour des / des violons pis des chalets / de dire que on a le droit / on a accès à un marché mondial de musiciens d’artistes qui travaillent dans le secteur culturel

Léo for [the festival] well it was to put our folk heritage into question
Mireillehmm
Léo and to say that yes okay there is a space for violons and la Sagouine too etcetera / but if we want to retain youths and even the people who’ve seen / the violin and the cottages / to say well we have the right / we have access to a global market of musicians and artists who work in the cultural sector (my translation)

While Léo managed to successfully harness the discourse of the State (where he wasn’t actively participating in producing it himself.) to create a contemporary artistic product
that was in line with both “modernizing” ideologies of art and globalizing ideologies of governance, some other groups weren’t able to position their organizations in the new discourse, for their understanding of Acadian modernity (and what to do next) was more closely bound up with an idea of an authentic Acadian identity being produced outside of market forces.

Examples of artists contesting the folklorization and touristification of Acadian identity were somewhat abundant in both my field work and that of the Prise de Parole field work. These critiques were usually meant to position the speaker’s art as representing the true face of contemporary Acadie, against the backdrop of either art that was “just for tourists” or art that was “too cliquey” or art that was “too commercial”. (Different artists would use different adjective depending on the type of art they produced). I have chosen, however, one particular case, MétroAcadie, because it speaks volumes in regards to the power dynamics within l’Acadie as actors strive to position themselves in the art world. Most particularly, the case of MétroAcadie, a group of young artists and webdesigners which bills itself as being urban and contemporary, indexes how government funding is involved in the reproduction of particular ideologies of Francophone Canada and how culture is a site of struggle.

Philippe, one of the co-founders of MétroAcadie is a soft-spoken twenty-something that colleague Mary Richards and I met in a café in Toronto’s Bloor Street West in 2006. Philippe is a graphic designer who studied Arts at the Université de Moncton and transferred to Toronto to pursue graphic design. He works both as a webdesigner and as a new media artist, having some of his work showcased in galleries in Moncton and Toronto. Like many other Acadians interviewed in Toronto, Philippe
moved and stayed there because of the incredible opportunities the city offers – and because of the comparative advantage his bilingualism gives him on the market (Philippe, for instance, says that he wouldn’t have as many opportunities in Montreal because he feels his French isn’t up to par for the Montreal market – but it gives him a competitive edge in Toronto.)

We approached him because of his long-distance involvement in the Acadian art scene. Along with a few friends in Moncton, Philippe is the webdesigner for MetroAcadie, a multimedia organization meant to bolster the urban Acadian art scene.

While I have selected pieces that speak more specifically to the struggles Philippe and his organization faced, Philippe was always careful to present his work as being complementary to what he calls the “business side” of contemporary Acadian identity.

Immediately though, Philippe, unprompted, positions his project as being an urban, contemporary counterbalance to the touristic and historic versions of l’Acadie.

Philippe moi pis mon partenaire présentement de [MetroAcadie] / Marius Bourque / euh on s’est mis ensemble pis on s’a dit qu’il y a vrai manque d’identité euh sur l’internet le web / ailleurs en dehors de l’Acadie euh qui représente l’Acadie contemporaine euh / avec un sens de tu sais urbain euh / tu sais un groupe qui pense au futur / de l’Acadie et pas nécessairement euh tu sais le côté touristique et historique tu sais / c’était un nouveau côté de l’Acadie qu’on voulait vraiment euh aider à à grandir pis de promouvoir

Philippe me and my partner currently of [MetroAcadie] / Marius Bourque / ah we got together and we thought that there is a real lack of identity on the web / elsewhere outside of l’Acadie which represents contemporary Acadie ah / with a sense of you know urbanity ah / you know a group who thinks about the future / of l’Acadie and not necessarily ah you know the tourist or historical side you know / it was a new side of l’Acadie that we really wanted to to help grow and promote (my translation)

The organization produced cultural events, promoted artistic projects, offered free advertising for its members and, more importantly, ran a website where artists could
share their work, network and advertise (it was the first Acadian website to have on-line video-clips). The general public could also participate by commenting on a forum, a practice that was done abundantly from 2002 to about 2007. (The site’s utility as an Acadian networking forum dwindled with the growing popularity of other social networking websites such as Facebook – which came out in its current form in 2005.)

The general public for Metro-Acadie readily identified itself as globally positioned, as members – mostly people originally from the Atlantic provinces – posted from Montreal, Paris, Tokyo, Ottawa, Toronto, Québec and, of course, from multiple localities in the Atlantic provinces (Moncton, Bathurst, etc.). Philippe contended that the type of art promoted on the website (Acadian Hip Hop, digital abstract pieces, literary prose) meant that the majority of its followers tended to somehow identify themselves as “urban”. Very few Acadian migrants, for example, posted from Albertan mining towns.

Philippe positioned the project as being an alternative to the mainstream ways of presenting l’Acadie. He felt, like Jean, that his project was the continuation of the political heritage of the 1960s and 1970s. Unlike Jean, however, Philippe and his colleagues were struggling to find funding for their project – this – according to Philippe, because the government was mostly interested in generating profit, employment and business. Funding agencies therefore couldn’t understand the relevance of an artistic social networking organization based on free collaboration (note that Philippe and his colleague applied for funding at a time when arts associations were only beginning to organize a lobby to be recognized by government as an economic development field, see chapter 4). Throughout his interview, Philippe refers to this government interest in economic development as “tourism”:

Mireille pis vous-autres vous recevez aucun financement euh du gouvernement?
Philippe c’est ça / on euh / on on essaie pis on a déjà essayé d’avoir euh / un peu de financement pour le projet mais beaucoup du financement qui qui se donne / euh // aux Atlantiques aux Maritimes ça a affaire avec la génération d’emplois / et la génération de business d’argent pis on n’est pas / un modèle qui est pour faire de l’argent alors pour nous c’est plutôt de trouver des / des dons

Mireille yeah

Philippe tu sais des dons des bourses des / tu sais des genres de / de partenariats / euh ben des bourses du gouvernement ça serait vraiment cool / pis on a essayé de l’avoir / euh on a essayé / d’avoir une bourse pour les les communautés virtuelles en Acadie pis on essaie de l’avoir mais c’est / c’est comme que je le dis on dirait que c’est / ça va toujours au côté du tourisme parce que ceux qui gagne c’est eux-autres / qui font les sites web sur les Dunes de Bouctouche ou à la site web sur le Baie de quelque part ou les baleines ou les violonistes de ce petit village-là

