(RE)IMAGINING HISTORY AND SUBJECTIVITY: (DIS)INCAR-NATIONS
OF RACIALISED CITIZENSHIP


RACHEL SHIELDS
B.Sc., University of Lethbridge, 2011


A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
of the University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS


Department of Sociology
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

# Abstract

This thesis explores the ways in which modern history-writing practices reiterate race-based categories of citizenship. To investigate these practices across time, I have examined discourses produced by the United Farm Women of Alberta (UFWA) in 1925, and discourses produced by the contemporary magazine *American Renaissance* (AR). The UFWA were concerned with the promotion and definition of citizenship, and in so doing laid race as a foundation of Canadian identity. AR is a magazine that concerns itself with white nationalism in the contemporary United States. Drawing upon Avery Gordon and Wendy Brown's theories of history and haunting, I have situated these discourses in imaginative relation to one another, illuminating the "past" in the present. I have also critically examined how I am complicit in reproducing the historical practices under study; as an architecture of history, haunting helps to imagine alternatives for the study of history and social life, particularly our own.

# Table of Contents

# List of Figures

## List of Abbreviations

**UFWA** is the abbreviation for the United Farm Women of Alberta.

**AR** is the abbreviation for the magazine *American Renaissance.*

**UFW** is an abbreviation for references to United Farm Women's groups outside of Alberta.

**Proem**

Wandering around on the University of Illinois campus with Jason, my supervisor, I feel excited about the conference being held here. Because I have been told that this particular conference provides a space to speak critically not only about *what* research is being done, but *how* (and *to what end*), I am eager to meet the people he knows. Jason introduces me here and there to various scholars whose names I mostly recognise. As I shake hands with someone I've just met, we make friendly eye contact and he smiles at me: "so what is your thesis about?"

I smile back but feel slightly disconcerted. This question has been posed to me countless times and in a variety of situations. Being put on the spot by strangers (who, I worry, are much more articulate than me) usually results in me being at a loss for words. In this case, I open my mouth and nothing more than "umm…" comes out, along with a nervous laugh, seeking understanding. I pause awkwardly, trying to arrange my thoughts, knowing it seems odd that I don't seem to know what my own thesis is about. Eventually I say, honestly, "I never know how to answer that question!" He continues to smile politely, but with eyebrows raised.

*Why do people ask this question anyway[1]? Don't they know how difficult it is to sum up one's research in the 30 seconds or so that someone's polite, cursory interest usually lasts?*

---

[1] Following authors such as Newman (2012) and Ellis (2009), I use italics here to explore the possibilities of polyvocality for capturing the process of self-reflection, in this case in the moment of interaction.

The scholar I've just met is still looking at me expectantly. "Just describe it in a nutshell," he says, not unkindly.

Willing myself to say something that *makes sense*[2], I venture: "Okay, well, my thesis is about a few different things." He glances briefly elsewhere, so I try to hurry. Speaking a bit too quickly for my liking, I say: "It's about the history of early liberal feminism and nation-building in Canada, and how that history is connected to contemporary American white nationalism." He nods, tentatively, so I press on: "But it's also about what it means to interrogate and construct these histories – the most important parts of my thesis involve questions about epistemology, and the process of being called into subjectivity through research." Being asked what my thesis is about almost always starts me thinking about it in general, about what I want it to accomplish and how I have gone about doing that. As I think about what I just said, I expect to become part of the background again, relieved that attention will no longer be squarely on me.

He doesn't yet look away: "Is that what you are presenting here?"

"Yes," I say, now beginning to worry about the possibility that someone might actually attend my session. I feel like I should pre-empt my talk by admitting that it might not be what anyone is expecting: "Yes, but it's been difficult to turn into a twenty minute presentation." Seeing his eyebrows lift at this, I feel compelled to elaborate: "It's not a very traditional thesis. It attends to and makes room for disjuncture, incoherence and imagination, both in terms of

---

[2] The phrase "make sense" appears throughout this thesis. As elaborated upon in chapters four and five, the idea of *making sense*, and my reliance upon it, becomes particularly significant.

the research itself and my own role as researcher. The fact that there is, on the one hand, a substantive discussion about race and nationalism, and on the other hand, a discussion about what it means to make knowledge claims about those issues has made it difficult for me to know which train of thought is most important."

*In other words, I mean to say that I don't know how to describe this research in a way that I feel captures it. Using vague terms like "race," "nationalism" and "subjectivity" is dissatisfying. Have I bored him?*

He simply says, "good luck with that," as he turns away to chat with someone else.

*What did I mean when I said I didn't know "which train of thought is most important?" Really, I suppose it's not a matter of 'which is most important,' but a matter of doing both in a way that won't confuse the audience or the reader. But then again, if there are moments of confusion or contradiction, isn't that part of the point? Isn't the experience of being disoriented amongst competing knowledge claims a productive one, particularly if these competing claims can be brought into, indeed invite, conversation with one another[3]?*

---

[3] In order to engage with others' stories I have included throughout the thesis comments taken from a personal email correspondence with Dr. William Ramp over the dates of June 25 to 27, 2012 (these occur in footnotes indicated by an asterisk). I made the decision to include these comments for three reasons: first, as a way to include and offer to the reader an alternative version of the history of the United Farm Women of Alberta (UFWA) that I construct here. Including Dr. Ramp's voice, and the voices of others who speak through him, goes some way toward fostering an exchange between the ways in which each of us have drawn upon UFWA memories. Second, some of his comments toward this end refer to groups, places and memories that are in danger of being forgotten; while they do not figure into the thesis outside of these comments, perhaps they will incite the reader to *wonder* about these (near) losses. And third, I have included some of the questions he posed to me after reading my thesis, questions that encouraged me to

My thoughts turn to conversations I've had about my research with my parents. They don't quite seem to "get it," mostly because I never know quite how to put it. When I say, "I don't know how to describe my thesis! It's about *what's there*, but also *what's not there*[4]," it is usually met with laughter, on all of our parts. But maybe their response to my words, which don't make sense to them, provides an interesting way for me to understand my research.

*Maybe it's okay that I have no solid frame of reference with which to describe my thesis. When dad asked me if my degree was in "Paranormal Studies," maybe he wasn't too far off the mark – after all, Wikipedia defines paranormal events as "phenomena [that] are inconsistent with the world as already understood through empirical observation coupled with scientific methodology[5]" (Wikipedia, 2012). And that may be precisely what I am interested in investigating here. If I have conjured the sensation of something not quite being right (such as a "researcher" who doesn't know quite how to articulate what her research is about), then I think I may have already gone partway to explaining what it is I hope to have done here…*

---

reflect further upon the relation between my construction of this text and the people, past, present and future, whom I speak to and "for" within it. While I hope that this project will enter into dialogue with others, the inclusion of Dr. Ramp's voice directly within the text has provided me with a way to present readers directly with this exchange, and may draw their attention to the way such an engagement shaped the thesis itself.

[4] My use of these phrases will become clearer throughout the following chapters.

[5] I cite Wikipedia because I am interested in the "common sense" version of what *paranormal* means. That is the version I imagine my dad is drawing upon when he interprets what I say as being outside the realm of "real knowledge."

**Chapter 1**

*American Renaissance,* The United Farm Women of Alberta, and Race- and

Nation-Making in North America


Studies of the meaning and effects of race have increasingly understood racism not simply as a matter of prejudice, but as a systematic pattern of exclusion that persists today in part because it is foundationally important to the maintenance of discourses of modernity upon which nations and their supporting institutions have been built (Goldberg, 1993; Hall, 2007; hooks, 1992; Omi & Winant, 2006; Said, 1979; Thobani, 2007; Winant, 2006). In the contemporary United States, there exists a monthly publication entitled *American Renaissance* that calls for the raising of white consciousness in the belief that white culture is under threat from inherently degenerate and dangerous non-white groups, both within and external to the nation. Founded in 1990 by Jared Taylor and published out of Virginia, this magazine makes clear in no uncertain terms the authors' beliefs in the meaning of race and nation, and people are listening; Taylor himself has appeared multiple times on Fox News, Cable Network News (CNN), The Phil Donahue Show and CTV News, amongst others. Their positions on whiteness and the rigidity of cultural boundaries requires and reproduces a particular framework of nationalism and the ontological existence of cultures as discrete entities, a common (or perhaps "common-sense") idea that is evident in a variety of discourses, including nationalism, multiculturalism, and the value of cultural "tourism". Whether one takes a multicultural (such as the celebration of cultural

diversity) or monocultural (such as a belief in racial or national superiority) position, the assumption that culture is essentially attached to particular races or ethnicities, or is bounded by national borders, is necessary in order to make these claims tenable. What I find particularly interesting about *American Renaissance* is that they seem to occupy an uncertain position between being seen on the one hand as hateful and unacceptable, and on the other as a logical (and perhaps desirable) reaction to a set of social problems that are described as stemming from natural racial differences (examples of these two positions, though not mutually exclusive, will be elaborated upon in later chapters). The logic of race provides, as I elaborate on below, a framework for thinking about and evaluating the concepts of citizenship and personhood that are fundamental to the modern development of imperialism and liberal nationalism.

The authors of *American Renaissance* (AR) write about the crime rates, disease rates, and standardised test scores of whites versus blacks. They routinely refer to violence and political unrest in African nations as proof that black people are not capable of rational government. They publish dehumanising photographs of black and Hispanic people along with anecdotal evidence that whites are naturally disinclined to associate with non-white individuals. Their primary concern, however, is to point out that attempts on the part of white people to celebrate white culture, self-segregate, or publicly identify non-whites as the source of crime, poverty, and irresponsible citizenship are described at worst as hate speech and at best as politically incorrect. The authors and editors of AR feel racially oppressed within what they believe is their own nation, a nation that was

founded *for* whites. AR does not conduct its own research; they publish studies from the medical and social sciences that have already analysed data for racialised trends. They hold conferences, sell issues, publish books, and are interviewed on popular news networks. If AR's claims are at all recognisable and intelligible, even if one disagrees with them, what is it about them that renders them so?

To (very partially) begin to address this question I have turned to history. The significance and differential evaluation of racial categories is an effect of particular knowledges, and all knowledge has a history. There are an infinite number of possible places from which to begin tracing a history of American racism and nationalism, but none of them are "origins" in the traditional sense of the word (this will be explored further in Chapter 3). For the purposes of this project I have chosen to begin a historicisation of contemporary racism and nationalism with a very particular group of women who settled the Canadian prairies in the early twentieth century[6].

The United Farm Women of Alberta (UFWA) was the women's branch of the United Farmers of Alberta (UFA), a politically active group that constituted a powerful part of the agrarian democratic movement, forming as they did the government of Alberta for the years between 1921 and 1935. The women's branch of this organisation is particularly interesting in relation to AR because, in a time when women were often barred from participation in the public or

---

[6] The first three chapters of this thesis were originally written before any archival research was begun. I have modified the language to reflect present rather than future tense in order to render it more intelligible. However, as will be explored in later chapters, many of these early claims about what I "do" in my research are eventually thrown into serious question.

economic realms, its members were formally charged with the task of attending to issues of "social welfare" (Langford, 1997). This meant that they were responsible for weighing in on a very broad range of issues that were defined as matters of women's concern. From curriculum development, to arranging get-togethers that relieved the social isolation of farmers, to lobbying the Alberta government to pass the Sexual Sterilisation Act in 1928, the UFWA were active across the province in their attempts to shape the social development of their local communities, the province at large, and ultimately, I argue, Canada as a nation.

