

CAN A WHITE CANADIAN WRITE A  
POST-COLONIAL TEXT ? <sup>1</sup>

**Miguel Nenevé**

*After all, Canada seems an ideal laboratory for the study of postcolonial writing: it was formed by the interactions of three distinct cultures — the aboriginal, the French, and the English. Each of these cultures was deeply affected by colonialism, and each has writers who identify themselves as members of these originary groups and who explicitly deal with the problems of colonial dominance and the difficulties of finding identity after having been subordinated to another culture. (Donna Bennet)*

According to the authors of *The Empire Writes Back* (Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin), post-colonial literature is the literature produced by those people formerly colonized by British and other European empires. The authors state that the term post-colonial covers “all the cultures affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day.”<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, post-colonial literatures are those literatures written by people affected by colonialism or by “cultures which suffered the experience of colonization” and had to fight against imperial dependence. Thus, they believe that it is possible to study Canadian literature within a post-colonial context. However, this concept appears to me to be both too general and too loose. One has to be aware of the particularities of Canada as a colony when referring

to the post-colonial there. One may even ask whether Canada has much in common with other post-colonial nations.

In general, critics from diverse fields of studies agree that, although occupying a position of relative power nowadays, Canada was once, indisputably, a colony. From this assertion, several questions arise. For example, to what extent has the country escaped the colonialism by which it was so affected? What evidence exists to show that Canada has not completely thrown off the shackles of colonialism? Once a colony, countries usually take a long time to escape the burden of colonialism: is this the case with Canada? And finally, is or is not Canada still a colony? For the purpose of this discussion, it is, therefore, useful to consider briefly the term "colony".

According to Albert Memmi, a colony is "a place where one earns more and spends less. You go to a colony because jobs are guaranteed, wages high, career more rapid and business more profitable."<sup>3</sup> The colonized, on the other hand, are the disadvantaged. If the colonizer's living standards are high it is "because those of the colonized are low." If there is one who profits, there will invariably be the "other" who is exploited and whose rights are ignored. People who live in a colony are under the control of a "mother" country whose dictates rule their decisions. Colonialism would be, then, the maintenance of the colony, that is, the control of other people's land or territory. David Spurr explains that the word colony, like culture, has its origin in the Latin word *colere* which means "to cultivate, to inhabit, to take care of a place." The word *colonia*, for the Romans, designated a settlement "in a hostile or newly conquered country" while *cultura* referred both to tilling the soil and to refinement in education and civilization.<sup>4</sup> A Colonial situation would then be characterized by the domination imposed by a foreign people over a racially and culturally different one in the name of racial and cultural superiority. The supposed difference, or rather, superiority of the colonizer becomes an important question in the process of establishing and legitimizing authority over the colonized territory.

Frantz Fanon discusses the psychological and economic disgrace imposed by the imperial powers on the colonies. His most famous work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, besides examining some points of colonialism, offers strategies of decolonization. For Fanon, recovering the suppressed history of the colonized is one of the most important strategies of decolonization. Although referring more specifically to the Algerian people, Fanon's theory is valid because it points to any colonial situation. He affirms, for example, that in a colonial situation the colonized has to forget his culture in order to admire the culture of the colonizer. Feeling a stranger in her/his own land, the colonized has to adopt European culture as her or his own: "He will not be content to get to know Rabelais and Diderot, Shakespeare and Edgar Allan Poe, he will bind them to his intelligence as closely as possible."<sup>5</sup> Like other theorists of colonialism, Fanon asserts that the admiration of the mother country's culture is characteristic of a colonial situation.

In the introduction to *Culture and Imperialism*, Said asserts that imperialism "means the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory." Colonialism, in its turn, "is the implanting of settlements on distant territory" and is "almost always a consequence of imperialism."<sup>6</sup> Further Said argues that colonialism, which naturally follows imperialism, involves not only profit and the hope of more profit but also a commitment to subjugate "less advanced" people. Moreover, Said claims that the oppressive situation of the colonized can germinate a culture of resistance. The Canadian critic Mary Louise Pratt adds that in a colony there is the belief that reality is elsewhere, outside the colony; in this aspect, she contends, Canada suffers a burden of colonialism and dependence similar to one experienced by Latin America.<sup>7</sup>

The notion of colonialism is, therefore, far reaching and also ambivalent. The colonial situation goes beyond colonial rule itself and territorial domination, involving notions of ruling ideas and cultural hegemony. When considering these characteristics of the colonial situation at the beginning of *Imperial Eyes*, Mary Louise Pratt says

that “English Canada was still colonial in the 1950s.”<sup>8</sup> Some critics, as we will see further on, say that Canada is colonial even nowadays.

