

Education Landscapes in the 21st Century

Education Landscapes in the 21st Century:
Cross-Cultural Challenges
and Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives

Edited by

Iris Guske and Bruce C. Swaffield



Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Education Landscapes in the 21st Century: Cross-Cultural Challenges and Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives, Edited by Iris Guske and Bruce C. Swaffield

This book was first published in 2008 by

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

15 Angerton Gardens, Newcastle, NE5 2JA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2008 by Iris Guske & Bruce C. Swaffield and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-84718-576-2, ISBN (13): 9781847185761

Our sincere thanks to everyone who shares our compassion for education—especially our families and friends. We are grateful for the patience and encouragement you have shown us during the last year. It is to you that we dedicate this book. Thank you for keeping us focused and for reminding us, more than once, why we began this project in the first place: to make a difference in the world of education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Foreword | xi |
| Preface | xv |
| Acknowledgment..... | xvii |

Chapter One: Time out for Huckleberry Finn—Embracing Diversity

| | |
|---|----|
| With Open Arms and Closed Fists: How the Press Teaches Canadians What to Think about Aboriginals Mark Cronlund Anderson..... | 2 |
| Race, Ethnicity & the News: Sensitizing Young Journalists to Representations of Differences Frank Harris III..... | 20 |
| Time out for Huckleberry Finn Sharon E. Rush..... | 35 |
| The Role of Contemporary Multi-Ethnic Literature in Developing Strategies for Teaching Appreciation of Other Cultures to Children and Adults Kuldip Kaur Kuwahara..... | 43 |
| Teaching Writing across Cultures Ginger Jones..... | 51 |
| Embracing Diversity: Teaching and Modeling Appreciation for Other Cultures Mary Ann Clark..... | 56 |
| The Politics of Culture: New Perspectives for the Study and Practice of Multicultural and Global Relationships in the Public and Private Spheres Lorna Bell-Shaw..... | 65 |

Chapter Two: Language Policies to Overcome Language Provincialism in the Age of Globalization

| | |
|---|-----|
| Advancing an Integrative Theoretical Framework for Second Language Motivation Research Mingyue Gu..... | 82 |
| Language Policy and Language Provincialism: Barriers to Globalization in Public Schooling in the United States Judith Lessow Hurley..... | 101 |
| Dual Language Programs: What are They and Why Should We Use Them? Some Points and Recommendations for Educators, Parents, and Administrators Lucia Buttarò..... | 106 |
| Educational Opportunities for Bilingual High School Students: Factors in the Success of One Small School Sandra Liliana Pucci, Jesús Castellón and Gregory Cramer..... | 134 |
| English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education: Human and Pedagogical Impacts Nikki Ashcraft..... | 149 |
| New Horizons for Language Learning in China: Developing a Positive Classroom Culture Yingchun Li..... | 162 |
| Possibilities and Justifications for Communicating Cultural Issues in Teaching English for Science and Technology Nadežda Stojković..... | 179 |

Chapter Three: Diverse Ethnic, Socio-Economic, and Cultural Learning Communities

| | |
|--|-----|
| VBU: The First e-Learning Project Focused on the Developing Entrepreneurial Spirit in Romania Mihaela Alexandra Ionescu and Ștefan Stanciu..... | 188 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Expanding the Profession: Industry Placement for Teachers Annamarie Schuller and Roberto Bergami | 196 |
| The Impact of International Study Tours on Students' Intercultural Competencies Declan McCrohan, Richard Mapstone and Roberto Bergami | 206 |
| Helping International Students Adjust to Living and Studying in an Arabic and Islamic Environment Dale Taylor | 219 |
| Reshaping the Chinese Diaspora: International Education and Foreign Students from the People's Republic of China Frank H. Shih | 232 |
| Utilization of Cultural Elders in Modes of Non-Traditional Education Verona Mitchell-Agbemadi | 251 |
| Fighting for "Deep Change" in the Quest for Diversity: Iowa State University's Multicultural Learning Community Jane Davis and Anne Richards | 259 |
| Chapter Four: Teaching and Learning across Borders in the New Millennium | |
| The Internet & the Innernet: A Philosophy of Education in the Age of Technology Louis Silverstein | 284 |
| The Seven Laws of Teaching: New Methods from an Old Paradigm Bruce Swaffield | 288 |
| Cognitive Style and Global Learning: Teaching for Transfer and Understanding Ann Whitaker | 300 |
| Interactive Technologies, Information Landscapes, and Constructivist Learning Environments Iris Guske | 306 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Early Childhood Education Programs that Develop Multicultural Capacities through Technology and Empathic Field Experiences Elizabeth Landerholm and Cynthia Gehrie | 327 |
| Universities in Dialogue in a World without Distance Maria Amata Garito..... | 340 |
| Leading across Borders: Preparing the Next Generation of Higher Education Leaders Gwen Lee-Thomas and J.L. Kemp | 354 |
| The Social Justice Imagination: A Better World as Possibility Michael Ernest Sweet..... | 375 |
| Teacher Education: Preparing 21st Century Culturally Proficient Global Teachers for their Roles as Peace and Character Educators Reyes Quezada and Edward DeRoche | 385 |
| Teaching and Learning Democracy in the Wake of September 11 Elisabeth Jorgensen | 407 |
| Contributors..... | 429 |