There are several reasons why I have chosen to study AR as part of the legacy of the UFWA. On a pragmatic level, both may be described as relatively discrete entities that produce(d) comparable publications that can be studied textually. On a personal level, the UFWA form an important and problematic part of the history of racism and ableism in Alberta, and it was the history of Alberta eugenics programs that first interested me in my graduate program. As this history is still relatively unknown, and as members and associates of the UFWA such as Irene Parlby, Louise McKinney, Nellie McLung and Emily Murphy are still venerated as heroes for their role in obtaining suffrage for Canadian women (see, for example, *Famous 5 named honorary senators,* Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, October 10, 2009), I believe it is important to complicate this history in order to avoid rendering invisible practices of racial violence (both physical and discursive) that accompanied it. More particularly, however, the UFWA existed during a time that was fraught with intertwining discourses of imperialism, colonialism, liberalism, feminism, and nationalism (amongst

8

countless others). As early settlers of a burgeoning nation, these women were subject to an immense number of ideals for the future and were well positioned to play a part in shaping it. As women of primarily British origin, they occupied positions of power within a colony that privileged whiteness, and within an imperial project that privileged British rationality, civilisation, and good government. Their authorial position on issues of immigration, citizenship, culture, and the future quality of Canadian generations, as evidenced in their textual record, allows me to draw a connection between their articulation of race and citizenship in the early stages of North American nation-building and the contemporary white nationalism of AR.

While there are certainly important discontinuities in the discourses of these two entities (an issue that will be addressed in later chapters), the existence of prominent similarities between them challenge a traditional view of history as a series of progressive events that lead to an ever-closer appropriation of truth and enlightenment through discovery. That is to say, while it is commonly believed that things such as overt racial prejudice and the ideology of eugenics were problems that ended along with World War Two and the fall of the Nazi regime (Kevles, 1995), the ongoing presence of racist ideology as the basis for creating nationalist identities calls into question the "we know better now" rhetoric that is commonly employed in metanarrative histories of Western progress (Brown, 2001). In the following section I will explore the history of early liberal feminism and its intimate relationship with imperialism and race production in order to

make the case that this history is important for understanding the perpetuation of racism in claims of national citizenship and culture today.

**Imperial feminism and the early race-making project**

For this project I am particularly interested in tracing the seemingly obscure discursive connections between the UFWA and AR, as well as interrogating their discourses in terms of the way they construct "Othered" bodies on the margins of proper, responsible citizenship (de Beauvoir, 2011; Hall, 2007). Both AR and the UFWA can be understood in terms of the history of colonialism and imperialism, as both are concerned with issues of nationhood, nation building, the preservation and dissemination of particular cultures, and race. Here, I reflect on my decision to compare the UFWA with AR by exploring two avenues of analysis that are directly related to the history of feminism and feminist thought. First, I outline an approach to this study that understands the links between early feminism and imperialism as contributing to the embededness of race and racialised subjects within modern North American nations (hooks, 1992). As I argue here, the discourses of feminism and imperialism in Canada in the early twentieth century were inextricably linked, most evidently within discourses of feminism that explicitly take up the aims and values of the British imperial project. This had the profound effect of reinforcing and embedding within the discourses of personhood and citizenship the exclusionary practice of race-making (Henderson, 2003). This practice is still very much a significant part of contemporary nationalist discourses (Gardiner, 2005/2006; Goldberg, 1993).

Second, I situate my project more broadly within contemporary theories of race, racial (racist) knowledge, and racialised subjectivity in order to make clear the theoretical position that elucidates important connections between the UFWA and AR. In my discussion of the discursive structures of race and racism, I explore the practice of othering that necessarily occurs within the production of racial knowledge, knowledge that is necessary in the maintenance of modern nationalist discourses (Goldberg, 1993). I will also outline some of the theoretical concepts that I draw upon in my investigation, including the belief that the process of racial othering and its underlying assumptions persist across time and provide a framework that links the discourses of the UFWA to those of AR while leaving room to accommodate discontinuity. Both groups engage in practices that serve to make coherent the meaning of race, nationhood, citizenship, and progress, which in turn allow them to delimit the boundaries of the One in relation to the (despised, feared, racialised) Other in ways that ultimately (re)produce a culture of white supremacy (hooks, 1992).

I am predicating my investigation on a belief in the ongoing presence and profound effects of racism as an organisational force of Western epistemology and social practices (Goldberg, 1993; Omi & Winant, 2006). Omi and Winant's (2006) definition of *racial projects* is an important concept that allows for a link to be made between the discourses of the UFWA and AR: "Racial projects connect what race means in a particular discursive practice and the ways in which both social structures and everyday experiences are racially organised, based upon that meaning" (p. 199). In the case of these particular groups, the racial project

they take up is one concerned primarily with nation building on the premise of inherent, differentially valued racial attributes. They both define the limits of citizenship in ways that are fundamentally racialised.

The issues that I have proposed to interrogate in this comparison are closely related and implied by one another. The constitution of the threatening non-white Other provides an overarching link across discourses of race and citizenship. The process of othering is both an instrument and an effect of (post)colonial power and racial knowledge, the existence and theorisation of which is (partially) bound up in the histories of feminism and feminist critique. To that end, the Foucauldian concept of governmentality (Michel Foucault, 1984, 1991a; Smart, 2002) can be used to explicate the links between early liberal feminism, race-making, nation building, and contemporary scientific racism, all of which are situated within a framework of liberal individualist ideology, by attending to the ways in which women as governmental agents constructed their claims to personhood.

**Settler women as governmental agents**

There have emerged contemporary feminist critiques of earlier feminisms and their role in perpetuating, or failing to account for, the experiences of women who do not exist within the white centre (although the existence of such a *centre* and its implied cohesiveness may be thought of as imaginary). One set of critiques has been aimed at reinterpreting the history of early liberal feminism by identifying and theorising its contribution to the histories of imperialism, racism,

and ableism (Carlson, 2001; Crenshaw, 1989; Henderson, 2003; hooks, 2000; Mohanty, 2006). This look at history focuses on who was left out of, marginalised, or seriously harmed by the early articulation of rights for women as legal persons in a context that systematically privileged white, middle-class, English-speaking women. At the beginning of my own inquiry into the UFWA I had intended to treat their feminist politics separately from their involvement in racism and the eugenics and institutionalisation movements; in fact, I thought it ironic that feminists were active in the reproductive control and dehumanisation of other women. However, as I explore here, the co-existence of the UFWA's feminist and racist politics was not at all ironic. Feminism, racism and imperialism in Europe and North America were always already in conversation with one another and relied upon each other to facilitate particular, co-constitutive claims to truth (hooks, 2000).

Henderson (2003) discusses the history of feminism, imperialism and race-making in Western Canada in the early twentieth century in order to complicate interpretations of this history that articulate it in primarily celebratory ways. The history she constructs is directly related to that of the UFWA as she focuses on the life of Emily Murphy[7], magistrate of the first Women's Court in Alberta and associate of Irene Parlby, the first president of the UFWA. Henderson

---

[7] Emily Murphy was not a member of the UFWA, and while she was closely involved with several prominent UFWA members it is important to note that her politics were not necessarily embraced by the organization as a whole. My concern with Murphy has to do with illuminating a particular set of discourses and practices that were actualized within already existing discourses of British superiority, morality, nationhood, citizenship and responsibility. The UFWA operated and came into being within the same (and more) sets of discourses, but the way individual members took them up did, of course, vary greatly.

argues that Murphy's discursive practices articulated feminist and imperialist ideologies and served to actively construct notions of personhood, womanhood, citizenship and race in Canada. This work represents the taking of a particular ontological position; rather than viewing women's rights and concepts of race as reflecting pre-existing truths, Henderson describes how these ideas are socially constructed through discourse. In this view, women's status as legal persons was neither a discovery nor an enduring fact that simply required legal recognition; through her practices, both official and personal, Murphy herself produced and defined women's qualities as the basis for the rights to which she believed they were entitled.

Emily Murphy's concern with personhood was directed almost solely toward Canadian society, which was at the time a Dominion of the British Empire. However, the production of the identity of Canadian women was bound up in discourses of race and imperialism that were prevalent in Britain and its diverse colonies and ex-colonies, including the United States. Murphy was not acting in a vacuum (although she was acting in a "New World", a site that was seen as holding the potential to engineer anew the perfect nation), nor was she acting out of pure innovation. She acted "within a governmental machinery for operating on the psychophysical life of the population" (Henderson, 2003, p. 160). In other words, she was embedded within discourses of imperialism and nation building as well as a governmental system of administration that categorised and regulated the bodies of its citizens for the purpose of imperial expansion and the constitution of a new nation with a strong population. Thus, Murphy's claims

about women's rights and responsibilities in terms of racial propagation reflect her engagement with other discourses; women's citizenship in Canada was made possible by appeals to an imperial and national project that already took for granted ideas of racial and cultural superiority.

Henderson chose to study Emily Murphy because of her position that "transformations in the machinery of government … are accessed not by means of a global analysis but rather through the scrutiny of particular scenes" (2003, p. 160). Understanding Murphy's role as a governmental agent involved in the surveillance, judgment, discipline, and education of the population can help to explicate the political context of early feminists[*], as well as illuminate the concept of governmentality. The term *governmentality* refers to the management and control of a population in such a way as to produce subjects that fulfil the policies of the state (Smart, 2002). This process involves the concert of various institutions and disciplinary/productive systems of knowledge, all of which operate within a system of administration to achieve the goal of a well-managed population (Michel Foucault, 1991a). For settlers in Western Canada in the early twentieth

---

[*] *"Murphy's 'governmentalist' vision was not entirely in tune, [however], with the many United Farm men and women who saw their civic efforts as aimed at constructing a Canada consciously opposed to the imperialist project of the Ontario/Quebec financial and political elites, consciously opposed to a patronage/dependency system of politics, consciously opposed to the manipulation of 'masses' by political party elites, consciously opposed to militarism and nationalism, consciously opposed to sharpening class divisions in Canadian society. These are all prominent and recurring themes in UF/UFW discourse. Yes, they articulated this in a language of Britishness and settlement, but that terminology did not bind them into a unitary political consensus that would ally them with, for example, the federal Conservatives of the time, the Anglo industrial elites of Toronto & Montreal, the financiers of London, or the Orange Lodge."*

century, governmental concerns were centred on the building of a new nation, the founding of which was thought to require the building of a strong population of rational citizens who upheld the values of nationalism and the responsibilities of good citizenship. Murphy's disciplining influence, particularly through her work in the Women's Court, allows her to be understood as a governmental agent, an individual through whom are transmitted the goals of the state, in this case the goals of the British imperial project.