The British Empire divided its colonies into three classes: crown colonies, colonies with “representative” governments, and colonies with “responsible” governments.<sup>9</sup> The latter were eligible for elevation to “dominion” status, as is the case of Canada. Canada was ruled entirely by British dictates until 1867, when it officially ceased to be a colony of the British Empire, becoming the “Dominion of Canada.” However, even after that date, Canadians were still defined as British subjects. Until 1982, the British Canadian Act was the basic statute of Canada.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, we can say that Canada remained a colony for a long time. Colonialism strongly affected Canadian history and still influences Canadian culture, since dependence is not relinquished by decree. Dependence causes a state of mind which may prevent, or retard, the valorization of the colonized country by its own people. Signs of cultural dependence on, and subordination to, the mother country are visible in Canada long after 1867. For instance, the Union Jack remained the Canadian national flag until 1965 when a distinctive national flag was proclaimed. Moreover, the Union Jack is still flown in Canada on some occasions (Commonwealth meetings or in honour of the Queen). The other fact which may be seen as a sign of subordination is related to the national anthem: only in 1967 did the Parliament adopt a committee recommendation that the music “O Canada” become the national anthem of Canada and “God save the Queen” remain the “royal anthem.”<sup>11</sup> This may help to characterize the colonial situation of the country. In 1971, in his preface to *The Bush Garden*, Northrop Frye states that Canada is “the only country in the world which is a pure colony, colonial in psychology as well as in mercantile economics.”<sup>12</sup>

Novelist Margaret Laurence has likewise expressed her ideas about the colonial condition of Canada, stating that Canadians do not have their own judgement but depend on the colonizer’s standards. Laurence confirms Pratt’s view that English Canada has its reality based somewhere else. In “Ivory Tower or Grassroots: The Novelist as

Socio-political Being”, Laurence states : “My people’s standards of correctness and validity and excellence were still at that time [1957] largely derived from external and imposed values; our views of ourselves were still struggling against two other cultures.... Who on earth taught us to think of ourselves that way ? The whole history of imperialism.”<sup>13</sup> Laurence believed that it was necessary for Canadian writers to fight against this dependent state of mind, just as writers from other colonized countries do. In the same essay, for example, she declares that Canadian writers are like Third World writers, as both “have had to find [their] own voices and write out of what is truly [theirs], in the face of an overwhelming cultural imperialism.” She aligns herself with Third World writers like Chinua Achebe, because she claims that culturally, her country is similar to his, in that Canadian artists do not belong to the cultural forms of “that dominant imperial culture.”

Contemporary critics have also revealed a preoccupation with the colonial state of Canada. Margaret Atwood, for instance, affirms that by being a Canadian she is “a citizen of a country which until recently was dominated by one imperial power and is now dominated by another.”<sup>14</sup> Linda Hutcheon states that Canada as a nation has never felt central, culturally or politically, but warns against equating Canada with a Third World country.<sup>15</sup> Diana Brydon claims that “Canada as a nation was created by imperialism and all that it entailed: theft of the land from its original inhabitants, genocide, massive immigration from around the world, exploitation of our labour and our natural resources by imperial powers...”<sup>16</sup> Therefore it is obvious that Canadians would be profoundly affected by colonialism. The recognition of the colonial situation of Canada is, moreover, important in generating discussions about ways of decolonization. In “Eruptions of Postmodernity: the Postcolonial and the Ecological”, Linda Hutcheon comments that “historically, Canada has been — has had to be — sensitive to the issue of difference and exploitation: it defined itself as a nation in 1867, but it

continued to be a colony of Britain until, some would say, it graduated to being a colony of the United States."<sup>17</sup>

The problem of Canada being a "colony of the United States" has been raised by many critics. They reveal a great concern for Canadian vulnerability to U. S. power and influence, both in cultural and economic terms. Margaret Laurence, worried about Canada's cultural dependence on the USA, complained that there were too many American publishing companies in Canada which led to Canadians being colonized by American literature: "The more American brands we have, the less books which are going to be published in this country because branch plants are going to bring in great numbers American books, which they already do, and they will publish relatively few Canadian books."<sup>18</sup> The situation may have changed somewhat, with Canadian ownership of publishing companies increasing since Laurence wrote this statement, but in 1991 McGoogan complained that these companies are still foreign dominated.<sup>19</sup> In addition, Robin Mathews affirms that only three percent of the films in Canada are Canadian films and that ninety percent of text books come from outside Canada, most from the USA.<sup>20</sup> Thus, critics warn that Canadians are losing their voice because of the American media invasion. They still have reason to lament the "continuing economic and cultural hegemony of the United States over Canada," as Hutcheon says.