FOREWORD

THE POLICY PARADOX

ROSE LEE HAYDEN¹

It would be both presumptuous and futile to attempt to provide a foreword for a volume crafted by so many talented voices focusing on so many different topics. Therefore, assuming that we all agree that each and every paper contained in this volume deals in some way or other with multicultural challenges and multidisciplinary perspectives, let's cut to the chase, avoid academic jargon, and put it right out there—the policy paradox:

At this point in our collective professional lifetimes, while sectarian, ethnic and regional conflicts and terrorist tactics have never been so widespread and murderous worldwide, let alone relentlessly present thanks to global media coverage that brings Darfur into our dining rooms, international/intercultural expertise, research and experience has had little to zero impact on policy-makers or the general public.

Obviously, this “dog won’t hunt” as things now stand. International or multicultural education is even seen as a threat to the body public, to the nation state, to your average Joe Citizen. And when international/multicultural education is tolerated, it remains marginal, under-funded, and adopted only on a piecemeal and ephemeral basis thanks to the heroic efforts of a few dedicated “believers.”

In a word, we have had no cumulative effect whatsoever. Neither politicians nor citizens seem to appreciate, let alone utilize what it is we

¹ Dr. Lee Hayden served as Director of the Division of International Education Relations of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., and was the Deputy Director for the Peace Corps for the Latin American and Caribbean Region. She moved from New York to outside Rome in the wake of 9/11, where she continues to write and teach.

provide in terms of expertise. As a result, nothing we have collectively accomplished has made us, or more to the point, our leadership, more capable of coping with ongoing crises that have their roots in ethnic, sectarian, nationalistic and regional hatreds often nurtured over the centuries. Perhaps our species possesses a genetic marker that predisposes us to such murderous behavior.

No one ever said that getting our knowledge applied in real-life settings would be easy. Having dedicated a lifetime to lobbying in some fashion or other for improvements in foreign language, international and intercultural education in the United States, and speaking only of my own professional experiences, it is my firm but sad belief that we Americans have experienced real setbacks since World War II when the Marshall Plan, the Fulbright Program, and later, thanks to Sputnik, Title VI provided a sense of national purpose with respect to promoting and funding competence in world affairs. Indeed, multicultural education, global education, bilingual education and their brethren have seen somewhat better days in terms of overall policy and individual impact.

Back in the “bad old days” of the Cold War, Americans and their leadership at all levels, even business tycoons, could be persuaded that it was important for our citizens to be more internationally competent in order to survive, prosper, and have more options thanks to knowing more about other peoples and cultures.

This is not to ignore the real progress that has been made. In fact, if anything, globalization has brought home this message thanks to outsourcing and relentless economic competition. It has also provoked even more bitter reactions to immigration as well as widespread fear that the next (and supposedly inevitable terrorist attacks) will be either biological, chemical or nuclear.

Part of the fault lies with us, thanks to our excessive academic tribalism. Perhaps “multidisciplinary” education is an oxymoron. Your basic ESL instructor teaching Juan how to speak, read and write the mainstream language (and now the global one) hardly ever interacts and/or exchanges useful teaching strategies with your basic Spanish instructor busily figuring out ways to teach Spanish to those hapless students who must pass a foreign language requirement. This is true at the schools level as well where foreign language, multicultural and social studies educators can be ships passing in the night. What’s wrong with this picture? Juan must learn English, Johnny must learn Spanish, and so it goes.

Despite decades of effort, and official university propaganda declaring the opposite, your average American college or university student can graduate from even our most elite institutions without ever having taken

an international or intercultural course. Many cannot find Iraq on a map. Goodness knows, this might mean taking one less “business” course, thus damaging your prospects out there in the job market where incentives for hiring people with multilingual and multicultural competence vs. those with that one extra business course are shamefully few and far between, despite corporate claims to the contrary. How many recruiters come to YOUR campus to hire the multilingual/multicultural graduates who have also completed all the basic business education requirements? I rest my case, and with no visible incentives out there in the world of work, plus reinforcement of suspicions and fears of “the other” on the home (and sadly the national) front these days, the well is well and truly poisoned.

What to do? Who knows, but at least we can try to make our work readable and accessible, or even policy relevant by taking a more active role in *implementing* it. Academic-speak, that solipsistic “eduspeak” jargon is a real turn-off, even for those of us who understand what it is you are trying to say. Organizing real interdisciplinary educational options for students of all ages would also help to solidify experience and diffuse it. Such “brainstorming” is critical, but can only take place when one is able to listen to what others have to say outside their own insular academic tribe.

It may be that the so-called “American Dream” is no longer. It worked for my immigrant parents, but today who knows? Back in my youth, your average middle class family could have a car, a home, a life, and also afford to send their children to college, albeit with sacrifice and hard work on the part of everyone. The working poor had a real chance to improve their socio-economic prospects, and despite racism and linguistic discrimination, hard work paid off. Upward mobility was not just an unattainable fantasy.