Burton (1994) also discusses the relationship between feminism and the imperial project within Britain, which serves to contextualise the ideas and values that were transported to Western Canada along with British immigrants in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. According to Burton, feminists in Britain were successful in their campaign for women's legal personhood due to an articulation between traditional female roles and dominant ideas of the nation. British citizens prided themselves on their perceived cultural superiority, both in terms of morality and the maintenance of social order through good government; both of these ideals served as part of the justification for British colonialism (Burton, 1994; Thobani, 2007). Women were already conceived of as bearers of the race, mothers of the future generations of British citizens. Thus, they already occupied a highly moralised position, as they held a responsibility to propagate the race/nation both through physical reproduction and by providing moral guidance for future citizens. This role was traditionally relegated to the private sphere; however, British feminists argued that the imperial project of Britain would be best advanced by the presence of women, whose moral superiority

would benefit both the public and colonial realms (Burton, 1994). This discursive reframing of a "separate but equal" role for women in the advancement of the nation, which was also the official tenet of the UFWA on issues of sex difference (Langford, 1997), was present in the discourses of feminism engendered in Canada by women such as Emily Murphy. The particularities of the Western Canadian context were different, however, because it was a new nation, the quality of which would be determined by the quality of its future citizens. This was a concern that seemed to be amenable to biopolitical control of reproduction, a domain that was seen to be under the purview of women, through discourses of race, morality and reproductive "fitness," and practiced in law and through institutionalisation and sterilisation.

Attempts to ensure that the quality of the new race of Canadians would be high were focused on women's bodies as the bearers of reproductive responsibility. Henderson discusses the young woman's body as one of the primary sites of biopolitics and the wielding of reproductive control, as it was seen as both "vulnerable and dangerous" in terms of the risk of temptation and the threat of "degenerate" traits being passed on to future citizens; hence, Henderson understands the girl's body as "the point of expansion for race-making strategies predicated upon maternal authority" (2003, p. 163). She describes Emily Murphy, both in terms of the literary character Janey Canuck (a pseudonym under which Murphy published travel writings and stories intended to provide moral guidance) and in her official role as magistrate, as taking up a supervisory and disciplinary role in the governance of society and the production of race. As an agent of

governmental authority, Murphy was able to participate in the discursive construction of womanhood and its relationship to personhood and citizenship responsibilities within the Canadian West. Examining the "connection between [the] historical moments" (p. 163) of feminism, colonialism, and the developmental of administrative government allows for an analysis of history that challenges the naturalness of categories and identities that emerged from it. In terms of my own research, choosing to examine the UFWA, a group of women who operated within the intersections between feminism, colonialism, and nation building, requires that I start from a position that acknowledges the complicated interdiscursivity of historical events and their legacy. Because I am interested in interrogating imperialism and its contemporary manifestations in the concept of citizenship and its relationship to the physical body, an analysis that draws on the concept of governmentality, including the supervision and regulation of bodies and the construction of race categories to both justify and advance imperialism, is a prudent strategy to take.

Burton's (1994) and Henderson's (2003) investigations of the interconnectedness of early British feminism and imperialism[*] can be understood as providing one part of the history of imperialism, colonialism and racism that sets the stage for "the conditions of possibility" (Smart, 2002) of the emergence of *American Renaissance,* as well as of other forms of racism that are (arguably) less

---

[*] In terms of UFWA members, "*one women's organization that explicitly embraced and promoted the British imperial project, and Canadian patriotism in relation to that project, was the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire (IODE). Louise McKinney, [for example], was a member of both the IODE and the UFWA. I suspect, though, that other UFWA members, such as Amelia Turner, would have found the IODE highly problematic.*"

overt. In the same vein, other feminist theorists have elaborated upon the relationship between feminism and colonialism and its historical legacy in contemporary society. As bell hooks writes, "America was colonised on a racially imperialistic base and not on a sexually imperialistic base" (2000, p. 375). The development of North American feminism has occurred, and is occurring, within an already existing structure of racism and colonialism; thus, Western feminisms are always already implicated in the perpetuation of these structures. In particular, white feminists have always operated with imperialist knowledge as a taken-for-granted truth. In the case of the UFWA, we can see how feminism was advanced at the expense of people whose bodies did not measure up to the normalised bodily standards that feminists were active in defining, as this expense was physically manifested in the bodies of forcibly confined and sterilised "mental defectives," who were most often poor, women, non-white or of Eastern European descent, and deemed threatening to the morality and quality of the nation[8].

**Racial subjects: The legacy of colonialism**

My interrogation of the histories of the UFWA and AR depends upon, and demonstrates, the existence of racialised bodies, an existence that is both culturally constructed and historically contingent, but also very real in its embodied effects. The discourses of race, along with the related discourses of nationalism and imperialism, have remained prominent features of North American society; indeed, the epistemology, politics, and lived experiences of

---

[8] For a more thorough account of the history of eugenics, see Grekul (2004), Kevles (1995), Dowbiggin (1997), Wendel-Hummell (2009), or Gould (1996).

racialised subjects/objects are colonised by knowledge and assumptions about the realness of race, assumptions which are still foundational to the discursive structures that organise social life (Carby, 2009; Miguel, 2009; Newman, 2010). In other words, the coming into being of the colonised/coloniser binary and its necessary exclusions has had profound effects on identities and bodies as it has continued to exist within and between the various discourses that shape how and what we know about our world, including discourses and practices of history. The presence of racialised subjects today is a testament to the ongoing contemporaneousness of colonialism, although "the multiple ways in which [their] creation and re-creation is haunted by and dependent upon the invention of the black other has been forgotten, repressed and denied" (Carby, 2009, p. 625). The construction in Orientalist (Said, 1979) and subsequent colonialist discourse of the black Other has continued to be reproduced in various sets of scientific, moral, and historical discourses, all of which serve to make real the black (or otherwise non-white) Other and reconstitute whiteness as the frame of reference to which all Others are held.

The histories and effects of (re)producing and/or being the Other have been theorised by the mid-century writings of de Beauvoir (2011) and Fanon (1967). Both of these theorists refer to an historical construction of subjectivity, part of which involves placing limits upon what can be meaningfully thought and said, a process that is played out in everyday power relations. However, this is not to say that the history of marginalised subjects has been unilaterally and passively shaped by the powerful. Through the construction of the racial Other, the meaning

of whiteness is also invented and sustained. Historicising bodies by understanding them as effects of power relations and as pedagogical instruments for displaying and reinforcing (or perhaps deconstructing and challenging) the naturalness of racial categories (Newman, 2010) exposes the perpetuation of colonialism and colonised identities that exist within the (re)constitution of the black/white, Orient/Occident, East/West, colonised/coloniser oppositions.

The process of othering is not in and of itself to blame for racial inequality and racialisation. In order for racial otherness to remain meaningful, a supporting body of knowledge and truth claims must exist that both makes possible and limits certain ways of thinking (although these "ways of thinking" are not always coherent and are often contradictory, despite the fact that contradictions are often made or perceived as invisible). Stuart Hall (2007) draws on the Foucauldian concept of discourse to describe the relationship between power and knowledge that gave rise to Orientalist discourses of the black other. Hall writes: "Not only is discourse always implicated in *power,* discourse is one of the 'systems' through which power circulates" (p. 57). The practices to which particular sets of knowledge give rise, such as colonialism or scientific racism, bring particular subjects into being by identifying them within texts and practices. The "truth" about those particular subjects is therefore reinforced by dynamic textual and embodied practices; within a particular epistemological framework, statements begin to take on truth status simply because they fit a particular way of

knowing that "makes sense[9]" regardless of their accuracy or validity (Mills, 1997). Through the work of writers such as Burton and Henderson, we can see that race-making projects in Britain and Canada were bound up in very particular ways of thinking about the individual and the nation; early feminists framed their arguments in ways that "fit" this already existing knowledge.

Thus, one legacy of colonialism is the perceived naturalness of the categories of race and racial difference, a naturalness that is reconstituted in every text and practice that reproduces rather than (or even as it) challenges this "common sense" way of knowing, classifying and hierarchising. For example, the writers of AR draw upon these "natural" categories in ways that accept and reinforce the non-white Other as being inherently different, deviant, and dangerous. This "makes sense" when supported by (selectively interpreted[10]) statistics on SAT scores, crime rates, teen pregnancy rates, etc. The genetic and social sciences take the place of colonialism, Orientalism or eugenics as fields of

---

[9] I use the phrase "make sense" many times throughout this thesis in an intentionally open-ended way. My understanding of what it means to "make sense" of something is informed on the one hand by Foucault's theory of discourse and the relation of knowledges to each other in such a way as to produce statements that are understandable (Michel Foucault, 1979, 1991b, 1991c), and on the other hand by Avery Gordon's discussion (elaborated upon in later chapters) of literally making something sensory, or perceivable. Making sensory something that was previously inaccessible *because* of the ways in which we understand things to *make sense* in the first meaning of the term can be thought of as *un*making sense if it disrupts the framework of knowledges that seem to make everyday understanding a seamless process (2008, 1999).

[10] Because I am focusing on AR's production of particular discourses, I have not looked specifically into the production of the scientific studies they draw upon. While I say that the results of such studies have been "selectively interpreted" in AR's use of them to produce secondary claims, I am not assuming that the original studies were not borne of similar, though perhaps differently articulated or not consciously acknowledged, concerns or knowledges about which kinds of people are desirable and which are not.

knowledge that take up racial difference and construct it as truth; scientific knowledge is now the coloniser of the racialised bodies it constructs (through its own reliance upon assumptions about the naturalness of categories of race, ethnicity, desirable people versus undesirable people, as well as through the ways in which these claims are taken up in other ways by people and groups who put them to use in their own complicated political lives) but it is founded upon the same modern notions of the individual, culture and the nation as its predecessors.

Linking the UFWA and AR is the historical emergence and maintenance of the racial subject and racialised knowledge, both of which are tools *and* effects of the perpetuation of racial nation-making projects. Ultimately, it is the (re)construction of racial knowledge that continues to produce the meaning of race in ways that justify inequality. Goldberg (1993) argues that "we have come, if often only silently, to conceive of social subjects foremost in racial terms" (p. 1). In his view, the prevalence of the racialised subject is tied to the history of liberalism, an ideology that reinforces the notion of the individual and the democratic nation state in ways that are predicated upon the existence of racial difference. The early history of eugenics in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries[11] is an example of the ways in which liberalism converged with both positivism and imperialism (Gould, 1996; Kevles, 1995) to bring race to the fore as "one of the central conceptual inventions of modernity" (Goldberg, 1993, p. 3). In order to maintain the meaning of the racialised subject across time,

---

[11] Eugenics is an ongoing contemporary practice. See, for example, Brady (2001), Ekberg (2007), Goodey (2003), Kallianes (1997), Lemke (2002), Morita (2001) or Rembis (2000).

an authorial body of racial knowledge that supports the categories and meaning of race must also be maintained. In the words of Bruno Latour (2000), a considerable amount of "work" must be done in order for existing knowledge to continue to "make sense"; dominant epistemology must be maintained through a plethora of institutions and discourses that (seem to) operate in concert in order to continually (re)produce it.

Racial knowledge, then, is constructed through powerful practices of "naming and evaluating" (Goldberg, 1993, p. 150), practices that construct an epistemological framework in which the concept of race and its associated moral and biological attributes count as truth. When a statement begins to take on common-sense status it also takes on an illusory cloak of neutrality that masks the politics and power relations of everyday experiences and practices. The construction of racial knowledge is always a circuitous and ongoing process, which means that it is always open to contestation and reinterpretation; however, this is not to say that power relations are equal or that resistance is always possible. Because power is inherent in every discursive formation, racial knowledge is bound up in necessarily exclusionary practices; the establishment over time of dominant knowledge systems makes certain ways of thinking about or challenging race unlikely, if not impossible. These systems of racial knowledge have provided the very foundation of modern nationalism upon which entire networks of institutions have been built. As hooks elaborates, this has given rise to a powerful culture of white supremacy that systematically controls and devalues non-whiteness (1992).