Other critics are more direct in their assertion that Canada is a "colony of the United States." Tony Wilden, for example, states explicitly: "Canada is the richest colony of the United States;"<sup>21</sup> he refers to a colony in economic and cultural aspects. Rudy Wiebe, in an Interview with Om Juneja and others, blasts Canadian foreign policy-makers for continually tailoring their decisions to suit American ones.<sup>22</sup> Wiebe laments that Canada's decisions depend on American decisions, revealing that Canada is culturally a colony of the United States. Wallace Clement worries about the economic exploitation which Canada suffers. In "Uneven Development: A Mature Branch-Plant Society," he explains that American corporations began to penetrate the Canadian economy

mainly after the Second World War, causing Canadian dependence to shift from Britain to the USA. He laments that the petroleum in Western Canada is largely controlled by US oil companies so that Canada "is not master of its own house" and therefore "cannot be characterized as an independent capitalist society."<sup>23</sup> Likewise Norman Penner states that, although there is a lack of accurate figures, "there is no doubt that a large proportion of Canadian Industry is owned or controlled by American capital." He contends that after the Second World War Canada's colonial ties to Britain weakened but its dependence on the USA increased.<sup>24</sup> Daniel Drache, in "The Canadian Bourgeoisie and Its National Consciousness", maintains that "for the past one hundred years Canada has acted as the safety-box for the British and American investments," that the elite profit from the colonial situation in Canada, and that Canadian nationalism is no more than a continuation of the British empire.<sup>25</sup>

The suggestion, therefore, is that nationalism is dangerous when not a manifestation of the people but of some privileged groups. Nationalism, in this case, is inextricably linked to colonialism. When nationalism means British-Canadian nationalism, there will invariably be a repression of other interests and desires. It seems to me that this is the concept which Benedict Anderson refers to as "official nationalism", which is merely a continuation of empire. The colony is transformed into a nation but continues to be dependent, because the "nation" was "officially" imagined by the controllers of power. A. Lower states: "Some people are born nations, some achieve nationhood and others have nationhood thrust upon them. Canadians seem to be among these last."<sup>26</sup> Scholars thus see Canadian nationalism sometimes not as a manifestation of common interest but as a construct of those who have thrust nationhood upon Canada. According to Diana Brydon and Helen Tiffin, there are two kinds of nationalism: one is positive; the other serves imperialism and sees a nation as a single voice.<sup>27</sup> This latter type is connected with colonialism through the transference of British principles, customs and system of government to Canada, recalling

Simcoe's imperialist recommendation that "the utmost attention should be paid that the British customs, manners, and principles in the most trivial as well as serious matters should be promoted [in Canada]."<sup>28</sup>

The idea is that the creation of Canada was artificial in some aspects, which may be, in part, responsible for the colonial situation there. The view of Canada as a British colony persisted, as did the notion — for some Canadians — that England was the "great good place." Although acquiring its official independence in 1867, there are elements which show Canada's subordination to the "mother country". In 1984, in a letter, the Nigerian writer Chinua Achebe tells Margaret Laurence how surprised he was when at a Canadian University convocation ceremony, he heard "God Save the Queen."<sup>29</sup> Colonial ties to Britain may have helped to foster the "superiority" of British Canadians over "other" Canadians. In this sense, "other" Canadians may consider themselves colonized by Anglo-Canadians — "others" meaning, for example the Metis people, the natives and all those who manifest supposedly "primitive behaviour" like Third World immigrants and other "inferior people."<sup>30</sup>

If one can draw any conclusion from the discussion so far, it is that the concept of Canadian colonialism is very complex; it is not just a matter of saying, for example, that Canada is still a colony of either England or the United States. While the settler Canadians feel post-colonial in relation to the British empire, they represent the central colonial power to the natives, Metis, and other dispossessed Canadians. The latter are undoubtedly farther from the centre which decides and defines their lives. If they cannot define their own lives and their decisions depend on "superior" Canadians, they are surely colonized. My argument then is that while all Canadians were affected by colonialism, the Indigenous, the Metis, and other non-British Canadians suffered (or continue to suffer) under colonialism to a far greater extent than the "charter" settlers (British, in my study). It is important, therefore, to be aware of Hutcheon's affirmation that Indigenous Canadian populations should, more than others, be regarded as post-

colonial.<sup>31</sup> In addition, one has to remember that colonialism affected diverse cultures in many different ways.