The “American Dream” seems more elusive these days when many are losing their homes and others are constructing McMansions. Today, in the United States, 1% of our population receives 43% of our GDP, compared with the end of FDR’s presidency when that figure was 22%. If anything, the working poor and a lot of the so-called middle class are downwardly mobile thanks to shifts in the overall economy, and the inevitable impact of global competition.

It is not my intention to cast a negative cloud over what has been achieved by all of us, or to view the future with terrible foreboding. Perhaps I exaggerate in order to get your attention. In any case, I do urge us all to continue our important work, to reach out and get involved in the politics of our schools, universities and communities, to provide policy-relevant, readable, and just as important, exciting multicultural/

multidisciplinary incentives. This is not to say that many of you are not already doing this to some degree, as is evident here in this volume. In fact, participants in the *Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture* over the years are the exception to the rule. You are, in general, far less prone to overly academic and policy-irrelevant blathering. Yet given the challenges of our times, I think you would all agree that much more is needed and that we must all become far more strategically adept if we wish to succeed.

And while I am still on this soapbox, let me add that we had better practice what we preach. All too often, we multiculturalists are intolerant of other points of view. We succumb to a tendency to believe that the “melting pot” is all bad; things are either all black or white, good or evil. You are either with us, or you are not. How can we “convert” anyone if we ourselves are “true believers” to such a degree that we become “academic fundamentalists?” Beware of this tendency as there are essentially only two kinds of people in the world—those who dichotomize and those who don’t!

It is up to us whether our response to current events and challenges represents “an open moment” or “an insurmountable opportunity.” We must address that policy paradox—that in times of greatest need, we seem to be rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. This need not be so.

PREFACE

When the Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture began at the beginning of the new millennium, hosting its first conference at John Cabot University in Rome, little did anyone know that within five years the papers given by an academic community—one extremely eager to share up-to-date research results and practical findings—would add up to such a cutting-edge collection as the one presented herewith.

With contributions from scholars and practitioners in the fields of education, literacy, literature, media, communication and cultural studies from all five continents, the present volume focuses on themes of pressing importance in today's globalized world. These presentations will introduce the most varied of educational settings to the reader, e.g. an integrative creative writing course, a collaborative school partnership involving parents and community organizations, and a professional development course offering industry placements for teachers.

By giving voice to international educators committed to excellence in teaching from primary school to university, the book will introduce the reader to a plurality of approaches to, and applications of, up-to-date theories in the fields of cognition, language acquisition, intercultural communication and technology-based distance education, to name but a few.

Since teaching paradigms are strongly culture-bound and influenced by national policies as much as international politics, the present volume attempts to represent a maximum of diversity by including philosophical texts, hands-on research results or classroom observations, and a wide range of articles in the critical discourse tradition, which reflect a number of contentious issues, ranging from the pros and cons of dual-language classrooms to potentially racist literature curricula and the intersection of politics and pedagogy in a post-September 11 world.

Though situated in a concrete educational context—be it a Chinese EFL-classroom in transition, a progressive online MBA-course offered in post-Communist Romania, or a Midwestern university utilizing community elders as a pedagogical tool—each paper was selected on the universal value of its findings, which educators facing the challenges of 21st century pedagogy will find readily applicable in classrooms all over the world.

We hope that this compilation of topical articles will give rise to the same stimulating interdisciplinary and cross-cultural discussions that have, in the meantime, attracted some 300 scholars and practitioners from more than 30 nations and a variety of academic and/or professional, ethnic, religious, socio-economic and cultural backgrounds to the renowned conferences hosted by the Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture.

These conferences, as well as the present book, are meant to highlight the growing need for culturally-sensitive education that draws on the strengths of both traditional teaching methods and technology-rich forms of instruction. This crucial element has come to be seen as an important prerequisite of imparting knowledge and fostering skills in our students, which will enable them to negotiate their personal and professional lives in a world where physical distances are no longer barriers to communicative interchanges, but where perceived and real rifts between different cultures are also coming alarmingly close to preventing meaningful communication from bringing about true understanding at the individual, community and societal level.

The ontogenesis of the Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture is seen here clearly in the perspectives and presentations of diverse professionals who are dedicated to teaching and learning as a help, as Matthew Arnold said in *Literature and Science*, “to knowing ourselves and the world.”

Iris Guske and Bruce C. Swaffield

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A work of this tremendous magnitude and scope would not have been possible without the effort of many hands and minds during the past several years.

The Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture would like to thank all those scholars and participants who have attended the annual congress in Rome, Italy, as well as the following individuals and institutions: Joan Colin Carpenter, DeMishea Charleston, Giovanni Conso, James Creagan, L. Chris Curry, Gian Carlo D'Ascenzi, Pilar Davis, Peter Ganslmayr (for special editorial assistance), Maria Amata Garito, D. Brent Hardt, Rose Lee Hayden, Josselyn Kennedy, Stephanie Longo, Francesca Monteporzio, R. James Nicholson, Franco Pavoncello, Markus Pfeiffer, Francis Rooney, Mark Smith, Jeannine Swaffield, Gaddi H. Vasquez, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, John Cabot University, Centro Studi Americani, NETTUNO: Network per l'Università Ovunque, Regent University, U.S. Embassy to the Holy See, U.S. Embassy Rome and U.S. Mission to the United Nations Agencies.