The classification and hierarchisation of racialised bodies is an effect of a particular deployment of power within a particular framework of racial knowledge. The persistence of the non-white Other and projects of racial nation-making (conscious or otherwise) in North American society are (in part) what allow me to draw a comparison between the UFWA and AR as two groups that operate(d) from sites of racial privilege, both drawing upon and constructing discourses of nationhood, citizenship, and race that reproduce and reinforce racial inequality in their respective cultural frameworks. The historicisation of racial bodies, including the history of the white, privileged body, involves the highly political project of seeing the past in the present. This is an important way to deconstruct the perceived naturalness of our physical bodies and subjective identities, as well as the structures of inequality that arise from them. Historicisation also involves tracing interdiscursive practices, power relations and effects that are much more complicated than a traditional categorization of eras and social movements, or a description of historical tragedies that drive progress, allows. The project of race-making and the nation-making practices that are predicated upon it provide one of way of developing a theory of history, power and subjectivity that can explain contemporary racism and racialisation in terms of the past. However, understanding race as historically and politically constructed is not to deny the very real embodied and affective experiences of being situated as either the dangerous Other or the privileged One. The project of historicising race must attempt to "avoid both the utopian framework which sees race as an illusion we can somehow 'get beyond,' and also the essentialist

formulation which sees race as something objective and fixed, a biological datum" (Omi & Winant, 2006, p. 199). The profound writing of Fanon, for example, continues to remind us of how *real* race is. It is not merely an idea that exists in the realm of thought; it is a base upon which identities are formed, resources are distributed, nations are founded and borders are drawn. Racial knowledge is present as each of us walks down the street and engages in everyday activities with either the invisible privilege of racial neutrality, or the burden of racialised difference. Thus, the project of linking the histories of feminism and colonialism with contemporary nation and race-making practices is to expose the ongoing presence of racism in every structural and personal aspect of social life. Both the UFWA and AR (re)produce racial inequality and attempt to regulate racialised bodies, effects of systematized racial knowledge operating within a fundamentally racist culture (Goldberg, 1993).

**Chapter 2**

Researcher Embodiment and the Ethics of Writing

Questions of researcher subjectivity are important in any critical study that attempts to interrogate the authority of knowledge production. When investigating issues of embodiment, as this project inherently does through an investigation into embodied categories of race, nation and citizenship, the embodiment of the researcher also becomes an important site of critical reflection and experience. In this chapter I explore the relationship between my research questions and my particular ontological and epistemological position, as well as the ways in which the related concepts of ethics, praxis and reflexivity can be understood in terms of this research project and the theoretical paradigm I use to explore it.

**Ontological and epistemological considerations**

I have given great consideration to the ontological position I hold while thinking about how to do, or make, this research. In many ways, my research constitutes a critique of scientific and positivist social discourse, and it has been guided in part by the following questions: how are bodies and subjectivities constructed and naturalized by scientific and historical discourses, as well as by discourses of nation and citizenship? In what ways are the body and mind historically contingent? What are the histories of how the body and mind came into being, and are maintained as, objects of scientific inquiry? How have the shifting conceptions of both the body and mind reflected shifting scientific and

historical language and sites of inquiry, as opposed to reflecting an increasingly "True" apprehension of reality? In making this project I am attempting to explore the relationship between ontology, epistemology and history, and the formulation of these questions stems in large part from theorists who challenge the notion that knowledge claims transparently reflect reality (Foucault, 1979; Latour, 2000). The acknowledgement that language, historical circumstance, politics and individual and disciplinary interests influence which objects "come into being" or "pass away" as foci of scientific inquiry (Daston, 2000) requires that one explore the possibility that dominant ways of thinking about reality and its relationship to knowledge can be severely limiting. In terms of this particular research, it requires that I explore the ways in which a scientific (or modern, more generally) ontology can have seriously harmful effects on individuals whose bodies and/or minds become defined as "abnormal," "undesirable," or outside the realm of real citizenship.

Lincoln and her colleagues (2011) discuss the (im)possibility of converging paradigms, arguing that while there may be considerable overlap in non-positivist paradigms at times, a fundamental divide exists between positivist and non-positivist positions in terms of the ontology-epistemologies of each. The idea that truth is "out there" waiting to be discovered through rigorous, objective and empirical research is in full opposition to conceptions of truth that are more fluid, relational and interpretive. This relativist approach to truth and knowledge allows for researchers to redefine and "resituate" (p. 119) themselves, their research subjects, and the ways in which knowledge is constructed and

28

deconstructed as ongoing processes of (re)production, reformulated moment to moment. For this project I have analysed particular sets of texts in such a way as to deconstruct categories and claims to truth that have, through a loss of their historicity, come to be seen as unhistorical and natural rather than socially constructed. My ontological-epistemological position allows me to critique the metanarratives of scientific and historical progress, but this is not to say that I replace one version of history and truth with another. To hold a belief in the contingency and relativity of knowledge is to recognise that every version and articulation of knowledge is dependent upon the subjectivity of the inquirer and the particular limitations of history, language and circumstance that exist at a particular moment. Acknowledging the mutually co-constitutive relationship between subjectivity and knowledge is an important difference between scientific epistemology and what Lincoln et al. refer to as "new-paradigm" epistemology (ibid.). This notion is expanded upon by Slack (1996): "The context is not something *out there, within which practices occur or which influence the development of practice.* Rather, *identities, practices, and effect generally, constitute the very context in which they are practices, identities, or effects"* (quoted in Newman, 2010, p. 315).

In a similar vein, Ellis (2009) writes about the multiplicity of truths that stem not only from different individuals but from one individual over time. Although the following quote was taken from a section in which she speaks directly about autoethnography as a method, it applies as well to the study of history more generally, as both require an understanding that "to story ourselves

29

is not to describe the way it 'really' happened … it means to 'see and rediscover the past, not as a succession of events but as a series of scenes, inventions, emotions, images, and stories' rewritten by the author within the conditions set by the author" (Ellis, 2009, p. 16, quoting Benjamin, 1968). In terms of my own research, to replace one metanarrative of history with another would go against the political aims of the project. To do so would be to contribute to the kind of rhetorical strategy of naturalising and universalising truth claims that I attempt to challenge. Like our individual life stories, the histories of the body and of subjectivity have been told and re-told to reflect and justify changing knowledges and the powerfully compelling metanarrative of human progress. However, it is a *conscious* awareness of this re-telling of history that is quite often missing when we speak of our bodies and the bodies of Others, for what could be more materially *real* and unchanging than our own biological, directly observable bodies? And although the history of the mind is in many ways easier to acknowledge as non-scientific and therefore less certain, we still believe that we know a "disabled" or "abnormal" mind when we "see" one (Goodey, 2003).

Lincoln et al. (2011) explain that dominant beliefs in the natural categories of human science are in many ways the products of texts. Scientific texts "lead us to believe the world is rather simpler than it is, and they may reinscribe enduring forms of historical oppression" (p. 124). While I have described my research as constituting a kind of challenge to scientific authority by offering an alternative interpretation of history, it is important to remember that I am not analysing scientific texts directly. Rather, I am examining how other social groups have

30

interpreted scientific and historical (as well as moral and political) discourses in ways that reflect their own particular cultural and historical contexts, and how this interpretation forms the basis for them to construct and reinforce particular ways of thinking about bodies, minds and national identities. This is a kind of second-order effect of scientific and historical texts that are re-presented as political and moral rhetoric (which is not to say that politics are not already present in all scientific inquiry). Lincoln et al. call for texts that "break boundaries" (p. 124) by disrupting the illusion of neutrality and enduring truth. Such texts offer alternative ways of understanding the human subject-object as the site of a struggle over knowledge that is politically and historically informed. We may ask the question: while it is one thing to scientifically categorise humans as objects according to biological "difference", what does it mean to actually *live* within these often-untroubled categories? Ingham (1997) writes: "all of us share genetically endowed bodies, but to talk about physical culture requires that we try to understand how the genetically endowed is socially constructed, as well as socially constituting and constructing" (quoted in Newman, 2010, p. 316). While this quote does not go far enough in terms of troubling the notion of genetics, it certainly captures the relationship between discourse and embodied practice that I have drawn from Foucault and use as a basis for analysing the discourses of the UFWA and AR.

These epistemological and ontological considerations, which Lincoln et al. (2011) convincingly collapse into one question of paradigm, are central to the questions of ethics, praxis and reflexivity that I explore in this chapter. While I

31

discuss these issues separately for the sake of clarity, I also endeavour to demonstrate that the boundaries between these concepts are rapidly blurring as there comes into being an increasing number of what may be called "postmodern" texts that further open up the possibilities of multiple, partial truths rather than a universal truth (Hall, 1996; Hutcheon, 1989; Jameson, 1991; Lyotard, 2007; P. Smith & Riley, 2009). Lincoln et al. discuss this new "era" by arguing that "the slippage between signifier and signified in linguistic textual terms creates representations that are only and always shadows of actual people, events, and places" (p. 125). This position has helped remind me that my own research, being confined to the analysis of two particular sets of discourses, constructs a very partial, contingent understanding of history, as well as an important articulation of my own subjectivity with "corporeal power-knowledge structures" (Newman, 2010, p. 316).

**Ethics and writing**

Ellis (2009) proposes that the question of ethics be rephrased from *is this particular approach/practice ethical or unethical* to *what is the right thing for me to do right now?* While my own research does not involve direct interaction with other living subjects, it is still inquiry of a profoundly social nature and must be approached ethically. Below, I explain my understanding of ethics not as a formal practice but as an ongoing personal reflection and conscientiousness that has guided and shaped my thinking and the way I choose to transform it into text. There comes an important time when the amorphous flow of thoughts and ideas

inside a researcher's mind must be crystallised into text of some form, and while that crystallisation can provide a relieving sense of articulation it is always important to ask oneself why it was articulated this way and not that; what are the constructive implications of this particular articulation for myself and for others?

One idea that is central to Ellis' approach to ethics is her insistence upon placing the subjectivity of the researcher squarely into the ethical questions. It is not enough for a researcher to stay "outside" of the research and ask questions about the research subjects, a point that is emphasized in Librett and Perrone's critique of institutional review board (IRB) ethical guidelines (Librett & Perrone, 2010). While IRB reviews of research are important for protecting the basic rights of research participants, their rigid formality places restrictions upon qualitative social research. IRB guidelines are not designed to accommodate research that does not involve human subjects; these formalized ethical guidelines send the message that adherence to an institutional document can mitigate ethical concerns about research with human subjects (which is already far too simplistic), but they also send a message that research that does *not* involve human subjects exists entirely outside the realm of ethical consideration.

Librett and Perrone make the important connection between one's research paradigm, or ontological-epistemological position, and the articulation of ethical concerns and questions (2010). Ellis addresses this issue when she asks: "What do we owe those we study? [Should we] honour blurred boundaries rather than build concrete ones, respect contradictions rather than reify patterns…?" (2009, p. 78). Her stories show the reader that ethics is a continual, fluid process

that does not end along with the research; thinking about ethics can (indeed, should) be revisited and re-interpreted, and it has continued effects into the future. The ethical choices we make moment to moment reflect our life experiences and knowledge, and as we change we have every right to return to those choices and reflect upon how we may have done things differently. The simple acceptance that the ethical choices we make will change over time and that we can in fact reflect upon them in such a way as to trace their development and criticise ourselves is liberating as it transgresses the boundary of the ethical/unethical binary by changing the language we use to speak about ethics as a process. When ethics becomes doing what we think is right, *right now,* with the full knowledge that that choice is contingent upon a multitude of dynamic forces and that "doing what is right" is *always* informed by relationally constructed notions of morality, we can see how the relationship between epistemology and ethics can become ambiguous and how unsatisfactory it is to simply judge a particular choice or practice as "ethical" so long as it meets institutional criteria. Doing what is right *right now* is not an invitation to disregard ethical obligation altogether; it is quite the opposite, in fact, as it is a call to think carefully about what our practices mean for both ourselves and others, in research and in daily life, and to think about them in an ongoing, critical way.