Mary vous rentrez pas exactement dans ce cadre là

Philippe exactement (…) Philippe tu sais il y a beaucoup de professionnels (…) c’est eux-autres enfin qui ont planté la graine dans les années soixante et dix soixante quand qu’il y a eu les émeutes à Moncton pour euh les droits de la langue à l’Université quand que les francophones de la province se sont mis le pied à terre pis on dit que on est ici on est beaucoup on a le droit d’avoir des services en français on a le droit de vivre notre vie en français (…) c’est cette / c’est cette mentalité-là que / qu’à été planté chez euh cette nouvelle renaissance de l’Acadie qui a commencé dans les années soixante qui donne le mouvement puis euh / ça donne une ça crée une demande je pense pour un endroit comme MétroAcadie ou un groupe comme MétroAcadie qui veut penser différent / qui veut pas se classifier dans les vieux euh / dans disons dans les vieilles idées ou les vieilles classifications qui ont été données à l’Acadie / par avant / par les les groupes touristiques ou les grands groupes culturelles qui sont peut-être trop poussé sur euh / vendre la vieille Acadie

Mireille vendre la vieille Acadie

Philippe ben on a un œil critique sur le côté touristique de l’Acadie / tu sais on veut pas // on veut pas le défaire / défaire cette demande être contre cette demande mais on veut pas non plus être / juste classifié / pis tu sais c’est important parce que c’est aux personnes d’ailleurs / les touristes / de d’autres provinces d’autres pays d’autres villes qui viennent pis ils voient pas le plein spectrum de notre culture pis ça nous triche dans le fond pis euh c’est pas c’est pas la pleine vérité de qu’est-ce qui se passé

Mireille so you guys don’t receive any funding from the government?

Philippe that’s right / we ah / we we try and we’ve already tried to have ah / a a bit of funding for the project but a lot of the funding that’s that’s being distributed / ah // in Atlantic Canada in the Maritimes has to do with job creation / and business creation money and we’re not / a model that is there to make money so for us it’s a question of finding donations

Mireille yeah

Philippe you know donations scholarships some / you know kinds of / of partnerships / ah well des government scholarships would be really cool / and we tried to get it / to get a scholarship for virtual communities in Acaide and we’re tring to get it but it’s / it’s like I was saying it feels like it’s / it always goes to tourism
because those who win are the ones / who makes web sites on the Bouctouche Dunes or to the / web site on the Bay of somewhere or the whales or the violon players in a little village

Mary: you don’t exactly fit in that framework

Philippe: exactly

(...) Philippe: you know there a lot of professionals (...) they’re the ones in the end who planted the seed in the nineteen sixties and seventies when there were riots in Moncton for language rights at the Université when the Francophones of the province put their foot down and said we’re here we’re a lot we have the right to have services in French and the right to live our lives in French (...) it’s that mentality that / that as been implanted with ah this new rebirth of l’Acadie which started in the sixties which gives the movement and ah / it gives a it creates a demand I think for a space like MétroAcadie or a group like MétroAcadie who wants to think differently / who doesn’t want to categorize itself in the old / in the let’s say the old ideas or the older classification which were given to l’Acadie / before / by the the tourism groups or the bigger cultural groups who have perhaps pushed too hard on the the / selling the older Acadie

Mireille: selling an older Acadie

Philippe: well we keep a critical eye on the tourism side of l’Acadie / you know we don’t want / we don’t want to dismantle it / dismantle that demande be against that demand but we also don’t want to be / just categorized / and you know it’s important because it’s to people from elsewhere / the tourists / of other provinces of other countries of other cities who come here and they don’t get to see the full spectrum of our culture and that’s cheating us in the end and it’s not the whole truth of what’s happening (my translation)

At the end of this excerpt and throughout the interview, he ponders the reason why too touristic an investment in culture is, in his view, dangerous for Acadian communities.

First, he mobilizes the same argument as Léo: the touristification of Acadian culture runs the risk of alienating youths who, he will say elsewhere, are led to conceive of Acadie as something folkloric, all the while consuming American and global products (like hiphop, sitcoms, etc.) Second, Philippe feels that focusing too much on the commodification of culture and not its internal promotion is detrimental to the tourists themselves, who come to the Atlantic provinces and miss out on the full spectrum of l’Acadie. For Philippe then, one of the outcomes of the commodification of culture is misrecognition of everyday Acadian identity (constructed as being authentic).
Philippe also politicizes the project: his perception of the political mobilizations of the 1960s and 70s is that actors were fighting for the emergence of a “new Acadie”, one that leaves room for alternative voices and allows Acadian culture to be contemporary and inclusive (Philippe will go on to talk about how the activities of MetroAcadie enable the “adoption” of Anglophone Acadians and international Acadians). What underlies Philippe’s positioning, however, are the tensions that are raised by the investments of the State in the reproduction of capitalism: the State and an Acadian elite are commodifying culture to ensure that Acadian identity is competitive in the global economy. This means that projects such as MetroAcadie fall out of the State’s engagement to Franco-Canadian communities as that project remains primarily anchored in cultural promotion – but not even the classic “historicized” type of promotion which the State funded in the 1970s and 80s. Because the State and the Acadian deciding elite moved from cultural promotion to neoliberal economic development, MétroAcadie’s organization is actually in rupture with the dominant Acadian conception of its history. MétroAcadie presents an urban and globalized Acadie, one that would fall outside the control of instituted elites and would be porous to mobilize as a territorialized linguistic community on a global stage (except as a potential public for Acadian products). Philippe and his colleagues are young though, so who knows what the future holds? Is the future of l’Acadie in the salvation of its rural bastions through rural economic development (and rural tourism), or is it in recognizing its urbanization?

The examples of Jean’s, Léo and Philippe’s positionings show us the challenges Franco-Canadian communities face as they confront the new conditions of the economy while maintaining modernizing discourses of identity from within the discourses of the
State. All three were seeking ways to reinscribe discourses of l’Acadianité into the current global conditions of the economy. All three recognize that new media spaces like the internet and the increased flow of products and identities, with its contingent broadening of publics, are simultaneously an opportunity and a challenge for the reproduction of Acadian modernizing discourse. All three are brought to position themselves vis-a-vis the discourse of the State.

Léo and Philippe are arguing for new ways of doing Acadian nationalism. They recognize that the commodification of identity and the need to increase profits and access broader publics is a source of tension for community art scene workers. As I discuss in the next section, shifting from a discourse of cultural promotion to one of economic development, from operating budgets to grants-based funding, is indeed raising questions about the authenticity of the Acadian artistic products.

7.2.1 "C’est juste pas assez Acadien!" : producing Acadian identity in the neoliberal regimes of governance.