CHAPTER ONE

TIME OUT FOR HUCKLEBERRY FINN— EMBRACING DIVERSITY

WITH OPEN ARMS AND CLOSED FISTS: HOW THE PRESS TEACHES CANADIANS WHAT TO THINK ABOUT ABORIGINALS

MARK CRONLUND ANDERSON

Introduction

Canada is home to 600-plus indigenous nations. Yet the country's most pervasive, persistent and influential history teacher, the printed press (Cortes, 2000; McCombs, 2004), has tended to conflate all these people into one heavily stereotyped monolith. Pernicious and deeply rooted, this collective Canadian imaginary has remained remarkably unchanged and unchallenged in the press since the country was created in 1867. Not surprisingly, the shadings of the attendant imagery abound in Canadian culture (Francis, 1992), yet are seldom if ever discussed publicly (Henry & Tator, 2002). This informal yet highly persuasive curriculum substitutes colonial bias and racial prejudice for fact, the imagined for the real, including broad allegations citing inherent native weakness, backwardness, and absence of religious faith. The first of these includes charges of intemperance (especially drunkenness), licentiousness, dishonesty, criminality, laziness and affection of gratuitous violence. The second incorporates the ideas that natives are unprogressive, lost in time, moribund and wild creatures of nature. The third charge cites aboriginal irreligiousness as central to the "Indian problem," inasmuch as it defined, for the newspapers, a people unhinged from and untouched by civilization.¹

¹ The newspapers analyzed in this paper used the term "Indian" where today the terms "aboriginal," "indigenous," and "native" (which I employ as synonyms in this paper) are more common in Canada; common usage in the United States continues to employ the earlier term. By the same token, the Métis in western Canada were commonly referred to as "half-breeds," "breeds," or sometimes simply as "French," where given the context it was understood that the term meant French-Indian "half-breed." While the press inconsistently made a distinction between and among Métis and aboriginals, this paper does not because its focus

As teacher the press has attributed aboriginal behavior and character inconsistently to alleged racial and/or cultural inadequacies. Further complicating this very public curriculum, it has presumed for Canadians a teleological view of human history as “evolutionary,” the gist of which held that natives were doomed to die off in the face of expansive white civilization. While press depictions frequently contradict themselves when considering whether natives are redeemable human beings or even human beings at all, the press has tended to present the allegations as objective, just the “facts.” Remarkably, these historical media portrayals have gone largely unnoticed by scholars. In effect, this has created a situation in which the most popular and compelling teacher in Canadian history has never undergone course evaluation, a standard classroom practice.

Framings

The press framing of aboriginal peoples has served as a form of historical amnesia, for not only are the allegations wrong-headed, but they are demonstrably, almost deliberately, inaccurate. From a pedagogical viewpoint, however, the results are important for at least two reasons. First, the formidable power of the mass media to instruct audiences and teach readers has been well established (Cortés, 2000; Nesbitt-Larking, 2001). In particular, agenda-setting research shows that the press has the power not merely to instruct an audience *what to think about* but even *what to think* (McCombs, 2004). The mechanism by which this occurs is simple. To begin with, because it frequently provides the major or the only source of information and opinion on a topic (e.g., how do you know what you know about global warming?), press content can and will influence readers, as proudly claimed by the Montreal *Gazette*, one of Canada’s leading dailies, in 1873:

Newspapers are getting to be much more than mere transcripts of the news and gossip of the day. They are pioneers in learned explorations; they are foremost in geographical and historical discovery; they are the teachers of social science (...). The reporter of today is the adventurer who penetrates the desert and the jungle, the scholar who researches for relics of the forgotten past, the courier who bears the news of victory (...) across a wilderness and through hostile armies (...) we can hardly doubt that it is destined in a very short time to be the foremost of all the secular

engages the general construction of press Indian-ness, irrespective of European admixing.

professions—the most powerful in its operations, the most brilliant in its rewards, and the most useful to mankind.²

Further with respect to natives, press content in North America overwhelmingly has reinforced mainstream norms (Coward, 1999; Weston, 1996). Consequently, insofar as the content of the press imagery derives from the larger culture in which the press and its readers participate, one might reasonably expect a consonance between press content and preexisting reader bias (Berkhofer, 1979). The result is that the news *qua* curriculum emerges organically, naturalized, as if nothing were more normal. In short, as curriculum the images do not present new material so much as they reinforce the status quo.