Although my own research does not involve human participants, questions about *what* and *how* to write, keeping in mind the question of what I owe to the people and histories I write about, are extremely important. The history of the UFWA is a significant story for the histories of Alberta, women's rights in

Canada, and the attempt to develop strong agrarian communities*. Posing an alternative version of this history, or choosing to highlight only certain aspects of the story that may be seen as morally reprehensible, is a direct threat to the integrity and sacredness of these women (that is, as representations of women which are set apart, not to be defiled or tampered with) who figure prominently into the stories of rural farmwomen and men even today (Langford, 1997). Do I owe it to them and their legacy to write about them in a way that preserves their dignity and is mindful of the important contributions they made to society? Is it wrong for me to directly link them to a white supremacist, paleoconservative group of American men whose ideology is morally questionable in ways that are much more direct than the UFWA's ideas ever were? Does this comparison denigrate the history of rural women in ways that are harmful? On the other hand, do I owe anything to AR in terms of how they are represented in my writing?

I have remained mindful of these questions and have tried to write in a conscientious way throughout this process. As I discuss more fully in Chapter 5, my own politics and aspects of my identity will be formed and re-formed as I write, and my immersion into the texts of the UFWA and AR will elicit emotions and thoughts that may challenge my intent to write about them in ways that are

---

* UFWA members may be saddened to hear that "*many of the communities [they] resided in have been erased from the map or reduced to shells, and their farms erased when folded into larger agribusiness concerns. Surviving rural communities face constant crises over depopulation, disappearing services, political impotence, environmental degradation and the intrusion of capitalist extractive industries (oil, gas, mining, etc). Agrarianism as a feature of rural culture has largely ceased to exist except for the odd nostalgic remnant, as likely to be held by an urbanite as a rural dweller. Rural dwellers are [now] largely urban-oriented consumers of material and symbolic goods.*"

respectful, but that still convey the message I believe is important. This leads me to the last point about ethics that Ellis has opened up for me. She writes about the researcher as a person whose interests are just as important as those of the people he or she studies; the need of the researcher to convey their story or their own thoughts and opinions on a subject that is meaningful to them is an important part of making the everyday ethical decisions and reflecting on why we are interested in something and how it is that we are going to textualize our stories/thoughts. Negotiating and balancing these concerns will require mindfulness, but in articulating here some of the main ethical concerns about my writing, they have remained present throughout my research and have guided me in making and thinking about my choices.

**Politics and ethically guided practice**

Politics are an inescapable fact of any research, despite positivist claims to neutrality and objectivity in positivist research. Denzin and his colleagues (Denzin, Lincoln, & Giardina, 2006) write about competing paradigms of research, knowledge and truth as a political struggle. Because a positivist paradigm is socially and politically privileged, producing qualitative research that is received as "valid" and valuable is both problematic *and* essential for challenging dominant epistemologies and opening up new ways of thinking and doing. Quoted in Denzin et al., Lincoln and Canella write: "multiple kinds of knowledge, produced by multiple epistemologies and methodologies, are not only worth having but also demanded if policy, legislation and practice are to be

sensitive to social needs" (2006, p. 770). Denzin et al. also describe how qualitative research within the academy is severely restricted by the "methodological fundamentalism" of politically sanctioned epistemology (ibid.). According to the authors, critiques of dominant epistemology as colonialist, oppressive and interested in the maintenance of status quo power relations have already begun to seriously challenge its hegemonic status. All qualitative research that stems from alternative epistemological positions is therefore engaged in a political struggle over truth.

The very existence of alternative knowledge allows for new ways of thinking that were previously relegated to the realm of the unsaid (Smart, 2002). However, for Giardina and Denzin (2011), critiques of "right-wing ideologies [and] neoliberal economics" (p. 3), for example, are not enough because they do not give us a way to move forward with *practices* that will actually elicit and encourage political change. They outline the ways in which their activist politics provides a pedagogical foundation, including the hope that this new pedagogy will foster an "ethical self-consciousness that is critical and reflexive", and that this self-consciousness will in turn "[shape] a critical racial self-awareness" (p. 4). Although I struggle with thinking of how my own research engenders praxis of this nature, I do believe that it can contribute in some small way to these aims in two ways: first, as a qualitative piece of research that is founded upon a non-positivist epistemological standpoint, which, in a world where positivist research is politically and institutionally privileged, constitutes an offering of an alternative epistemology from which an alternative pedagogy may emerge; and second, as

research with a political agenda to historicise, without relying upon traditional conceptions of history, the racial, ethnic and disabled body, which in turn historicises white, English-speaking national identities (including my own, which is perhaps most important).

Newman engages directly with body politics by drawing upon Foucauldian theory as a tool to create "historically-grounded theories of subjectivity" (2010, p. 6), an approach that I believe also articulates my own. His goal is to "understand and disrupt [the] modern axioms of representation" (ibid.) by analysing and deconstructing the discourse of dominant pedagogies. For Newman, praxis is always already intertwined with bodily existence; our bodies are sites of knowledge inscription, therefore our existence in the world is necessarily pedagogical; they represent to ourselves and others the political circumstances in which they were inscribed, and they teach us something abut how to exist in the world. Perhaps, then, what needs to be called for *first* in developing a theory of praxis is an awareness of our pedagogical bodies: that our bodies are inscribed with the histories of race, gender, and ability, and that a critical self-awareness of this can help mitigate and challenge the oppressive effects of these histories.

There is quite clearly an easy transition from thinking about praxis in this way to thinking about reflexivity as a researcher, including acknowledging one's identity and body as historically, culturally and politically contingent constructs. There is no real demarcation between praxis, reflexivity and ethics, as all are informed more broadly by the ontological-epistemological positions taken up by

particular subjects, and through which these particular subjects are themselves formed. An awareness that there exist concomitantly multiple truths, that knowledge constructs and is constructed *between* individuals, or networks of individuals, moment to moment, that this knowledge changes over time and can be reflected upon critically – all of these epistemological considerations lead to certain questions about how to navigate ethics in research and praxis, and how to acknowledge our own partial truths at each fleeting moment of our lives in order to make room for others' truths, as well as for our own knowledge claims to change.

Reflexivity, the practice of thinking metanarratively about research, values, choices, ethics, and identity is yet another dynamic process that is difficult to formally define. Guillemin and Gillam (2004) attempt to define it loosely as an ongoing process of reflectively acknowledging the researcher's role in "actively construct[ing] interpretations" (p. 274). They go on to say that reflexivity is a component that, when included in research, contributes to more "rigorous" and "ethical" practice (p. 278). While this conception provides an easy way to think about reflexivity in a kind of "add and stir" way, I do not believe that it captures the ongoing, fluid process that other authors such as Ellis and Newman describe. Reflexivity, like ethics, does not end with the final draft of an article. Rather, as is evidenced throughout Ellis' meta-autoethnographic writing and reflection upon her work, reflexivity involves a level of critical self-awareness that stays with us every moment throughout our lives.

This process of reflecting upon and reinterpreting one's knowledge and practices (Ellis, 2009) is not one that leads to an increasingly accurate apprehension of one's "real self;" rather, one's identity is dynamic and historically contingent, shaped by experiences that are later examined in the context of new ones and, perhaps, by the writing process itself. Newman (2010) describes the process reflexivity similarly by acknowledging its role in shaping and articulating his own changing but historically grounded identity. His ethnographic engagement with the southern United States has made him "aware of a habitus-based, contextually-important, historically-constituted performative politics" in reference to his own body and history as well as those of others (p. 308). His reflection also brings him back to his childhood, tracing connections between diverse life experiences within the confines of an historically inscribed body. He links the study of the body, as I hope to have done in my own historical and at times biopolitical research, with a project that is necessarily political through its attempt to deconstruct the discursive power relations that define bodies and give rise to bodily identities. His own body is implicated, as is mine, within this discursive web of knowledge and power: "those corporeal power-knowledge structures that I was attempting to situate in context *were ultimately articulating me"* (2010, p. 316).

In many ways, Newman's description of his epistemological, methodological, and reflexive positions describe my own. He navigates the connection between discursive deconstruction and praxis as existing in the opening up of possibilities to disrupt "existing regimes of power" (p. 14), and I

hope that my research will contribute in some small way to this disruption[12]. As Newman notes, any inquiry that attempts to locate power within individual bodies requires that the researcher locate his or her *own* body within that particular context, understanding that articulating the discursive dimension of bodies (fleetingly) crystallises them at the same time that it makes room for transgression of their limitations. My own bodily history must come to light as I attempt to historicise the bodies of others. This will form part of my life story as I reinterpret and reflect upon my own bodily experiences. As Ellis (2009) writes: "who I am is unfinished and in motion" (p. 350). Ellis also captures the danger of articulating into text what are but momentary conceptions of our identities; that is why resisting the forms and metanarratives of ethics and knowledge that constrain us by embracing a fluid, ongoing story of making, re-making and reflection is so appropriate for understanding lives that are both fragmented and continuous. I can always return to my stories, my choices, and my articulations of knowledge from a new context in the future, reinterpreting them for myself *and* for others.

Finding a way to articulate the contradictory experiences and sets of knowledge that emerge out of the "postmodern moment" has been itself a feature

---

[12] My commitment to both an ontology-epistemology of subjective contingency, as well as a belief in the *use* of such a position toward the troubling of power relations (conceived very loosely as those events, texts and relations that systematically assert the dominance of one way of knowing over others) is taken up as a politics of possibility that is rooted in the belief that systematic inequalities, violences or marginalizations *must be* contested. This represents a site of convergence between epistemology and morality; inequalities must be contested, in my view and perhaps in the views of others, simply because there are other possibilities for those subjects rendered as *Other*, as *outside of*, or as *lives that do not matter*, a consequence of which is that certain lives are lived in fear, under constant threat of exclusion, denial, violence or disappearance, both physical and mental.

of "a history marked by multivocality, contested meanings, paradigmatic controversies, and new textual forms" (Lincoln et al., 2011, p. 125). In terms of my own research on bodies, it is important to understand how they are both historical and continuous at the same time that they are contingent upon circumstance and discursive construction at *every moment.* Acknowledging the fluid boundaries between all of the issues discussed throughout this chapter and understanding how they operate to inform my research questions, analytic approach(es), and exploration of my own bodily history is essential if I am to produce research that challenges the natural, ahistorical body while remaining mindful of the potentially harmful or constraining ways that my own articulations construct (bodily) histories.