As I discussed earlier in this chapter, Franco-Canadian mobilizations have been perceived, since the 1960s, as part of the cause of social justice. As such, these mobilizations gained legitimacy from their marginalized position and ensured the participation of working class Acadians within the nationalist project. Mobilization meant there was a shared Acadian social project: expanding the use of French in public spaces and being proud of one’s identity as ways to counter systemic economic inequalities. I have also outlined that the current diversification of l’Acadianité — in both discourse, economic opportunities, geographic trajectories and linguistic ideologies — make it
increasingly difficult to maintain a representation of Acadians as homogeneously oppressed. And yet, discourses of marginality hold sway, but the brunt of it has shifted from redistribution to recognition (where the basis for continued state intervention is understood not as economic redress but as symbolic recognition of diversity) (Fraser and Honneth 2003). It is in this shift that post-nationalist discourse and post-nationalist institutions are emerging.

What results is a struggle around ideas of authenticity. Ideals of social justice were linked, for Acadian modernity, to ideas about authentic selves: only with the recognition of the French language and Acadian identity would Acadians be able to "be emancipated selves" in civic and public spaces. These ideas about authentic identity pervaded the artistic scene in often quite contradictory ways. Government involvement in cultural management muddles the cards of authenticity; economic profit is a space of contention as public-oriented artists are, like elsewhere, accused of selling out by other artists who, themselves, target smaller niche markets. Even more striking though, is the allegiance that remains, in Acadian discourse, to the cause of the socially oppressed. And yet, the socially oppressed self is now often a thing of the past, or an image displaced onto l'Acadie's colonial other: "our native friends". This section will investigate these tensions around authenticity and what they mean for the government agents, artists and community organizers in the field.
7.2.3 On diverse agendas: l'Acadie diversifiée

We were lucky. The weather was predicting rain, but so far the day had been sunny. This meant that Acadie ReBelle, an event that my friend Ella was coordinating, could go on as planned, outdoors, in a downtown Moncton park. I showed up on site at 4:30 pm, to get ready to enter my functions as ticket sales administrator. I had debated, that year, between staying in Moncton to see the 7th or so edition of Acadie ReBelle, or go to Québec City to witness the Acadian tintamarre at the 400th anniversary of the city. Ella had decided for me: "oh no! you're not going to Québec. You're staying right here and you’re volunteering for l'Acadie ReBelle". From there, I had bargained that I would stay and volunteer if they allowed me to include the event in my field work. None of them seemed very concerned, and so, there I was, walkie talkie in hand, coaching a few volunteers on how to sell tickets for what we hoped would be a successful event.

My position as a head volunteer for the box office gave me ample opportunity to talk with a maximum amount of people at the event: other volunteers who had, for the most part, been recruited through a cultural volunteer network set up by an art institution in Moncton; the public, which would prove to be quite varied in its desires and expectations; and the steering committee of the event. This is where a member of the public told me the title phrase of this section: "C'est juste pas assez Acadien" "This just isn't Acadian enough". Indeed, the history of the event, which had propelled it from being a fundraiser for a local art gallery to being the showcase Acadian event for the City of
Moncton, receiving funding from the French government, the Canadian federal government and the government of Québec led the organizers of the event to showcase Québécois, French and underground artists. As a result, the public, out to celebrate Acadian identity in Moncton, often failed to identify with the musical performances and with the offerings on the grounds of the events. There should be more face painting, you know, for the children", was another comment offered by a concerned member of the public. A few other individuals suggested the steering committee (with which I was identified by my T-Shirt) should hire other, more popular, Acadian bands for the next edition, such as folk-rock group 1755. The tensions stemmed from the original mandate of the show as a site for the construction of an alternative Acadian identity and the economic and community mandates of the government agencies which pushed organizers to try and access as wide a public as possible. As a result, the public was divided between revelers who were not interested in the construction of an alternative urban Acadian identity and audience members who firmly believed in the necessity of alternative spaces for Acadian art.

L'Acadie ReBelle is a music concert meant to celebrate what the organizers have come to call urban Acadian identity. The event, originally, was organized to produce a modern and urban Acadianité, one that could compete with the more traditional and folk version which gathered crowds around country, folk rock or the violin. The event is also part of the postnational multilingual, as artists can perform in the languages of their
choice. As one of the organizers of the 2008 event said in an interview to the press, the goal is to present l’Acadie as an urban society:

[W]e don't impose a specific frame on our performers. We aren't afraid to function outside the norm. We aren't afraid, for example, to include English music[4]. Were very open minded. We still want to promote French music, but we want people to know Acadie is now an urban society. There are Acadian musicians these days who make music that's more urban than traditional. (...)We have in the last few years been able to change people's mentality in thinking that Acadian music had to be traditional. (Elslinger 2008)

The urban movement staked claims to authenticity, dubbing the folk movement as "touristy" and, therefore, somewhat disconnected with the contemporary everyday Acadian reality.

As an undergraduate, I attended the first few editions of the concert, simply because they showcased musicians I liked, not imagining that I would one day include the event in a thesis. I too felt an allegiance to this 'urban' and 'cosmopolitan' Acadia, one that could compete on par with the diversity of the broader national or international art scene by appropriating its sounds and styles, from acid jazz to hip hop. The first editions, in the early 1990s, were put on by the direction of a local art gallery, who simply wanted to counter-balance the more traditional Acadian celebrations by showcasing musicians who were rarely —or never-- asked to perform on the 15th of August, the official Acadian national day. The perceived snub occurred in spite of the fact these bands identified as Acadian performers. The organizers and musician involved felt, at the time, that the reason for the snub was that their music was too underground for the general public. Yet, as I recall, the first edition managed to pull about 150 people, the same
amount of people who showed up in another edition I attended in 2002, when it was merely a BYOB party in a jamroom\textsuperscript{37}.

From a show put on as a fundraiser for a local gallery, to a last minute jamroom party, I saw the show become a big event, where a group of scenesters lobbied for—and were granted — municipal, federal and provincial funding, along with a few sponsorships (from a brewery, for instance). This changed the stakes for the event, as more funding also meant the event had to attract broader publics in order to fulfill the various objectives of the funding agencies: from being an event that could please as many denizens of the city on behalf of the municipality to solidifying the funding basis by proving results through entrances and economic sustainability for federal funding.