Second, Canada's birth as a colonial entity fashioned by Great Britain, which in turn has given rise to a colonial state in its own right, has contributed both to the paucity of study (i.e., because colonial societies tend strongly toward non-reflexive thinking) as well as the tone and content of the imagery (Bird, 1996; Hall, 1997; Lambertus, 2004). In this way, colonialism and agenda-setting team up to fashion a sort of informal imperial primer, unstuck from empirical reality insofar as the images are predictably and consistently mistaken yet reflective of, and in a sense true to, mainstream Canadian racialized colonial norms (Furniss, 2000; Hall, 1997; Said, 1979). This helps explain why those few Canadians who have had direct contact with natives tend to share reports closely similar to those who have had little or no contact with aboriginals—again, irrespective of evidence that easily refutes the central allegations. In and for the United States scholars have examined in some detail how the press has imagined indigenous peoples (Coward, 1999; Weston, 1996)—yet how Canada's aboriginals have been imagined historically by the mainstream press has received no close reading.

Three cases

To explore this topic and assess the two basic assertions articulated above, this paper summarizes and analyzes press research conducted for three distinct historical cases and then positions it with respect to other recent research. The first case is Canada's purchase and subsequent absorption of Rupert's Land in 1869. Located in the west, this territory, which doubled the size of the country, was sold to Canada by the Hudson's Bay Company. In a sense, the people living there were sold

² Montreal *Gazette*, reprinted from the New York *Tribune*, 04 September 1873.

along with it, having had no say in the matter. Mostly these were aboriginals or Métis (usually of indigenous-French or, to a lesser extent, indigenous-Scotch or indigenous-English heritage). The second, and closely linked, historical case involves the 1873 signing of Treaty Three, in which the federal government usurped some 12.5 million hectares in central Canada from the aboriginals living there. The 1905 creation of Saskatchewan as a western province offers a third case.

While it is not my contention that such a modest sampling can establish firmly a pattern for all press coverage curricula in Canada insofar as press representations relate to larger cultural visions (that is, Canadian colonialism), or teach the value of maintaining the prevailing social and political order, remarkable similarities in treatment are readily discernible and strongly support the contention that the press has aided and abetted Canada's colonial project (Furniss, 2000; Harding, 2006; Anderson & Robertson, 2007).

A close historical reading of popular images of Indians in the United States has identified virtually no substantive change in two centuries (Berkhofer, 1979). This offers a key starting point because scholars have demonstrated an almost uncanny congruence between Canadian and American Indian policies (Nichols, 1998), despite popular notions to the contrary (Francis, 1992).

Points westward

The sale of Rupert's Land elicited much comment from Canada's two leading English-language daily newspapers in 1869, the Toronto *Globe* and the Montreal *Gazette*. The *Globe* referred to it as "the path of empire and the garden of the world,"³ the "most fertile land in the world,"⁴ "exceedingly fertile,"⁵ and "inconceivably rich."⁶ The *Gazette* agreed, calling it "the greatest place for game, ever,"⁷ "great—inexhaustible—inconceivably rich."⁸ Four years later in 1873, just six years after Canada had been granted nominal independence from Great Britain, these deeply partisan publications, the *Globe* politically Liberal and the *Gazette* Conservative in orientation, battled tenaciously in all matters political in the emerging nation state. However, given both political parties' intense

³ *Globe* 28 May 1869.

⁴ *Globe* 16 January 1869.

⁵ *Globe* 21 May 1869.

⁶ *Globe* 01 January 1869.

⁷ *Gazette* 05 January 1869.

⁸ *Gazette* 07 January 1869.

desire to settle the territory west of the Great Lakes with white Protestants, the most pressing political issue of the day, after the initial land purchase, was the “Indian Problem” or “Indian Question”⁹ as it was known in the press. That is, the settling of the west was predicated on successfully garnering coveted lands hitherto occupied by aboriginals. The “problem” was what to with and about natives.

On this issue the papers spoke as if with one colonial voice. That is, the contours of aboriginal identity, as depicted by the *Globe* and the *Gazette*, bore close similitude during and immediately after the sale of Rupert’s Land and the year in which Treaty Three, third of the 11 numbered treaties, reaching from northwestern Ontario into the province of Manitoba, was struck. The images averred that natives were backward, dangerously savage, inept, dishonest, and doomed to die off in the near future. Such imagery served to justify the purchase and the subsequent treaty that cemented indefinite white hegemony.

Closely similar images emerge from a reading of the five most widely distributed newspapers published in Saskatchewan (which is primarily Treaty Four country, an agreement struck in 1874) some 30 years later. The year 1905 is significant because Saskatchewan was formally carved out of the Northwest Territory (formerly known as Rupert’s Land) and created as a province. Basically, the territory had been until that time sparsely populated by whites, but in 1905 the federal government decided that a sufficient population had been established to create new provinces in the west, Saskatchewan among them. So while the Canadian west only technically came into existence in 1869 and was only just opening up to settlement in 1873, by 1905 it was deemed, at least for the purposes of political representation on a national scale, to have become sufficiently full of Canadians (read: whites; aboriginals were not effectively enfranchised until the 1960s) to govern itself. Of course, none of this would have been possible without the numbered treaties, which for practical purposes took virtually all of the province’s territory from aboriginals.