One should be aware that as a white settler colony, Canada, as Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman argue, was not “subject to the sort of coercive measures which were the lot of the colonies, and [its] ethnic stratification was fundamentally different.”<sup>32</sup> That is, Canada did not suffer the same cultural imposition nor undergo the same degree of oppression as did the invaded colonies of Africa, India, or the West Indies. Therefore the Canadian colonial or post-colonial condition is not equal to any other nation colonized by European empires. It is in consideration of this point that Hutcheon alerts us against equating Canada to a “Third World and therefore a post-colonial culture”, claiming that it would be “both trivializing of the Third World experience and exaggerated regarding the (white) Canadian to equate Canada to invaded colonies.”<sup>33</sup> Without question, Canada has a less oppressive history than African countries, India and the West Indies. Critics agree that when one considers the Indigenous and less-favoured people in Canada, one sees a history of oppression. Here, Brydon’s preference for not stressing the difference between Canadian colonialism and post-colonialism and other countries’ experiences with colonialism seems to be relevant, as she believes that the emphasis on the “different” can lead us to “refuse to recognize” that Canadians have things to share with colonized people.<sup>34</sup>

If Canadian culture was affected by colonialism, it is possible to say that this culture can produce a literature which condemns colonialism and emphasizes the need for decolonization. Such literature would, of course, be different from other post-colonial literatures, but still post-colonial in that it could subvert colonialism.

According to Donna Bennet, “postcolonial is a viewpoint that resists imperialism — or relationships that seem imperialistic.” Furthermore, she claims that “to speak of postcolonialism is to focus attention on those who have sought independence and who view the imperial country’s proprietary claims as invalid.”<sup>35</sup> In this respect,

“postcolonial” is not only a historical situation marked by the dismantling of the institutions of colonial power but also, as David Spurr says, “a search for alternative to the discourse of the colonial era.”<sup>36</sup> Thus, a literature which serves as an instrument to reproach any form of colonialism can be read as postcolonial. Postcolonial, in this sense, does not presume that the colonial condition has been resolved. Post-colonial is, first and foremost, anti-colonial and subverts the imposed “truth” of the colonizer. So, it has something to do with decolonizing activities. The “post-” in post-colonial, as Hutcheon explains, “on the one hand means, *after, because of*, and even unavoidably *inclusive* of the colonial; on the other it signifies more explicit resistance and opposition, the anti-colonial.”<sup>37</sup> Post-colonial, therefore, speaks against colonialism, interrogating European colonialism and proposing resistance to it. Stephen Slemon’s statement about post-colonial is appropriate for our discussion:

[the concept of post-colonial] proves most useful not when it is used synonymously with post-independence historical period in once-colonized nations but rather when it locates a specifically anti-or post-colonial discursive purchase in culture, one which begins in the moment that colonial power inscribes itself onto the body and space of its Others and which continues as an often occulted tradition into the modern theatre of neo-colonialist international relations....I would want to preserve for post-colonialism a specifically anti-colonial counter-discursive energy....<sup>38</sup>

Post-colonial texts, then, are those texts which speak against any kind of imperialism and colonialism, subverting and deconstructing the discourse of the colonizer. They reveal a culture of resistance to imperial domination, a culture which was caused by the very existence of colonialism. As Brydon and Tiffin state: “Post-colonial writers subvert the imperial perspective creating from the tensions of their colonial

legacy new fictions which generate new ways of perceiving."<sup>39</sup> The post-colonial writers challenge conventional form, voice and content and introduce "new ways of perceiving" the world not only by rewriting traditional European texts which previously served imperialism, but also by introducing the readers to different voices which were silenced by colonialism. So post-colonialism does not presume that we have resolved the colonial condition. From our perspective postcolonialism means a struggle to decolonize what still bears colonial characteristics. Moreover, postcolonial texts remind us of the continuous presence of neo-colonial forces in our world.