And so, even the regular public for the event (and some members of the organizing committee) was somewhat dissatisfied with the 2008 proceedings. They also felt that the event "just wasn't Acadian enough". Their point of contention, however, wasn't the style of the event, but the management of the musical line up. The Acadie this part of the public felt was being cast aside was the urban, underground Acadie. The two headliners (out of 7 bands) were bands from France and Qu\'ebec. What added insult to injury, for the "urban" Acadian public, was that most were excited to see a legendary indie Acadian band, Id\'ee du Nord, reunite on-stage for the third time since the 1990s. Alas, in order to

\textsuperscript{37} The reason the event was held in a jam room that year was because most community organizers were somehow involved in the Sommet de la Francophonie or the Symposium d’art actuel, both held that summer in Moncton.
attract big names from France and Québec (and therefore draw a bigger public), the original coordinator had promised these bands the favored headlining spots; and so, the legendary Acadian band (which the one part of the public didn't know and felt was no match for 1755), ended up playing its 30 minute set at about 7 pm. This meant that many of the people in the regular alternative audience for the event showed up too late to see Idée du Nord, as they expected this band to be headlining. (It also meant that friends visiting from Montreal were thrilled to see one of their favorite Québec band play in Moncton).

Clearly then, the members of the public felt that they had an input on exactly how an Acadian event for an Acadian celebration should be run – even as they failed to agree on how exactly Acadian identity should be celebrated. This didn't hinder the show from attracting just enough people to break even for the first time in years (1300 people) or to sell 2008 cans of beer (a number we thought was quite appropriate for the 2008 edition). Cultural authenticity was at the centre of the debate and the steering committee, in its post-event meeting, went about explaining what happened and set about making recommendations for the next edition.

So what had happened? In order to qualify for various types of funding (federal funding, French funding and Québec funding), the event had to: 1) include at least one band from another Canadian province, which, for the federal funding, could be and, for Québec funding, should be from Québec and, of course, 2) include a band from France in
order to access the French government funding and 3) attract as many citizens of the municipality as possible for the municipal funding.

The best way to attract underground-alternative crowd-pleasing bands from outside l’Acadie was to promise them a good spot in the line up. And so the event became a showcase for underground, urban, alternative bands from France and Québec instead of being, as was the original concept, a space where Acadian bands could get a bit of limelight. While this ensured a bigger public and enabled a share of networking for local artists — as well as the presentation of an alternative francophone music scene -, it brought one of the organizers to wonder if the event hadn't grown outside of its own depth, and if perhaps it wouldn't be best for Acadie ReBelle to scale down and return to its original mandate as a space for marginalized — or at least urban and contemporary — performers. This organizer felt, in other words, that the quest for funding had corrupted the event.

This raises questions about the involvements of government in the production of culture and on how cultural authenticity is constructed throughout. Most of the festivals and events I have attended receive some forms of government funding, whether directly or indirectly. The art gallery that first produced Acadie ReBelle, for instance, receives its operating budget from a federal agency. And while government funding has to conform to the mandate of the State programs, the indicators (of return on investment) of the State are often negotiable. This means that the same sources of funding can be tapped to
produce quite different sorts of events.

It also raises questions about who gets included and who gets excluded in the Acadian space, as community organizations strive to include broader publics, to create economic benefits and to meet government objectives. The question of Acadian authenticity is exacerbated as the original mandate of funding and producing an Acadian art scene are shifting from cultural community representation to the commodification of culture for purposes of economic development. In the next section, I look at how l’Acadie is mobilized differentially by social actors to contest or reproduce class relations.

7.3. “Le drapeau a pourri”\textsuperscript{38}: from oppression to commodification

It was a Thursday evening in September 2007, the opening ceremonies for the 21\textsuperscript{st} edition of the Festival international de cinéma francophone en Acadie (FICFA). This edition of the festival was opening with the premiere of the documentary: *Kouchibougouac : l’histoire de Jackie Vautour et des expropriés*, produced by Belle-Feuille Production et Vic Production. The film documented the events that marked the foundation of Kouchibouguac National Park of Canada, the result of an economic development partnership, back in 1969, between the Louis J. Robichaud’s New-Brunswick provincial and Pierre Elliot Trudeau’s federal governments. The documentary focused on the underfunded government-organized expropriation of some 250 families who lived on the coastal land which was targeted for the establishment of the national park in what was then – and still is now – one of the poorest regions of Canada. The

\textsuperscript{38} “The flag is rotten”, http://www.radio-canada.ca/regions/atlantique/2007/09/20/004-NB-ficfa_n.shtml
narrative of the events and the testimonies of the expropriates served as a backdrop for the story of Jackie Vautour’s family’s refusal to leave their Kouchibouguac home. In fact, to this day, Vautour still lives “illegally” in the park and was accused in 2006 of illegal poaching as he fished within the confines of the parks (a charge which Vautour contested on the basis of his métis\(^{39}\) status). Vautour was set to speak at the end of the night, after the opening remarks thanking the public, the partners and the funding agencies, two short films and the presentation of the documentary itself.

The organizers of the Festival, Radio-Canada and the production companies had offered tickets to the families who had participated in the production of the documentary, sharing their experiences about the challenges they faced when, faced with expropriation, they moved from a predominantly hunting-gathering-farming autarchic mode of subsistence to a waged economy in Moncton, Rogersville or Richibouctou. In the auditorium of Moncton’s renaissance themed Capitol theatre, some of the “expropriés” stood out, wearing jeans, sports jackets, sneakers and, for the men, caps, against the backdrop of artsy looking students and community workers, preppy looking professors, dressed-up journalists, suited-up representatives from the various funding agencies and some cinéma de répertoire fans dressed in gala gowns. In short, the expropriates were amongst the only ones who hadn’t dressed to impress at this hobnob event of the Acadian art world.