The creation of a national railway that reached all the way to the Pacific Ocean in the 1880s had been central both to settlement and subsequent political enfranchisement, hence one reason to remove or relocate natives. Other reasons included maximizing the land available for white cultivation as well as reducing the likelihood of indigenous resistance by distributing the natives widely on to small reservations and then keeping their mobility severely restricted. In short, aboriginal people

⁹ See, for example: *Globe* 9 July 1869.

stood in the way physically and, to the extent that they inhibited the progressive march of history, teleologically.

In the early days the west was viewed very much in the press as the “wilds”¹⁰ (yet simultaneously, as noted, also a fabulously rich potential garden¹¹)—and inhabited, not surprisingly then, by wild peoples, savages, the uncivilized “red skin.”¹² This western territory, according to press reports—was coveted too for geopolitical reasons (i.e., to foreclose American annexation of the territory), but also as a source of wealth—a principle fount of which was expected to be rich agricultural lands.¹³

For their own good

The premise upon which colonization of the west rested asserted that natives occupied but did not own the land. Evidence of ownership, reflecting centuries-old English common law, would have required the construction of fences, bridges, and permanent buildings, plus the recognition that such construction conferred proper and legal ownership (Seed, 1995). Admix this culturally-bound prejudice with espied indigenous paganism and one gains a ready formula for Canadian-style colonialism—or, to put it in a North American context, Canadian-style Manifest Destiny (Horsman, 1981; Furniss, 2000; Kulchyski, 2005). And so the 1869 and 1873 *Globe* and *Gazette* frequently asked the question, how could peoples for whom senseless wandering served as a way of life possibly make good use of the land?¹⁴ They could not, the papers stressed, which served as a primary justification for whites usurping it in the first place.¹⁵ The notion that aboriginals were childlike lent weight to this conclusion.

The sale of Rupert’s Land was the key news story of 1869 and frequently therefore dominated coverage. The *Globe* especially, because it was an opposition newspaper when Sir John A. McDonald, a Conservative, was prime minister, expostulated almost daily on the need to secure the territory, but to do it in such a way that might endorse the *Globe*’s Liberal bent. The *Globe* summed it up succinctly: “The all-

¹⁰ See, for example: *Globe*, 12 April 1869.

¹¹ See, for example: *Globe* 01 January 1869.

¹² The term served as a ready signifier of Indian-ness. It was employed ubiquitously. See, for example: *Globe* 01 January 1869.

¹³ See: *Globe* 02 July 1873; *Globe* 09 July 1873; *Globe* 01 October 1873; *Globe* 30 December 1873.

¹⁴ *Globe* 02 July 1873.

¹⁵ *Globe* 03 July 1873. Also see: *Globe* 04 July 1873; *Globe* 07 July 1873.

important thing is to get the territory as soon as possible.”¹⁶ The *Gazette* offered significantly less coverage of the sale, and it tended to cast the purchase in a favorable light where the *Globe* took issue with everything from the asking price to the style of government that would follow the purchase. In short, while the two papers agreed on the inestimable need and value of the land, they squabbled over the details. Agreed in principle, once the land was secured, the tone and nature of the politics would grow more vitriolic by 1873.

Notably, however, the two organs spoke from a single monolithic cultural center when depicting natives. For example, in 1869 allegations of native weakness, backwardness, and irreligiousness could be found almost in every issue of the *Globe*. Drunkenness and a love of drink typified coverage, from “half-breeds playing billiards and drinking” and “drinking fire-water”¹⁷ to allegations such as, “You all know he [the native] drinks too much,” in the *Gazette*.¹⁸

Laziness dovetailed neatly with the claim that Indians were intemperate in their thirst for alcoholic beverages. Both the *Globe* and *Gazette* noted indigenous laziness as evidenced by an unwillingness to farm. In fact, “half-breeds” were so opposed to engaging in the principal economic activity of the colonial settlement that they would choose starvation before taking up the plow.¹⁹ This led to a situation in which they were “all dependent on the charity of the world for their daily bread.” And even when they prepared their meals they produced “cookery [that was] simple and inferior,” according to the *Globe*.²⁰

Another feature of alleged native backwardness lay in the espied inability to rise above the intemperate demands of the flesh, as illustrated by love of drink, laziness and also the devotion to atavistic outbursts such as the war dance.²¹ This might lead directly to “demoniacal orgies through the influences of the fire water upon the savage nature of the Indian,” reported the *Globe*.²² In another example, an article detailed the practice of “squaw kissing” when oversexed “Indian and half-breed women go about kissing every one of the opposite sex whom they meet.”²³ It would have

¹⁶ *Globe* 15 April 1869.

¹⁷ *Globe* 01 January 1869. Also see: *Globe* 15 July 1869.

¹⁸ *Gazette* 14 August 1869.

¹⁹ *Globe* 01 January 1869. Also see: *Globe* January 22 1869; *Gazette* 05 January 1869; *Gazette* 07 January 1869.

²⁰ *Globe* 16 February 1869; *Globe* 23 March 1869.

²¹ *Globe* 06 January 1869.

²² *Globe* 22 January 1869.