# Chapter 3

## The Concepts of Discourse and Method

As discussed in Chapter 1, categories of race and their attendant inequalities are part of the foundation of modern social organization, and racial knowledge places limitations upon what can be meaningfully thought or said about identity, nationhood, or citizenship. Perceived "progress" in eliminating racism, including efforts at decolonisation, formal racial equality in law and the black liberation movement, makes unapparent the dynamic and shifting power relations that continue to impart great privilege upon subjects who adhere to white ideology and who perform whiteness in particular ways. Certainly race "makes sense" within a set of scientific and (inter)nationalist discourses that bear a striking resemblance to (although are in some ways very different from) the discourses of race that existed one century ago. The categories and ontology of race and the inequalities that arise from them/it remain very much the same and continue to act in ways that are both productive and limiting; productive in the sense that certain meanings, subjects and events are made possible by their existence, and limiting in the sense that many alternative ways of thinking, being and knowing are closed off and rendered unsayable, or unimaginable.

In order to investigate the proposed link between past and present, articulated by the United Farm Woman of Alberta and *American Renaissance* respectively, my exploration of the discourses produced by, and producing, these groups draws primarily upon the relationship of discourse to history, and concepts

of power-knowledge relations that stem in large part from the work of Foucault. In this chapter I define (without closing off other possible interpretations) and elaborate upon the concept of discourse as I intend to use it, as well as outline the ways in which I approach research into the UFWA and AR (and of racial politics, history, knowledge and subjectivity more generally) methodologically (but not necessarily *methodically*). The concept of discourse may aid in the interpretation of history as a series of discursive events and linkages (or breakages) that change the ways in which we think and act, but do not significantly change or "improve" relations or operations of power, nor the inherently exclusionary (as well as inherently productive) effects of discourse and knowledge production (including the knowledge *this* text produces). Because questions of methodology are inherently tied to one's position on epistemology, ontology and axiology (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln et al., 2011), my approach to the study of history as a series of discursive events[13] requires that the categories of race, and indeed, our very physical bodies, be understood not as objects of discovery, but as objects *made* through an ongoing negotiation of power and claims to truth.

**Discourse, power and subjectivity**

In the words of Stuart Hall (2007), discourse is "a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – i.e. a way of representing – a

---

[13] History as a series of discursive events is a useful framework, but one that I fear is too simplistic. This particular point will be elaborated upon in later chapters but for the purpose of laying out some of the important features of poststructuralism now in order to expand upon them later, the idea of discourse is an important one.

particular kind of knowledge about a topic" (p. 56). Rather than understanding language as a transparent signifier of a pre-existing reality or as a reflection of the inner reality of some autonomous subject, it can be understood as a symbolic construction of particular ways of thinking about and interpreting the world that are historically and politically contingent. In this view, meaning is dynamic and unstable, reflecting cultural and historical shifts rather than an increasingly accurate apprehension of reality (Barthes, 1977; Hall, 1996; Hutcheon, 1989; Weedon, 1987); language shapes our consciousnesses and our perception of ourselves, Others, and the world around us.

Discourse can be thought of as producing, or operating within, a set of rules that govern language and what/how things can be meaningfully said; these limitations (alternately conceived of as possibilities) are placed, though not incontestably, upon the ways in which we think, speak, and act, as well as the ways we experience our own bodies and identities as they come to be known in particular ways. Discourse is always *both* open-ended and limiting in its production of meaning, and an interrogation of discourse, from a poststructural perspective, does not concern itself with the truth or falsity of representations of knowledge, social relations, or truth claims (Mills, 1997). Instead, the concept of discourse requires that we see truth as the product of ongoing negotiations of power relations through the production and reproduction of various competing and interlocking discourses; a statement is true if it constructs truth status for itself; an effect of this truth status is the production of real effects in the world (Hall, 2007). My investigation and critique of national and racial categories does

not, therefore, assume that these categories can be done away with simply by exposing them as historical and social constructs; the limits of language, and the force of everyday practices that assume the truth of these categories, are very real in their effects.

This view also rejects an understanding of history as being determined, even if only partially, by particular material forces. The words of Terry Eagleton (2011) sum up an anti-traditional view of history as "just one damn thing after another. [History] does not have the consistency of a fairy tale, or form a coherent narrative" (p. 110). Ideas *linger and haunt us* when we thought they were gone, and they disappear unexpectedly and in rapid succession during historical shifts; these continuities and discontinuities occur in the realm of discourse and cannot be reduced to a purely material matter, nor to a matter of essential humanness.

For the purposes of this research, I understand discourse to include sets of statements and knowledge claims that are both productive and limiting in terms of what sorts of things are knowable, and how and what we can know about them. Discourse is *how* certain knowledge claims "make sense" within a broader context of interlocking discourses, or ways of knowing, thinking, and acting. The inclusion of bodies (M. Foucault, 2007; D. E. Smith, 1993) as discursive texts is particularly important when attempting to theorise knowledge claims that have direct effects on the meanings of our physical bodies, such as medical discourses or discourses of race or sex. While I have examined texts for this project as opposed to real human subjects (a distinction that is actually troubled by the notion of discourse), I am mindful of the effects that discourses have on the

bodies and subjectivities of those they construct and control. The body as a site of discursive conflict (and as a discursive tool) has figured prominently into contemporary discussions of discourse. For example, Newman (2010) has described the physical body as a pedagogical tool for reinforcing or, perhaps less often (or perhaps simultaneously), challenging the historical construction of our bodies as raced, gendered, classed, or otherwise constituted in unequal ways. Bodies are sites of discursive representation and the accompanying power relations thereof; they are both instruments and effects of power struggles.

Foucault was particularly concerned with power relations and the constitution of subjectivities through knowledge claims: "it is already one of the prime effects of power that certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals" (Foucault, 1980, quoted in Mills, 1997, p. 19). Individual subjects are constructed by discourse, but they are also the media through which discourses are made and transmitted. As Hall explains, when knowledge about Others "is exercised in practice, those who are 'known' in a particular way will be subject (i.e. subjected) to it" (2007, p. 58). In other words, discourses construct the realm of subjectivities that are possible at a given time and place; certain subject-positions, as objects of knowledge, "come into being" and "pass away" as discursive frameworks, or the conditions of possibility, change (Daston, 2000). The textual articulation of knowledge, and the processes of subject formation therein, is particular in that it represents a fleeting crystallisation of meaning and calling into being of

subjectivity that is immediately open to interpretation and contestation, and is always in danger of becoming meaningless.

Both the UFWA and AR can be understood as participating in the production and reinterpretation of discourses of racial nation-making through their (conflicted and often contradictory) engagements with race, racialised bodies, and nationalist/imperialist rhetoric, issues which have been theorised extensively as the legacies of colonialist and imperialist histories. The histories and legacies of colonialism have provided important sites of knowledge and subject formation around which many discourse and cultural theorists have converged. Goldberg (1993) is one theorist who understood "racist culture" as an effect of practices of colonialism and imperialism; in this view, racism, or representations and interpretations of race that serve to justify certain knowledges and inequalities, is part of the foundation of all structures and practices in "Western" society: "racial thinking and racist articulation have become increasingly normalized throughout modernity", a result of which has been the increasingly common conception of subjects "foremost in racial terms" (p. 1). There is an ongoing production and reproduction of racial knowledge that changes in relation to shifts in "modernity's self-understanding and expression" (ibid.), but the ultimate meaning of race as both an essential quality and as the basis for social and biological inequalities is never eliminated. Goldberg discusses racial discourse as the accumulation of a body of knowledge (and, I may add, of bodies themselves) that is both open-ended and severely limiting (p. 42). Discourse is fluid and productive at the same time that it places concrete

48

limitations upon subjectivities and the meanings and experiences of their physical bodies.

Exploring the ways in which racial knowledge interacts and intersects with other discourses in dynamic ways requires an attempt to understand, if only partially, "relations between statements, between groups of statements and events of a quite different kind (technical, economic, social, political)" (Foucault, 1976, quoted in Newman, 2010, p. 25). To that end, racial discourse has been linked in some instances to the emergence of imperialism and liberal individualism, and they have remained closely tied together (Burton, 1994; Comack, 2010; Goldberg, 1993; Henderson, 2003). For example, Comack's research into the construction of race in public responses to the murder of an aboriginal man by police investigates how the discourses of individualism, "responsibilization" and formal equality are imbricated with racism. She writes: "those who refuse to become responsible, to govern themselves, therefore pose a 'risk' to be managed, and readily [*sic*] made subject to condemnation" (p. 43). She further complicates liberal discourse of the rational, culpable subject by showing how it is taken up in ways that reinforce representations of First Nations people as both incapable of living up to the liberal definition of personhood and personally responsible for this shortcoming. Racial Othering, in this case, effectively occurs at the intersection between different sets of knowledge and truth claims; we cannot know the responsible and good citizen without simultaneously defining the irresponsible and the bad.

The contributions of (post)colonial and poststructural theorists provide useful "tools" with which to interrogate the contemporary discourse of *American*

*Renaissance* by following through one chain of racial logic transmitted through the colonial and imperial legacy of the UFWA. The ways in which the UFWA was engaged in practices of race-making (Omi & Winant, 2006) can be usefully understood in terms of discourse and its relation to issues of power, subjectivity, and ontology; it allows one to theorise racialised subjects as cultural productions rather than as victims of oppression who are divorced from their "true subjectivities," and it allows those subjects who are implicated in race-making practices to be understood as conjunctures around which certain conditions of possibility converge and are transmitted. Subjects are formed *in relation* to one another and *through* the mediating force of discourse. This view is concerned as much with *what* discourse says and *who* it names (and how) as it is with who it does not name. Newman (2010) discusses the white body as a power-knowledge nexus, though its discursively constructed naturalness as a neutral frame of reference makes it unnecessary to directly name. This has the effect of reproducing a systematic denial of the white subject's implication in "the structures and discourses which create ideological power for the 'invisible centre'" (p. 18). Thus, the historicisation of bodies does not merely apply to those racialised subjects who constitute the borders of such a centre; the white subject's position within a perceived centre must necessarily be troubled as well, as both are always already discursively articulated in relation to each other.

The project of studying the UFWA and AR as analogous responses to, and sites of convergence around, colonialist and racist epistemology is not an attempt to uncover the singular Truth of race as a socially and politically constructed

category; it will, however, offer an alternative "truth claim" that will enter into a power struggle with the claims of other truths, including those of the human sciences, liberalism, individualism, traditional history, or the grand narrative of modernity.

## Method?

One possible way to investigate the discourses of the UFWA and AR would be to approach them from a perspective of critical discourse analysis, which Mills (1997) defines as the "integrat[ion] [of] Michel Foucault's definition of discourse with a systematic framework of analysis based on a linguistic analysis of the text" (p. 131). My own research involves public discourses that are issued in non-conversational ways, cloaked in the appearance of science, neutral fact, or moral claims that attempt to make criticism or dissonance nearly impossible. My approach to these texts must take two things into account. First, the individual contexts of the UFWA and AR must be accounted for, however selectively; this requires identifying other discourses that are drawn upon, though not necessarily in entirely cohesive ways, in the production of racial nation building discourse (although, for my current purposes, I am not necessarily concerned with a thorough excavation of the local circumstances surrounding particular knowledge claims, a task that would be beyond the scope of this thesis). Second, the texts themselves must be understood in terms of their effects and the (already existing) systems of inequality that they produce and reproduce, and

which must have already existed in some form in order to make their claims intelligible.

But while discourse analysis as a method stems directly from the concept of discourse, my particular project is not conducive with a "systematic" approach to text that stems also from a tradition of linguistics. My concern is less with the details of word choice, arrangement and context, and more with the *understanding*, specific as it is to both the discourses I have chosen to study and to *myself* as mediator and constructor of the relationship between them, of particular histories, ideas, and power relations, and of the effects of knowledge upon subjectivities that are produced though and by various texts that "make sense" in dynamic relation to others. But while I have not taken up a discourse analysis for this project, understanding AR and the UFWA *as* discourses has helped me to think through the broader questions of subject formation, knowledge and history that my investigation into these groups gave rise to.