---

\(^{39}\) The redeployments of identity categories has meant that métis identity is gaining ground amongst Acadian communities. Historians studying Acadian migration place the arrival of the first French-born women in (1636), 32 years after the first settlement (Griffith 2005). Because the survival of the French settlers was highly dependant on their collaborations with local Micmac and Maliseet, 17th century French colonial policy did promote marriages and associations between settlers and natives. For this reason, since the 1990s, a new discourse has emerged, promoting the fact that Acadian identity is first and foremost a métis identity, one that was erased when the nation-building project commenced in the late 19th century.
The lights went out on the audience and the spotlight flashed on a podium set by the screen on the front stage of the theatre. As is usual for most of these events, the president and the director of the festival gave speeches and invited different people, generally partners and sponsors (from the National film board or the French Consulate) to give a few speeches. I was seated next to a family of Kouchibouguac expropriates who grew impatient by the third of five speeches. « Ça va-t-y finir? On est-y pas là pour voir le film? » “Isn’t it going to end? Aren’t we here to see the movie?” exclaimed a man in his sixties. He kept getting louder as the speeches drew on, much to the embarrassment of two of his 20-year-old relatives sitting next to me and to the exasperation of a gala-gowned member of the public sitting in front of me. When the second of the two short films came on, an abstract artistic animation, the man in his sixties could no longer contain his irritation and spoke out, quite loudly, to the hilarity of another man sitting next to him, also wearing a cap: « Ben là! Je comprends rien! Je comprends pas quoi-ce ça représente… (moment de silence)… comprenez-vous quelque chose vous-autres?». “Well! I don’t understand anything! I don’t understand what it means… (moment of silence)… do you understand anything guys?” Meanwhile, more members of the public turned around to try and silence both men by giving them their versions of the evil eye. The young woman in her twenties, sitting next to me, eventually leaned over in their direction and whispered: « ben mon oncle, c’est juste un petit film de cinq minutes. Le film va commencer bientôt. Arrêtes là tu déranges tout le monde ». “Well Uncle, it’s just a little five minute film. The movie is going to start soon. Stop it now you’re disturbing everyone.” The two men immediately settled down.
The movie played and then Jackie Vautour walked on stage, received by a standing ovation by Gala-Gowns and Caps alike. Jackie Vautour had chosen a speech he no doubt hoped would rouse his public. He decided to use the podium to decry what he felt was the treason of his 1969 allegiance to the Acadian flag: representing the marginalized. The cause of social justice, he declared, had been abandoned by Acadian elites as they accessed social mobility and community recognition. Vautour then went on to say, as Radio-Canada reports:


“The flag that was raised in my yard. It fell down. The pole rotted. The flag rotted. I didn’t receive any help from Acadian associations.” (my translation)

And finished with, as I noted:

Moi j’étais fier dans ce temps-là de me promener avec le drapeau acadien! Mais la bourgeoisie acadienne se fout du petit monde aujourd’hui. Le petit monde, vous savez qui peut le défendre? L’association des Métis. D’ailleurs, si vous êtes Acadiens ou Québécois, vous êtes sans doute Métis. Je vous invite à joindre la vraie lutte pour la justice sociale. Je vous invite à joindre les Métis

I was proud at the time to carry the Acadian flag! But the Acadian bourgeoisies doesn’t give a damn about the little people today. The little people, you know who can defend them? The Metis association. Besides, if you are Acadian or Québécois, you are most likely Metis. I invite you to join the true cause for social justice. I invite you to join the Metis (my translation) (field notes, September 2007)

He left the stage to mitigated applause – and certainly, no repeat of the ovation. For the next few days, I scoured papers and hung out in the Université de Moncton’s hallways – even raised the topics with art community friends, but Vautour’s speech had very little echoes in the art and academic community. The artists and community organizers distanced themselves from the whole polemic, perceiving themselves as being outside of the defining Acadian elite, yet convinced class was no longer an operative concept within
Acadian society. What little comments I heard happened in the lounge of Capitol theatre, immediately after the end of Vautour’s speech: a professor reported that another professor was outraged at Vautour’s misunderstanding of the Acadian cause (she did not specify what the misunderstanding was about). *L’Acadie Nouvelle*, the daily francophone newspaper of New-Brunswick, even failed to report the controversy Vautour had tried to stir. The author chose instead to focus on the warm standing ovation he had received from the crowd when first walking on-stage and on his continued crusade for the provincial and federal government accountability on the Kouchibouguac dossier (Mousseau, 2007).

With hindsight, I realize that the lack of echo amongst the community is in and of itself significant: the Acadian elites’ project had changed radically since it first rallied behind the flag to stake claims to modernity in the 1960s and 70s. The legitimacy of Acadian identity no longer relied on the discourses of social justice and pointing out systemic economic marginalization, discourses which had been prevalent in 1969, when the *Official Languages Acts* were passed in New Brunswick and Canada. The events of that night give insight into the stratification of contemporary Acadian society and into how the field of Acadian symbolic capital is structured today: the usual participants in the scene, from cultural workers, to funding agencies to gala-gowned public members were happy to be producing and purchasing their version of Acadian as an historically oppressed yet increasingly diverse identity. Vautour and the Caps, meanwhile, were mobilized to reassert a past linked to questions of social justice, one that legitimized contemporary celebrations of Acadian identity, without undoing (or even recognizing) the classed hierarchies within it.
So what happens to an identity, when the basis for its mobilization is changing? For Vautour, identity was about social justice, as he felt that “true” identities could be identified by their allegiance to the marginalized. At issue for Vautour was the purpose of mobilizable categories. For the cultural producers and tourist entrepreneurs I interviewed, identity was increasingly about successfully placing Acadianité on global markets. They did, however, have different ideas about what should be produced, for which purposes. Those issues traversed my field work, as artists, tourists and consumers sought to position themselves in the fields of tourism and art.

7.4 Doing art, yes, but for whom, according to whom?

In Acadie, practices of language, identity and memory meet in the field of arts, craft and, now tourism, as a way to ensure the reproduction of l’Acadianité and the markets this identity structures in the new conditions of the economy. In Québec, and subsequently in Francophone Ontario and Acadie, art was an important tool in the mobilization for the creation of a modern quasi-national institutional space. From singer-songwriters 1755 to the Théâtre Populaire d’Acadie’s production of Louis Mailloux (a play based on a real-life event about the shooting of a young Acadian, Louis Mailloux, and a Canadian soldier John Gifford in a school-related conflict) to Antonine Maillet’s depiction of a poor fishing villages, most of the cultural production of the 1970s served to index the effects of oppression.

As modern art emerged out of the nationalist project of the 1960s and 70s in collusion with the investments of the federal State in Franco-Canadian structures, Acadian art quickly had two objectives: mobilizing as wide an Acadian public as possible for the purpose of linguistic consciousness raising (which was understood as a way to
counter assimilation) and producing modern representations of Acadian identity. The
market was soon divided between “popular” products and products targeting an elite
public, generally one navigating the budding emergence of an Acadian field (consisting
of a few main institutions: Radio-Canada, the various campuses of the Université de
Moncton and the associative networks). Either way, artistic projects remained dependant
on public and private funding, as both types of projects were confronted to the production
of a public for their products and as the private sector remained largely out of the
mobilized public and, therefore, sponsors.

These networks and the way they inhabit the Acadian discursive space is what
was rendered visible at the Opening ceremony of the Festival de cinéma francophone en
Acadie. The Gowns, as I had called them, adopted a docile type of behaviour as they
(Perhaps pretended to) listened to the official speeches and sat quietly through the
abstract short-film. They even continued a long-standing tradition of positioning Vautour
as an emblem of Acadian emancipation as he was applauded on stage and used their
dominant position to depoliticize his message in the media and in everyday discussion
where Acadian identity does however still remain an important topic of discussion.