²³ *Globe* 09 February 1869.

been unsurprising then for *Globe* readers to learn that “Polygamy is practiced in the tribes (...). A man may have as many wives as he can keep, but he must buy them. The universal price of a wife is a pony (...). A squaw once purchased becomes the immediate property of the purchaser, but he must catch her.”²⁴

In particular, the *Globe* and *Gazette* drew upon reports emanating from the United States that stressed raw Indian savagery. On the less extreme end of this reportage Indians were portrayed as merely “hostile.”²⁵ On the other hand, and more typically, Indians were portrayed as unmitigated savages who would commit any manner of atrocity simply because it was in their nature to do so (and not because they were fighting a defensive war against white encroachment on lands they had called their own for thousands of years). The latter were common, usually brief notices on the front pages about depredations committed by American tribes and, often, the US martial response.²⁶ For example, in January 1869 the *Globe* reported that in the American west “a body of a white was found, perfectly naked and covered with arrows and bullet holes. The head presented the appearance of having been beaten with a war club. The top of the skull was broken into a number of pieces.”²⁷ With less embellishment, though more common, shorter notes simply noted outrages such as when “The Indians in the Colorado territory in September last killed and scalped Nicholas Ocamb”²⁸ or how American troops fought bravely “against the marauding and murderous savages of the frontier.”²⁹ The *Gazette* related a frightening tale about native “barbarities” in which “savages” seized a school house, raped the teacher, and nailed all the children to the walls before torturing them to death. Then “they roamed indeed over the country like so many demons.”³⁰

Savage aboriginal behavior was, of course, not limited to the United States, coverage illustrates. As the *Globe* warned readers in March, “The

²⁴ *Globe* 31 March, 1869. Also see: *Globe* 25 August 1869.

²⁵ *Globe* 01 January 1869.

²⁶ *Globe* 09 January 1869; *Globe* 10 April 1869; *Globe* 14 May 1869; *Globe* 1 July 1869.

²⁷ *Globe* January 11 1869.

²⁸ *Globe* 16 January 1869. Also see: *Globe* 27 January 1869; *Globe* 03 March 1869; *Globe* 09 March 1869; *Globe* 22 March 1869; *Globe* 17 May 1869; *Globe* 24 May 1869; *Globe* 1 June 1869; *Globe* 2 June 1869; *Globe* 10 June 1869; *Globe* 14 June 1869; *Globe* 03 July 1869; *Globe* 27 Jul, 1869; *Globe* 02 August, 1869; *Globe* 16 August 1869; *Gazette* 27 January 1869; *Gazette* 23 February 1869; *Gazette* 20 March 1869; *Gazette* 22 June 1869.

²⁹ *Globe* 20 May 1869.

³⁰ *Gazette* 23 February 1869.

Indians of the Plains are very different from their docile brethren in [eastern] Canada—they are constantly on the war path.”³¹ A week after this dispatch the *Globe* reported “that the Indians of the Plains are again on the warpath.”³² In late May it again reminded readers that “They are very different from the timid and cringing creatures who are now the sole representatives of the Indian race in the back settlements of [eastern] Canada.”³³ The natives to the near east of Rupert’s Land were also “numerous and warlike”³⁴ whereas in the west the Blackfoot were “the really wild Indians.”³⁵ The *Gazette* agreed almost verbatim, noting that the western natives were “constantly on the war path.”³⁶

Curiously, despite their espied savage nature, the press also noted that aboriginals “are easily dealt with and easily controlled.”³⁷ Despite a proclivity for warring, another article explained, “Qualified [Indian] agents could easily settle” them down.³⁸ Thus, the savage also earned status as a lowly and slightly pathetic creature, as the *Globe* had it, “the poor Indians.”³⁹ Citing comments made in Parliament the *Globe* even suggested that under select conditions some natives might become modestly “civilized.”⁴⁰ Finally, other reports claimed that “There is no fear of violent molestations from the Indians (...) [because] They are consummate beggars.”⁴¹ Ultimately, these sorts of characterizations led to the infantilization of natives, “who are to be taken care of as little children.”⁴² The *Globe* reported, “Of all savages those that live by fishing (...) are the most degraded. I was surprised at the thoroughly Mongolian type, with broad, flat faces and oblique eyes, or pure breeds. The older women were horribly withered, bleared and smoke dried, extremely suggestive of the witches in *Macbeth*.”⁴³

News of the signing of Treaty Three proved barely to register in the press in 1873. The *Globe* passed the signing off with 56 words—among them the gross exaggeration that “the terms are very liberal towards the

³¹ *Globe* 23 March 1869.

³² *Globe* 31 March 1869. Also see: *Globe* 21 May 1869; *Globe* 22 May 1869.

³³ *Globe* 25 May 1869.

³⁴ *Globe* 25 May, 1869.

³⁵ *Globe* 17 August 1869.

³⁶ *Gazette* 10 April 1869.

³⁷ *Globe* 16 February 1869. Also see: *Globe* 27 February 1869.

³⁸ *Globe* 23 March 1869.

³⁹ *Globe* 13 April 1869.

⁴⁰ *Globe* 28 April 1869.