Thus, it seems to me that it is possible to speak of post-colonialism from a Canadian perspective. If one is careful to investigate the peculiarities, about which critics like Hutcheon warn, avoiding generalization, the concept is useful. Furthermore, I would contend that when a Canadian text — even one written by a white Anglo-Saxon author — suggests a reflection on the damage of colonialism and questions the colonial order, it is a post-colonial text, and should be read as such. As Susan Rudy Dorscht says, "even white middle-class Canadian writers have long felt alienated, despairing, uncertain and groundless."<sup>40</sup> Post-colonial writers in Canada adopt the perspective of the colonized and write against the central imperial power, opposing the suppression of voices of the dispossessed such as the Indigenous, the Metis and other minorities. Post colonial Canadian texts challenge the colonial mentality which considers the British Canadian as the central voice with authority to define "other" lives. Rudy Wiebe explains why he feels the necessity to write the stories of the oppressed non-white people: "When I then come to Canada, to grow up in a land that accepts my people, but has shoved the original inhabitants whom I see around me as the poorest people in the society... what can I think, a person who has some sense of justice and decency and honour?"<sup>41</sup> Wiebe rewrites the imperial history of the Indigenous by presenting different angles from which the reader can perceive the voice of the oppressed. In this sense, I believe he is producing post-colonial texts

when he challenges the traditional history which ignores the voices of the Indigenous Canadian. In *Temptations of Big Bear*, his most famous book, Wiebe invites the reader to participate in the Indians' world and to look at the Imperialist British deeds from an indigenous perspective.

Wiebe's works undoubtedly decolonize imperial fictions of conquest and domination through presenting different voices with different versions of the official history. Likewise, Margaret Laurence, whose relevance to oppressed people is acknowledged by both Africans and Indigenous Canadians, produces post-colonial texts. Laurence writes against the domination of foreign centres, criticizing the devaluation of the local and the worship of the metropolitan. Moreover, she invites us to read (or re-read) Canadian history from the perspective of the oppressed. Margaret Atwood's works also offer us an opportunity to re-read traditional works, contesting the dominant Eurocentric interpretation of Canadian history and then allowing us to listen to different voices not heard in previous traditional fiction. In this way Atwood also writes decolonizing texts. Besides these writers better known to Brazilian readers, many other white Canadians produce texts which subvert the imperial British narrative and present new alternatives to a colonizing discourse. To this group, among many others, one could add Aritha Van Herk, Susan Swam, and even Leonard Cohen and Robert Kroetsch: all of them produce texts which challenge the traditional voices of colonial and post-colonial history. These are a few white Canadians who create decolonizing and postcolonial texts. My knowledge of Canadian literature does not allow me to cite more white Canadian Writers who write in this vein, but it seems to be true that any writer who writes from the colonized perspective can be read as post-colonial independent of her/his race.

Of course, one has to be aware of the problem of representation. A white writer produces texts which unavoidably reveal their "whiteness." As Terry Goldie warns, "any white text about indigene, is writing about what you don't know."<sup>42</sup> For a white writer, it is difficult to penetrate the world of the indigenous or other oppressed people and

write from their perspective. She or he cannot become an indigenous or an African or any other colonized people. This, however, does not necessarily prevent the writer from speaking in favour of the oppressed people. Depending on the moment and circumstance, the text may be very helpful for the oppressed community. As Barbara Godard points out, it is important to know "who is speaking to whom" and under what conditions.<sup>43</sup> Who is listening to or reading and in what time and circumstance? There are moments when not speaking is much worse than speaking for the oppressed. A text written by a white writer in favour of oppressed peoples cannot be discarded just because it is a "white" text. As Gayatri Spivak comments: "when you say this is a white position again you are homogenizing."<sup>44</sup>

In this respect, I believe a white, even an Anglo-Saxon Canadian, can be read as a post-colonial writer when she or he provides us with oppositional voices, speaks against the oppression imposed by a central power, suggests a reflection on colonialism and its damage to people, and proposes strategies to overcome colonial dominance.

### Notes

- 1 This essay is an abbreviated version of the first chapter of my thesis on Margaret Laurence, entitled "Imperialism and Resistance in the Work of Margaret Laurence."
- 2 Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London: Routledge, 1989), p. 2.
- 3 Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965), p. 4.
- 4 David Spurr *The Rhetoric of Empire : Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing and Imperialism Administration* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 5.
- 5 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (London: Penguin Books, 1990), p. 176.
- 6 Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p. 9.