The Caps, in contrast, stood out in the theatre; some showed impatience about the
speeches and at least two men overtly expressed their distaste of the abstract short-film.
Either way, the distaste of the taste of others structured the field and enabled the Caps
and Jackie Vautour to take a moral stance against the practices of the other as being
“false”, while the Gowns could dismiss the position of Jackie Vautour as one where “the
little man” is simply misunderstanding the contemporary goals of Acadian nation-
builders. Either way, the construction of an Acadian “truth” organized how each moral
stance structured itself in regards to the other and made certain symbols, such as dress and body practices in the theatre, salient codes of belonging.

This isn’t to say that there weren’t spaces of alignment between the diversified groups. Everyone in the room agreed that they were there to see a documentary and- as the Acadie Nouvelle article showed by interviewing expropriés – the crowd was complicit in agreeing that something dramatic happened in Kouchibouguac in the 1970s. The divergence (expressing frustration or sitting and expecting others to sit quietly, dressing up or dressing casually) were mostly minute details that did not disrupt the overall frame of the event and the constitutive elements that structured it. The only major point of divergence was Vautour’s conviction that the Acadian elite could not care less about the little people and had abandoned the ideals of its 1960s mobilization in favor of class distinction.

The investments of the State in the production of an Acadian art scene in the 1960s and 70s has succeeded in creating a market for Acadian products, one that has been mobilized by an Acadian elite to perpetuate ideas about nationalism. Tensions in regards to authenticity arise as State and community shift to economic development and the commodification of culture as a means of positioning the community in a global economy. This is a site of struggle within the Acadian art scene and the Acadian community at large, as some projects fails to meet the priorities of the government, and as those that manage to meet the priorities find themselves confronted to a diversified and often time disgruntled public. This structuration of the art scene raises question around the notion of “cultural authenticity”, “cultural ownership” and “cultural reproduction”. As I have shown, Acadian identity is a site of social struggle. The question is: who gets to
decide how Acadian identity will be mobilized in the globalized economy, for what purposes and with what consequences as to who is included in the scene, who is excluded and who gets to define it.
8. Conclusion: Culture and language as sites of social struggle

Language is at the center of much debate in l’Acadie as a government shift from welfare to neoliberal discourses and practices is challenging the nationalist understanding of Acadian identity. This shift, along with the democratization of the media and increased urbanization, are at the center of the emergence of a postnationalist discourse, albeit one that is as much in continuation with nationalist discourse as it challenges it. This discourse, linked to the geographic mobility that is characteristic of contemporary society, conceives cultures and languages as value-added commodities in the global economy, thereby simultaneously raising questions about multilingualism and cultural hybridity on the one hand and linguistic and cultural authenticity (its production, performance and circulation) on the other.

The emergence of postnationalist ideologies is linked to a central redefinition of Acadian culture. No longer an ethnic category defined purely by heritage, destabilized by the reterritorialization of economic and symbolic markets in the globalized economy, Acadians are now seeking ways to maintain a nationalist linguistic understanding of identity, all the while being interlocutors of the State. As the State shifted to neoliberal regimes putting emphasis on economic benefits and free markets, this has meant lobbying the government for the recognition of the field of art as a field of economic development rather than simply a field of cultural development. Moreover this shift in the legitimating basis for State-funding has meant that the original linguistic political mandate of the scene is now being replaced by an economic one. In this new discourse and in the context of a knowledge-based economy, community and government actors are brought to place emphasis on multilingualism. Community organizers mobilize multilingualism to reach
broader publics and artists mobilize it to position their production as authentic and/or legitimate in the local, national and global markets. The homogenizing ideologies of nationalism are therefore coming under tension in this context as actors position themselves and their practices as being outside of or within “nationalist” political discourse, all the while mobilizing Acadian identity to position themselves and their art in the global economy.

I have called this economic and discursive shift postnational. It’s a discourse where what is “political” is shifting as globalization reterritorializes conceptions of linguistic and cultural markets. This means that language dynamics can no longer be conceived, as in the diglossic theoretical model, as zero sum games where two languages “fight” for survival on a specified territory. Rather, it calls for a framework that investigates the mobilization of language or culture as resources in the global economy. Participants who held postnationalist views often characterized themselves as working outside of politics, not because their work was devoid of political meaning, but because it was unrecognizable as political from within the nationalist language oppression framework. Meanwhile, the postnationalist participants did stake political claims in regards to the recognition of multilingualism, geographic mobility and cultural hybridity.

Multilingualism and cultural hybridity can be resources in the production of Acadian identity for global markets. Mobilizing neoliberal ideologies, Acadian community leaders and the Canadian federal government are striving to develop the global commodification of Acadian culture, through arts and tourism, as a way to ensure the reproduction of Acadian identity in a global economy. This was a logical continuation of the original mandate of community government partnership, which bolstered the
production of a cultural art scene. Understanding this calls for a framework that takes into consideration the economic structuration, government policy and social struggles around the structuration of the Acadian space. It also requires stepping away from nationalist understandings of language and culture as being one and the same. Theoretically conceiving of culture and language as two separate but interrelated terrains help understand the tensions Acadian elites face when the artistic community sector is mobilizing multilingualism to expand its market. The commodification of culture challenges monolingual ideologies of language. In turn, territorializing ideologies of language are reify nationalist ideologies of culture on a global stage.

It also means that the State, while shifting its practices from welfare-inspired policies to increasingly neoliberal ones, is redefining its involvement in the production of Acadian identity and francophone spaces for nationalist purposes (both at the federal and community level) to one of being a producer of Acadian identity as a commodity. In order, then, to understand the language ideologies and linguistic practices within the Acadian artistic space, it is important for researchers to step away from essentializing conceptions of culture and understand the role that government, economic conditions and global processes play in the deployment of Acadian culture today. Culture, far from being a bounded homogeneized site that people “have”, is rather a concept mobilized by State, community and artists alike to position themselves and others on the global market. In other words, much like language, culture is a terrain of social struggle. The two can overlap, as in the nationalist mobilization, but these terrains can operate independently in order to tap into global publics or, even, to stake claims to artistic authenticity.
Artists and community organizers are positioned differently, however, in the production of both nationalist and postnationalist discourses. On the one hand, the central defining elite, along with the actors positioned within community organizations, erase the tensions that emerge in their investment in the commodification of culture: some of them claim continuity between the political mobilizations of the 1960s and 70s and the turn to the economic development discourse of today. This serves to legitimize and naturalize their position as central decision makers within the art scene. Others are literally cast out of the defining space because their discourses and projects do not match the new economic imperative. Authenticity, cultural and linguistic, is at stake for all as the structuration of the art scene under global conditions does reify notions of cultural ownership, be this for a public seeking exotic performances of otherness or for a local public seeking urbanized representations of Acadian identity.