Carby's work on racialised subjectification (2009) is more closely aligned with how I understand my own methodological approach to the historicisation of racialised bodies, as well as to the act and idea of historicisation itself. She draws upon both Stuart Hall and Foucault to analyse narratives of racial subjectification by taking the concept of discursive subjugation, or the incomplete constitution of subjects as an effect of discourse, and using it to "investigate the production and reproduction of unequal power relations and the 'manufacture of subjects'" through such relations (p. 625). For this project, I examine two (seemingly) historically distinct discourses in order to articulate structures of racism *with*

practices and histories of colonialism and *as* important, indeed prominent and foundational, within contemporary discourses of race, nation, and the human and social sciences. Carby also identifies European "exclusionary" history by taking the position that "the multiple ways in which its creation and re-creation is haunted by and dependent upon the invention of the black other has been forgotten, repressed and denied" (ibid.). A critical interrogation of the past in terms of its implications for the present (and future) allows us to forge new discourses, practices and subjects that, through disruption, may begin to ameliorate the violent history of racism in the building of nations.

Examining the texts of AR and the UFWA specifically may allow me to make connections between statements, their effects, and broader concerns about nation, race, subjectivity and the ways in which these ideas are imagined in relation to past and future. If we view the histories of colonialism and racism as discourses that have been taken up and reproduced in various ways throughout history rather than as ideas that we have transcended as part of the progress of the West, then it becomes possible to understand a magazine like AR as taking a logical position on the meanings of race and nation (Gardiner, 2005/2006), understood as foundationally important to the maintenance of contemporary culture, as opposed to representing an aberration or anomaly.

**Making a genealogy**

Linking the discourses of AR to the legacy of the UFWA is an example of the historical continuity of discourses of race in relation to shifts in other

discourses, such as justice, science, multiculturalism, formal equality, etc. Discourses do not die along with the individuals who iterated them; they continue to exist in ways that shape our social lives and inner consciousnesses, albeit in fluid, open-ended ways. The history of the constitution of racialised subjects cannot be traced to one moment in time, but we may trace, or perhaps actively make, connections between moments of racialisation and racial knowledge by investigating particular historical practices (i.e. colonialism, racism) and the legacy they have left behind (i.e. in the social and human sciences, neo-imperialism). Both the UFWA and AR contribute to the production of racialised subjects as objects of colonial knowledge *because* they operate within, between and as transmitters of discourses of modern progress, liberal individualism, nationalism, racism and science (amongst others); colonialism lives on in the bodies and subjectivities of the racial Other, and its presence may be challenged through the construction of alternative histories – histories that pay attention to things that challenge rather than (or even as they) reproduce familiar ways of thinking, knowing and doing.

Such a concept of constructing an alternative history can be thought of in terms of Foucault's *genealogy*, a methodology that is built upon the notions of discourse, subjectivity and power relations. The making of genealogies is a practice of historicising ideas and subjects, and is an attempt to describe history in such a way as to abandon the problematic search for "the essence of things" (Smart, 2002, p. 56). The idea that social life is constituted through and by discourses requires that notions of the *originary* be rendered senseless; from this

perspective, it is impossible to locate and describe the *source* of things, and the moments at which they occur, because sources and origins do not objectively exist. Any sense of an unbroken, unidirectional connection between events, ideas and people is the result of an active, constructive process, itself informed by particular historically contingent values and politics. Traditional histories, in their identification of historical origins, invoke acts of power that are in accordance with dominant ways of thinking, in place of what may more critically be described in terms of "complexity, fragility and contingency" (ibid.). The value of constructing such a history lies in its potential to open up possibilities in the realm of imagination in order that inequalities, acts of power, violence and subjugation might be reconceived: "it disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments what was thought unified; it shows the heterogeneity of what was thought consistent with itself" (Foucault, quoted in Smart, 2002, p. 56). It is a practice that requires the abandonment of systematicity *with* the aims of logical consistency, order, universality and verification or *with the assumption of coming to know in concrete, incontestable ways*, and is in favour of an acceptance of the vastly complicated experiences of social life and the ways in which they are affected by particular constructions of history, including those things that seem to be without any history at all.

In rejecting (for my current purposes) any formalised method or analysis that relies upon a positivist paradigm (but in so doing is not necessarily capable of leaving it behind entirely), I would like to describe my aim here as one of constructing a genealogy of (or constructing an unsettling relationship between)

two moments in time. This is a task of producing alternative stories and of embracing the enormous complexity of social life, both mine and those of others; the moments I attend to and piece together are as much a product of *myself* as mediator between them as they are emergences of and from the convoluted set of circumstances that surround them.

# Chapter 4

## Alternative Histories and Haunting

In the last section of the previous chapter, I claimed that alternative histories must be constructed in order to challenge the production of racialised subjects as objects of colonial discourse. I have also claimed that both the UFWA and AR exist within and contribute to the ongoing reproduction of categories of race and nation, and I have suggested that I am analysing both the UFWA and AR as discursive formations in a Foucauldian sense; that is, as a collection of statements and thoughts that correspond with one another in such a way as to (re)produce particular ways of thinking, seeing, speaking, and being called into subjectivity. Beyond that, though, I have not provided a clear-cut description of the way in which I will make a convincing case that they are connected to each other. The notion that they *are* "connected" in some way, as well as the question of method, which I specifically left unresolved in the previous chapter, are further problematised in this one. My central interest lies not in a systematic, positivist approach to texts in order to analyse them and then refer to them as empirical evidences of a point I am trying to make. Rather, I am interested in telling a version of a story, or, in Walter Benjamin's terms, looking at an image of history (1974), that helps me, and perhaps others, to imagine other historical possibilities, the process of which may illuminate the contingencies of discourse, knowledge and power.

However, Wendy Brown (2001) points out that theoretically and philosophically, the work of exposing contingency has already been done by a number of people. The problem now is that "we have ceased to believe in many of the constitutive premises undergirding modern personhood, statehood, and constitutions, yet we continue to operate politically as if these premises still hold" (2001, p. 4). In much of the social sciences and humanities, many scholars already operate upon the premise that language is not transparent, that metanarratives of progress create certain historical blindnesses, and that all representations are bound up in relations of power, their veracity being directly tied to how well they correspond to epistemologies of rationality, order and classification; systems, meanings, categories, our very bodies – all are contingent upon historical circumstance, language and power. We "know" that the status of truth is always shifting, "not simply because philosophy says so or because evidentiary rules of validation are always inadequate," but because objects of inquiry themselves possess no stable or transparent qualities that make the abstract concept of truth possible (Gordon, 2008, p. 20). We don't tell partial truths because the "real truth" is always inaccessible; we tell partial truths because that is still the only language we have that makes sense in the wake of modern stories and values that have been thrown into serious question, but which, as Brown suggests, have never been replaced with an alternative convincing enough to re-organise the bases of political life. So how can one approach social research in a way that does not rely on the language of those systems that have been rendered problematic and unjust?

Both Brown and Gordon take the importance of history to be a starting place, not only for research, but also for living in and coming to terms with our own everyday lives and politics. In "doing" this research, I have worked toward articulating the importance of historiographical social research using the language of haunting and spectral presences, taken primarily from Brown (2001) and Gordon (2008), rather than the language of evidence, empiricism, linearity, coding and analysis[14]. The idea of haunting requires that we abandon, at least to some extent, the idea of method. "Method" implies that there exists some way for a researching subject to go about finding a social reality, problematic and partial or otherwise; haunting allows the researcher to locate herself as an affectual subject who is always already part of an extremely complicated, not always rationally cohesive, social world. The way that we construct knowledge of the present and the past is more akin in this view to fictive storytelling than it is to traditional concepts of "science" (although this distinction has perhaps always been imaginary). Gordon's theory of haunting describes research in a way that requires the use of fiction, imagination, affect, and the freedom to piece together parts of stories in ways that "make sense" of our intuitions and feelings about

---

[14] There are several claims within this thesis that seem to construct a false binary between research that is on the one hand positivistic, logical and evidence-based, and on the other hand critical and fluid with a reliance upon the rejection of foundationalist epistemology, ontology and axiology. I read the works of Brown and Gordon as attempts at a real rejection of foundationalism, but with the acceptance of the fact that it is impossible *not* to rely in part upon the language, ideas and familiar patterns of foundational epistemology. It is a uniquely difficult task to attempt to undermine such ideas and remain intelligible without having access to alternative, more imaginative language. But while the binary that I have constructed serves *my* political aims for this project, I acknowledge that important critical work is done from a variety of epistemological positions.

ideas, events, images or objects that are uncanny – that is, both familiar and strange at the same time, the reasons of which not necessarily being identifiable or immediately evident. These are grounded in the claim that the past always bears upon the present, that what is invisible is not necessarily "not-there" (Gordon, 2008, p. 17). Inquiry into that which seems to be not-there, requiring as it does that the researcher (for lack of a better term) investigate those aspects of the social world that arouse a feeling that something is not quite right, allows for a departure toward a new methodology that does not rely upon (but does not, or cannot, necessarily abandon) internal logic or consistent presuppositions about (and evidentiary support from) social reality. A person who is haunted, or who recognises a haunting, is simultaneously always already a product of that history, as well as imbued with the capacity to make sense of it in varying ways. And beyond that, we also have the ability to encounter and make sense of, or be made sense by, histories, even if they are not ours or we think we have no *real* connection to them:

> [I]n [the] moment of enchantment when you are remembering something in the world, or something in the world is remembering you, you are not alone or hallucinating or making something out of nothing but your own unconscious thoughts. You have bumped into somebody else's memory; you have encountered haunting and the picture of it the ghost imprints. Not only because this memory that is history is out there in the world, playing havoc with the normal security historical context provides, but also because it is not over, *it will happen again; it will be there for you*. It is *waiting for you*. And therein lies the frightening aspect of haunting: you can be grasped and hurtled into the maelstrom of the powerful and material forces that lay claim to you whether you claim them as yours or not (Gordon, 1999, p. 117, emphasis in original).

The above passage makes clear that haunting is ongoing, occurring whether or not you choose to recognise or ignore it; it is a way of understanding (in always limited ways) history, social life, my life, the lives of people I know and people I don't, as well as of *being understood* by others in temporary and unsettling ways. In this sense, referring to haunting as a "concept" or a "theory" is already problematic in terms of Gordon's own critique of the compartmentalisation of research into/theories of the social into temporally, spatially and linguistically bound categories. Haunting is not a theoretical "framework" to be picked up and used here and there, though it is conducive to such use. I have found in Gordon a way to begin to articulate *everything* differently, a way to imagine possible ways of thinking about and understanding the social world(s) that does not necessarily rely upon the concepts and narratives that, though they have been rendered fragmented and problematic in the wake of poststructuralism, persist as foundationally important frames of reference for all knowledges, identities, life stories, migrations and politics. I also agree with her that imagining history differently is essential in order to begin to imagine both a different present and a different future. This is where I believe Gordon's call to listen to and take notice of ghosts, the missing, the eerie and the unusual incoherences we encounter as researchers may help to address Brown's question of what to do when everyday politics and knowledges operate upon an "I know, but still…" logic (2001, p. 4).