- 7 See Mary Pratt "Margin Release : Canadian and American Literature in the Context of Dependency" in Balakian A. ed. *Proceedings of the Xth Congress of Comparative Literature Ass.*( New York: Garland, 1985)
- 8 Mary Louise Pratt *Imperial Eyes: Travel writing and Transculturation* (N. York: Routledge, 1991), p. 1.
- 9 David Spurr *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing and Imperialism Administration* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 5.
- 10 *The Essential of Canadian History*, III.
- 11 *The Canadian Pocket Encyclopedia* 33rd Annual edition (Toronto : Quick Canadian Facts, 1979), p. 35.
- 12 Northrop Frye, *The Bush Garden : Essays on the Canadian Imagination* (Toronto: Anansi, 1971), p. iii.
- 13 Margaret Laurence, "Ivory Tower or Grassroots? The Novelist as Socio-Political Being" in New, William, ed. *A Political Art:Essays in Honour of George Woodcock* (Vancouver: Univ. of B.C., 1978), p. 23.
- 14 Margaret Atwood, *Second Words : Selected Critical Prose*(Toronto: Anansi, 1972), p. 358.
- 15 Linda Hutcheon, "Circling the Downspot of Empire" in Adam, Ian; Tiffin, Helen, eds. *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990), p. 171.
- 16 Diana Brydon, "Response to Hart", *Arachne: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language and Literature*, vol 1, 1 (1984): 101.
- 17 *Essays On Canadian Writing. 51-52 ( Winter 1993- Spring 1994)*: 147.
- 18 In New, William, op. cit p. 26.
- 19 See McGoogan's *Canada's Undeclared War: Fighting Words From Literary Trenches* (Calgary: Detselig, 1991), p. 16.
- 20 Robin Mathews, *Canadian Identity* (Ottawa : Steel Rail, 1988), p. 119.

- 21 Tony Wilden, *The Imaginary Canadian* (Vancouver: Pulp Press, 1981), p.15. in "Looking at our Particular World": An Interview with Om Juneja and others. *WLWE* 31, 2 (1990): 3.
- 22 In Eli Mandel and David Taras eds., *A Passion for Identity: An Introduction to Canadian Studies*. (Toronto: Methuen, 1987) p. 112-16 Norman Penner, *The Canadian Left: A Critical Analysis* (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1975), p. 75.
- 23 Daniel Drache, "The Canadian Bourgeoisie and its National Consciousness" in Lumsden, Ian ed. *Close to the 49th Parallel etc: The Americanization of Canada* (Toronto: U of T. Press, 1975), p. 20.
- 26 Paul Goetsch, "Der Literarische Nationalismus in Kanada seit 1960" in Kosok, H. und Priessnitz, H. *Literaturen in Englisher Sprache* (Bonn: Bouvier Verlag), p. 122.
- 27 Diana Brydon and Helen Tiffin, *Decolonizing Fictions*, (Sydney: Dangaroo Press, 1993), p.67.
- 28 In Burroughs, Peter. "The transfer of the British Social Institutions to Pre-Confederation Canada." *Diaspora of the British: Collected Seminar Papers* no.31 (London: Univ. of London, 1982), p. 112.
- 29 Laurence Archives, Scott Library, York University.
- 30 Tony Wilden, *The Imaginary Canadian* (Vancouver: Pull Press, 1980), pp. 69-70.
- 31 Linda Hutcheon, "Circling the Downspot of Empire", p. 172.
- 32 Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, "Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory : An Introduction" , *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory : A Reader* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 4.
- 33 Linda Hutcheon, "Circling the Downspot of Empire", p. 171.
- 34 Diana Brydon, "The White Inuit Speaks : Contamination as Literary Strategy" in Adam, Ian and Tiffin, p. 195
- 35 Donna Bennet, "English Canada's Post-colonial Complexities", *Essays on Canadian Writing* no 51-52 (Winter 93-Spring 94): 168.

36 David Spurr, 6.

37 *PMLA* 110, 1 (Jan. 1995), p.10.

38 In Adam, Ian and Tiffin, Helen, p. 3

39 *Idem* p. 29.

40 Susan R. Dorscht "Decolonizing Canadian Writing : Why Gender ? Whose English? When Canada? *Essays on Canadian Writing* 54 (Winter, 1994): 141.

41 Rudy Wiebe, "An Interview with Om Juneja and others", *WLWE* 31,2 (Autumn, 1988): 8.

42 Terry Goldie, *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Literatures* (Kingston: McGill- Queen University Press, 1988), p. 9.

43 Barbara Godard, "The Politics of Representation : Some Native Canadian Women Writers" *Canadian Literature* , 125 (1990): 201.

44 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interview, Strategies, Dialogues*. (London : Routledge, 1989), p. 57