New media and increased urbanization are a source of tension for the Acadian defining elite. The conditions of the new economy mean that educated French-English speakers are migrating to urban centers where their bilingualism is increasingly in demand. In this way, trajectories such as Philippe’s, a webdesigner who ran an Acadian website from Toronto, are problematic for the defining elite. Can a local (even rural) creative economy compete with a global one – enough so that it curtails Acadian migration to urban centers? What are the spaces that include these urbanized translocal Acadians?

Finally, there is a set of actors, mostly community organizers, who are managing to maintain themselves in the in the new government–community nexus by straddling both the shift in governance and the older nationalist discourses. These actors recognize
that doing Acadian art today means having an expertise in business. It also brings them to
conceive of languages not only as a carrier of culture, but also as a resource on the global
stage. They often hold contradictory discourses. On the one hand, their use of
multilingualism brings them to present Acadian identity as no longer under threat. On the
other, they struggle to position themselves as protectors of the “French language” in order
to meet their organization’s mandate, often set up under the welfare cultural government
programs of the 70s and 80s. Artists, in the meantime, are mobilizing the notion of
“authenticity” to argue for multilingualism on the global stage, all the while being aware
of the resources the government-community investments in the production of an Acadian
art field puts at their disposal. They are constrained by the established scene’s
structuration, its accent on cultural representation and its turn to professionalization. At
the same time, government investments have created a network of organizations that can
help artists establish themselves on the global stage, this, as long as they know how to
navigate the tensions between doing art for art’s sake and doing art for the community’s
sake.

The structuration of the Acadian art scene raises multiple theoretical concerns:
from the nature of culture to the nature of language, to the mechanism of the reproduction
of inequalities and the spaces for their contestation. A shift in social theory has brought
sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists to step away from theoretical models
conceiving of language as a bounded entity that individual “have” and that defines their
identity. Conceiving of language as a terrain of social actions helps understand the
dynamics of the Acadian art scene. There, language is mobilized to position, reproduce,
transform or contest individuals and institutions. Language is a defining element of the
structuration of the Acadian field – but nationalist language ideologies enter into tension with postnationalist ones as Acadians try to reproduce the identity on global markets. A study of the inscription of the Acadian art scene in the global economy conversely destabilizes notions of linguistic and cultural authenticity and linguistic and cultural “ownership”.

Moreover, the involvement of government in the production of the art scene calls for a framework that understands culture as a process, rather than an entity, as Acadians turn to the commodification of “culture”. Acadian “culture” is here defined not only from within, “by” Acadians, as older conceptions of culture would have it, but also from without, by State institutions, economic conditions and other discursive spaces. Indeed, this has long been the case, as the analysis of the *Massey Report* shows that competing understandings of how to institutionalize culture were at the center of how culture was defined, protected and produced in Canada. The welfare State produced the scene in the context of a modernizing discourse of linguistic duality. In the post-war context of Canadian nation-building the State stepped in and is mobilized to produce linguistic dualism through arts and culture. As it turns to neoliberalism, the State maintains its investment in arts and culture, but mobilized the field of economic development to commodify Acadian identity.

While the shift to commodification is in continuity with nationalist discourses, its implementation is a source of tension for nationalist elites. The State’s turn to commodification causes a restructuration of the art scene, shoving out anti-oppression militants as it brings in accountants and business experts. It also opens up problematic space for post-nationalism: as, in the global constitution of a market for Acadian art,
conceptions of art (linked up to traditional understanding of universal art) and authentic linguistic practices enter in tension with the circulation of tourist commodified authentic ethno-national products.

Following how discourses circulate and are mobilized in the institutionalization of social categories shows that language and culture are far from being obvious categories. Defining cultures and defining languages are historically anchored and context-relevant practices. They come to make sense precisely because of processes of institutionalization and the struggles in which social actors participate in order to maintain themselves or have access to the spaces where language, culture and the processes of institutionalization that sustain them are defined. Understanding language or culture therefore requires that researchers pay attention to sites where these entities are defined both within and without the social boundaries of communities.

Further research needs to be done to understand how the processes involved in the reproduction of Acadian identity in the global economy play out for other ethnolinguistic categories. This would help understand how global economic processes are simultaneously an opportunity and a challenge for ethnolinguistic communities, and for academic understanding of language, culture and the reproduction of social boundaries. What is the global market for ethnolinguistic commodities? How is it structured, mobilizing which elements of nationalism? In other words, how is nationalism mobilized in the global economy, by whom, with what effect on linguistic and cultural boundaries?

At a community level, involvement in the community art scene has shown me that neoliberalism is affecting community agencies. The tensions are tied to the reproduction of agencies set up during the welfare regime under discourses of neoliberalism. The
questions there are simple: what are the effects of changing State practices on our understanding of marginalized or cultural communities? How does State discourse trickle down into everyday practices and how is it appropriated or contested at a community or individual level? Conversely, how do communities and individuals influence the State in a context that favors “community partnerships” and “public consultations”. What are the means of appropriation, reproduction or contestation of the power of the State? Finally, how are State practices tied to the legitimization and naturalization of social categories?

I’m concluding this thesis in 2009, on the year when both Canada’s and New-Brunswick’s *Official Languages Act* are celebrating their 40th anniversary. Following the links between policy, historical contexts, discursive spaces and the production of artistic events, has allowed me to understand the tensions that the State’s involvement in the protection and production of francophone communities are raising for the second generation of “modern” Acadians, as they tackle globalization and neoliberal discourses. These tensions around authenticity arise out of the structuration of the Acadian art scene, a structuration which positions some practices and discourses as central and defining, and others as marginal.
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Arts Development Branch
– APPLICATION FORM –
OPERATIONAL GRANT PROGRAM
PRODUCTION/PRESENTATION ARTS ORGANIZATION COMPONENT
To be accepted as complete, this application form must be filled out using the format that has been provided
APPLICATION DEADLINE: APRIL 15
Part One: Applicant information
1. Registered Name of Arts Organization:
   Contact person:
   Telephone: E-Mail:
   Address (Head Office):
   Postal Code:
   Telephone: Fax: E-Mail:
2. CADAC ID code (confidential and for office use only):
   Pre-registration with CADAC is required as soon as possible to avoid delays in providing the
   financial and statistical
   information. The CADAC ID code will be provided when you register on-line. (See Part Two for
   information on CADAC)
Part Two: Financial and Statistical Information
The Department of Wellness, Culture and Sport is a partner organization of CADAC (Canadian
Arts Data/Données sur les arts au
Canada). All Production/Presentation Arts Organizations applying for operational funding are
required to register onto the
CADAC website, and complete both the financial and statistical forms as part of the application
requirements. Failure to do so
will result in an incomplete application to the program.
CADAC uses a web-based application that will lighten the administration burden on arts
organizations applying for
operational funding to one or multiple public funders by enabling them to submit one set of financial
and statistical
information.
In order to provide standardized financial and statistical information, please register your
organization and complete the required
forms at the following web link: https://www.thecadac.ca/login.aspx . Organizations applying for
operational funding are
encouraged to register with CADAC as soon as possible and explore the various options offered.
The financial form covers a number of years past and future. For the purpose of your organization’s
application, you are
required to complete the financial information for the period of 2007-08, the current 2008-09, and
2009-10, the year of your
request. Projected financial information beyond the request year is not mandatory.
The statistical form also covers a two-year period, including projections for your request year (2008-09 and 2009-10). You may include estimates where needed. Only complete the information that applies to your organization.