⁴¹ *Globe* 30 April 1869. Also see: *Globe* 17 August 1869.

⁴² *Globe* 20 May 1869. Also see: *Globe* 16 June 1869.

⁴³ *Globe* 02 August 1869.

Indians”⁴⁴ whereas the *Gazette* failed to mention it at all. Subsequently, the *Globe* printed excerpts of the treaty, advising readers that the shiftless natives might now be effectively “quieted” by white Canada.⁴⁵

That said, natives did not escape substantive notice in either paper during that year. In fact, both papers had much to say about them—ultimately leading one to conclude that the lack of interest in the treaty as news reflected the sense that the treaties constituted minor incidents in the larger narrative of triumphal Anglo conquest, as sketched in these two daily newspapers and as hinted at by the 1869 news reports. The earlier sale of Rupert’s Land evinced no substantive difference in treatment. While the sale was framed as of great consequence, overall aboriginals received little direct attention. Moreover, the coverage itself varied little, typically repeating the same tired clichés. The real story lay in tales of the re-dawning of civilization, the vanquishing of savagery, heroic tales of the white man’s burden, as it were, and so on.

So while the signing of Treaty Three *per se* elicited scant news interest, on other occasions treaties were discussed by the papers, and this discourse begins to shed some light on the more general news framing of the Canada’s aboriginal peoples in 1873 in these two publications. Canada’s Plains Indians sought treaties, the *Globe* explained. Natives invited the protection of the white community that the treaties allegedly granted at the same time as this gesture demonstrated an acknowledged (by the paper) inability to govern their own affairs. In short, at some level, the argument ran, sensible Indians endorsed colonialism—and treaties—as good for them.⁴⁶

In this way, then, natives typically were portrayed as desiring treaties, explicitly for their own good. Moreover, such assertions were presented as givens, assertions of simple common sense—never quoting or, for that matter, attributing such statements to any specific person or persons—and were couched with a caution that for any such treaties to be successfully negotiated the Canadian government must make strong show of “force,” because Indians tended to be mercurial and potentially dangerous.⁴⁷ The key remained that this “prairie land” was highly desirable, but it had lamentably been turned into little more than a “desert” through aboriginal misuse, according to the *Gazette*.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ *Globe* 08 October 1873.

⁴⁵ *Globe* 28 October 1873.

⁴⁶ See, for example: *Globe* 31 July 1873.

⁴⁷ *Globe* 31 July 1873.

⁴⁸ *Gazette* 04 June 1873. Also see: *Gazette* 18 June 1874.

Civilization and its malcontents

Natives, then, in part because of the ways in which they were cast as non-owners of the lands that had otherwise been theirs for thousands of years, were characterized as barbarians while mainstream white Canada was draped in the finery of all things civilized. This held true both in 1873 and 1905 depictions.

In both cases, to begin with, it meant that aboriginals were portrayed as not properly Christian—in particular, because the papers also expressed a certain disdain for Roman Catholicism, this meant Protestant Christianity—which, the 1873 *Gazette* assured readers, Indians preferred. Catholics were guilty of “religious persecution.”⁴⁹ In fact, the Catholic Church behaved in altogether un-Christianlike ways in its dealings with aboriginals, the paper warned. That the various Canadian churches, Protestant as well as Catholic, aided and abetted the disenfranchisement of natives from their lands and, indeed, culture, the papers lauded because it was “to their advantage,”⁵⁰ reducing an espied aboriginal predisposition to thievery⁵¹ and by improving hygiene, introducing women’s rights (in part, because of the practice of concubinage⁵²) and education all round for, in the *Globe*’s words, the “dirty, miserable (...) degraded pagans.”⁵³

As the *Gazette* put it on another occasion, “let us bless God that he has brought a vine into this wilderness; that he has cast out the heathen.”⁵⁴ Further, the *Globe* charged, even when converted to any variety of Christianity, Indians were probably just faking it, either because they were a) not trustworthy; b) because they just did not comprehend the precepts of organized religion; or, c) perhaps most charitably, yet implying dulled intelligence, they needed more time to figure it out.⁵⁵

The papers denied the existence of indigenous religious traditions. It was a mistake to identify indigenous belief systems as religions at all because their first premises were the promotion of aggressive violence,⁵⁶ patricide,⁵⁷ polygamy and infanticide.⁵⁸ Meanwhile, according to the

⁴⁹ *Gazette* 10 January 1873.

⁵⁰ *Gazette* 23 January 1873.

⁵¹ *Globe* 07 July 1873.

⁵² *Globe* 04 August 1873.

⁵³ *Globe* 03 July 1873. Also see: *Globe* 17 July 1873; *Globe* 04 August 1873.

⁵⁴ *Gazette* 15 February 1873. Also see: *Globe* 23 June 1873.

⁵⁵ *Globe* 23 June 1873. Also see: *Globe* 03 July 1873.

⁵⁶ *Gazette* 04 June 1873.

⁵⁷ *Globe* 23 June 1873.

⁵⁸ *Globe* 03 July 1873. Also see: *Globe* 04 August 1873.