Once completed, the Department will access your financial and statistical information with the CADAC ID code you provided. Remember, the online information is confidential and will only be accessible to the Department staff required to analyze your data.

**Part Three: Report on the Production/Presentation Arts Organization**

The Application assessment panel’s recommendation concerning your application will be based on the merit of your organization’s performance and programming, and measured against the criteria listed below. Please describe your recent and current activities in terms of these criteria by responding to the points that follow, and introduce each response with the heading provided below.

Some items have to do with artistic merit, others with administration. The instructions are meant to help you. How much space you give to each point is your decision. You are not required to respond to any items that do not apply to your situation. However, please limit your total response to Part Three to 12 pages maximum.

**A. Excellence of the Organization: Financial soundness and general organizational health of the organization:**

Please elaborate on the overall financial health of the organization, and on the efficiency of the organizational structure:

- Provide the amount of your accumulated surplus/deficit at the end of your organization’s last financial cycle. Comment on your financial situation;
- Provide for 07/08 and 08/09 your revenues based on the following three categories – performance revenue, public and private funding. Comment on your efforts to diversify your revenues;
- Attach your documents of incorporation (governance model) and your by-laws to your application;
- Describe your human resource structure and any specific challenges you face in this area. Include a description of each role and what makes the staff person qualified for that position (i.e. education, work experience);
- Attach the minutes from your last annual general meeting to the application. Indicate the dates of all your Board meetings and the list of all motions voted on by the Board in the last full operating year;
- Describe your current Board composition and explain your approach for identifying Board members;
- List the professional development opportunities provided to staff in 07/08 and 08/09;
☐ List key strategic partnerships that existed in 08/09;
☐ Have you undertaken a strategic planning process in the last five years? If yes, attach copy of the plan.
Comment on future efforts.

B. Excellence of the Productions and/or Presentations: Please elaborate on the artistic performance and merit of your organization, and how your work contributes to the arts discipline.
☐ State your artistic vision and how your organization’s programming corresponds with that vision;
☐ List the awards or prizes, positive critiques or public recognition your organization has received in 07/08 and 08/09;
☐ Indicate how your organization has demonstrated artistic excellence in the content and the interpretation of its production/presentation;
☐ Indicate how your organization has demonstrated leadership in its artistic programming.

C. Audience Development: Please elaborate on how your organization attracts the public to its productions and/or presentations, and how the programming contributes to enrich the lives of its audience.
☐ Indicate if your organization had a marketing plan for 2008. If yes, please attach;
☐ Provide a summary of your productions/presentations in 2008 and include the following information for each:
☐ Date of performance(s)/presentation(s)
☐ Cost of ticket
☐ Name of venue(s) and location(s)
☐ Capacity of each venue and number of people who attended;
☐ Provide a schedule of artistic productions and/or presentations planned for 2009-10;
☐ Explain if/how your organization has maintained audience stability or growth in the last three years (2006-2009);
☐ Explain how your productions/presentations contributed to the education and/or social development of your audience in 2008;
☐ Explain how your productions/presentations contributed to a better understanding of the discipline and developed an artistic and aesthetic taste in 2008;
☐ List your efforts in 2008 to ensure that all segments of society had access to your productions/presentations;
☐ List the databases that are maintained by your organization and how they are utilized;
☐ Indicate if the scope of your organization’s activities is local, regional, provincial, national or international.

D. Cultural Sector Development: Please elaborate on the contribution of your organization to the development of the cultural sector and to the cultural infrastructure of the province.
☐ Indicate how your organization provides fair and appropriate fees/remuneration for its performers/artists;
☐ List the economic partnerships your organization established in 2008, and the nature of these partnerships;
☐ Indicate if your organization exported its productions/presentations in 2008, and provide details;
☐ Indicate if your organization has a solid network of volunteers, and the role of these volunteers;
Explain efforts undertaken by your organization in 2008 to support new and/or emerging artists; Explain how your organization attracts top talent and how it provides a career path for those artists.

**E. Additional Information:**

If you wish to provide more information on your organization in terms of the particular context in which it operates or the unique challenges it faces, please elaborate. Please note that no score will be awarded for this question; this is simply an opportunity for you to provide the Application assessment panel with greater perspective on the work accomplished by your organization in addition to the information you provided in response to questions A to D.

**Part Four: Required Documentation**

Please include with this application:

- Six copies of a DVD of your organization (acceptable content: short excerpt of a recent production/presentation, a televised critique or printed article concerning the organization or a production/presentation, etc.) (if applicable);
- Six copies of your most recent exhibition catalogue (if applicable);
- Financial statements for your most recent fiscal year;
- A copy of your standard contract with artists;
- A copy of your Canada Council application form, if applicable;
- Documents of incorporation and by-laws;
- Minutes of annual general meeting;
- Strategic plan (if applicable);
- Marketing plan (if applicable);
- Year-end Report of activities.

**Part Five: Agreement and Acknowledgement**

I hereby agree to provide all requested information as well as any other supporting documents needed to evaluate this application. I understand that my application may be refused if it is incomplete. I recognize that applications are approved subject to availability of funds, and that beyond the provision of a grant, the Province of New Brunswick has no further commitment to the applicant. The Province will not be held responsible for the completion of an activity. I agree to acknowledge the contribution of the Department of Wellness, Culture and Sport in all publicity related to our activities. I certify that I have signing authority for the above-named organization, and that, to the best of my knowledge, the information provided with this application is accurate. I agree to provide the Department with a full report of the completed activities, including financial statements.
SIGNATURE DATE
TITLE COMPANY
Please return this form to:

**Arts Development Branch**
Department of Wellness, Culture and Sport
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, NB
E3B 5H1
Telephone: (506) 453-2555
Fax: (506) 453-2416