Writing alternative stories about the ways in which the past bears on the present, as Foucault suggested with his idea of genealogical history, can be done

61

most imaginatively with an attentiveness and sensitivity to who or what is excluded, or rendered missing, from narratives of the past. Foucault's genealogy is not incommensurable with the notion of haunting; both require a rejection of progress and teleology, as well as a rejection to some extent of the modern, coherent and autonomous subject in favour of a focus upon the complicated and sometimes illogical or seemingly unimportant circumstances surrounding knowledge and subject production across time. Both see the present as necessarily in complicated relation to the past, but neither views history as a purely determinative force. Traditional history requires consistent empirical evidence and facts, and views historical events and epochs as singular, bounded entities; the practices of making traditional histories arose as both instruments and effects of particular racial and national knowledges and are thus intimately bound up in matters of modern politics and racialisation (Said, 1979). Alternative histories, such as histories that account for spectres, ghosts, non-linearity and confusion, do not assume to collect the facts of the past, or to make logical, incontestable links between past and present events: "To write stories concerning exclusions and invisibilities is to write ghost stories. To write ghost stories implies that ghosts are real, that is to say, they produce material effects" (Gordon, 2008, p. 17). This is a call to write histories that do not rely upon modern ontological and epistemological positions, the practice of which has the potential to disrupt the inherent connection between racial knowledges and modern histories and politics. In order to begin to see who or what is missing, and to actually recognise and feel the depth of that loss, we must encounter moments that call our attention to the

past; in other words, we must see a ghost before we can begin to wonder about the effects it has had on the way we know, how we feel and who we are.

Brown, in her investigation into the historiography ("hauntology") of Derrida, claims that the very existence in everyday language of a vocabulary of ghosts, spectres, and haunting is an acknowledgement that the distinctions between living and dead, past and present are not clear. However, Derrida, whose reference to Marx's description of the "spectre of capitalism" looming over Europe in the introduction to *The Communist Manifesto*, also shows that not only does the past bear upon the present in ways that are mysterious and often unacknowledged, but the future does as well (Derrida, 1994). The "spectre reverses the usual understanding of history as origin (and the present as the teleological fruit of the origin) by virtue of its always being a revenant, a coming back" (Brown, 2001, p. 149). We can be haunted by spectres from the future because "the future is always already populated with certain possibilities derived from the past" (p. 150), and these possibilities, conjured in our imaginations, have material effects on the both the present *and* the present's conversation with the presence of the past. Furthermore, while ghosts and spectres from both past and present make themselves known in ways that are without pattern or logic, we, as subjects of the present, can conjure ghosts in the act of looking for them, or banish them in the act of refusing them acknowledgement. With this in mind, it would be senseless to search for such things as origins, as the processes by which we come to know and understand past, present and future are so fleeting and

inconsistent that they can only ever be grasped incompletely, and they certainly cannot be organised temporally into unidirectional causal order.

My look into a history that includes both *American Renaissance* and the United Farm Women of Alberta is therefore an attempt to challenge a particular concept of history with one example, one "snapshot", of a possible configuration of the meaning of, and relationship between, two (non-discrete) historical events: "Grasping the constellation that our own era forms with an earlier one entails grasping the extent to which (selected elements of the) past and present ignite each other, resemble each other, articulate with one another, figure meaning in one another" (Brown, 2001, p. 165). There are numerous possible ways that we might produce such an "image" (Walter Benjamin's term to replace the more cohesive "story") of history, because the order in which meaning is made, or resemblances are ignited, is not already determined. This historical study of the UFWA and AR, understood as producing, and being produced by, particular discourses, begins with a belief that the each one haunts the other – the ideas developed by prairie women in the homesteads and meeting halls of agrarian towns echo in the present in ways that inform (postcolonial and nationalist) practices and ideologies, and the spectre of the politics that AR engenders in the present loomed over the UFWA in their time. But perhaps most importantly, the ways in which the two haunt one another is mediated and brought into existence through my particular encounter with each – *my presence*.

Gordon reminds us that ghost stories involve the missing and the excluded. The solidification of citizenship as a category of utmost modern

importance, in which the UFWA had an active part and to which AR is clinging in light of rapid transformations in everyday meanings, economy and politics, means that there exists an indeterminable number of people who could have been otherwise, but who, because of the limitations and privilege of citizenship, have been living, or who have died, without being acknowledged as subjects whose lives matter. The haunting presence of these missing subjects and these powerful discourses also includes colonial and imperial practices, a reiteration of the goodness and progress of the West, subjects who are classified by race, sex, and intelligence, and the particular ways that we have defined nation, democracy and culture. The idea of haunting allows me to look at *American Renaissance* – some members of which were recently involved in a white identitarian conference in Paris that attracted record attendance and occurred days before a series of murders targeting black and Jewish minorities in France – as one nexus around which racism and latent colonialism continue to form and re-form, always *in*formed by the haunting presence of early nation-building discourses. And to understand this *in relation to* the UFWA requires a recognition that racism was just one of many complicated factors that gave rise to their discourses, but one that, in *my version* of this relationship, is important to follow through as a "condition of possibility for future constructions of racism, a condition of possibility (whether or not consciously intended as such by those who articulated it) *for the systematic violation of embodied but de-voiced persons"* (William Ramp, personal communication, June 27, 2012). Haunting presences are "unseen" (Gordon, 2008) because they are systematically rendered invisible; in this view, we cannot

successfully address racism, and its attendant epistemological concepts, without "reckoning" (Rosenberg, Dean, & Granzow, 2010) with the ideas of nation, citizen, and culture that are assumed to have a natural existence, as well as with the lives and deaths of people who could have been otherwise. This requires a critical de- and re-construction of important historical moments, as well as the practices of knowledge production that made their existences possible in particular ways, that helped to crystallise (however fragile) the meaning of modern nationhood. No matter how problematic or involved in the production of systematic injustice the discourses of AR may seem from a particular perspective, they are in many ways the logical extension of "racist culture" (Goldberg, 1993). The ghosts of history must be made visible within these discourses in order that they may, one day, be laid to rest with an ongoing attention to the ways in which "laying them to rest" are themselves haunted.

The idea of haunting requires that we think of the past as a kind of dream, the lingering remnants of which act, albeit imperceptibly, in "a violent or disturbed manner" (Coddington, 2011, p. 748) upon the present. Few people may agree, at first glance, that the friendly, co-operative meetings of the UFWA constitute a violent or disturbed historical presence. This analysis, however, is concerned with the UFWA as discourses rather than as individual actors. Their ideas, themselves haunted by particular histories, *have* had an insidious presence that remains masked in large part due to a particular construction of the identities of the women themselves within a discourse of liberal personhood, as well as the ongoing celebration of their political achievements toward liberal personhood as

an end. In the historical (re)construction of early liberal feminism in Canada many important events, ideas and perspectives were left out because they are inconsistent with a particular representation of progress and human rights – the desire to celebrate could not be realised if these ghosts were present. But the things that were left out were never truly erased "precisely because their *shadows, imprints* and *traces* remain and speak out" (Gordon, 1999, p. 97), and have been doing so since, and prior to, the patterned solidification of discourses of racialised nationhood. I am not concerned to treat the women of the UFWA as sources of knowledge that gave rise to a racist culture; rather, I imagine their seemingly light-hearted meetings and documents as momentary crystallisations of already existing, already circulating, and already problematic discourses that were informed and shaped by the various histories of war, colonisation, imperialism, slavery, feminism and science (amongst infinite others, a full articulation of which would be impossible). The violences they produce and enable is epistemic, and is visible in the construction of particular abject subjectivities through which the rest of the nation could come into, or maintain, existence. Because of the discourses circulating at the time of the UFWA, the future was *always already populated with certain possibilities derived from the past.* We may conceive of AR as one such possible constituent of that once-imaginary future, which exists in our present, and which "came back" in spectral form to the UFWA, prompting and haunting their fears, anxieties and hopes for the future.

**The melancholia of *American Renaissance***

Although there are many ways I could begin this analysis of a particular case of haunting, I have chosen to start by situating *American Renaissance* within the field of contemporary politics. Again, Wendy Brown's description of the state of politics now that the narratives of progress, increasing freedoms, rights, quality of life, and Western rationality are in the process of "passing away" as ontologies helps us to understand the violently reactionary force of AR politics: "That intellectuals and politicians are now gazing backward to glimpse better times suggests an important destabilization of the presumption of progress" (Brown, 2001, p. 7). Furthermore, she writes that "when a disintegrating political or cultural narrative seems irreplaceable, panicked and reactionary clutching is inevitable; when this perceived irreplaceability refers to a narrative or formation actually lost, melancholy sets in" (p. 4). Using the idea of melancholy to understand AR helps to situate them within an impossibly broad set of competing discourses and histories in a way that I find fruitful, as it allows me to keep the history of modernity in focus as a point of departure from which I can enter into a conversation with a particular past.

Racial politics aside momentarily, AR is an example of the kind of politics to which Brown is referring in *Politics Out of History* (2001) because they seem to be reacting, though not necessarily cohesively, to the loss of some of the fundamental categories around which modern history was organised, and the uncertainty and unsatisfactory alternatives that accompany that, in a way that

could be described as melancholic. They[15] affectively perceive the failings of the modern, American promise because they understood themselves as subjects of that promise, and that story. Promises of equal rights have left them feeling oppressed and marginalised:

> Prof. Ellis' *The Damned and the Dead* paints a harrowing picture of a nation under a cruel, mentally shackled regime that was at the same time fighting for survival against a terrifying enemy. The Soviets got the army they asked for …
> What army do we get? Although we do not have commissars who make political speeches during combat, we certainly have orthodoxies that weaken our forces. Blacks and Hispanics are less intelligent than whites or Asians, yet they must be promoted in equal numbers. Just as giving commissars influence over military decisions hurt the Soviet Army, promoting incompetents hurts our army. Dozens of studies have shown that women are physically weaker and more susceptible to post-traumatic stress disorder than men, and yet no one dares decry the folly of putting women on combat ships (Taylor, 2012a, pars. 30-31).

Promises of progress have left them feeling as though history has failed: "Today's 'anti-racists' share the mental outlook of Soviet commissars, and would probably be just as brutal if they had the power" (par. 4); and promises of sovereign subjectivity have left them feeling as though they are voiceless and powerless actors in a world whose internal logic seems unpredictable and confusing: "Plenty of officers know that 'diversity' is a weakness on the battlefield but just like the Soviet officer corps after the purges, they are paralyzed by fear, and dare not say

---

[15] I am not suggesting here that I have the authorial capacity to speak to the affective responses of AR authors. Instead, I am using this voice as a tactic by which I can situate them as engendering the type of melancholy politics Brown describes. This is, I believe, in keeping with the idea that social inquiry is a kind of fictionalizing process that stems from the researcher's encounter with the social world and often occurs in the moment of writing (Gordon, 2008). Gordon uses the notion of fiction to contest the idea that research can ever reflect an enduring, non-constructed reality.

so … [W]hite men … remain silent while every once-white institution plunges deeper into the insanity of 'diversity.' Whites are silent because they want to survive the purge, but it is silence that permits the purge, and even if they survive, their children will not" (par. 25). The article I have quoted here is particularly interesting in that it directly defines (what was supposed to be a) progressive democracy in opposition to the Communist regimes of the twentieth century, a story that Brown identifies as fundamental to stories of Western rationality and progress. According to AR, they live in a nation that is little improved from what is assumed to be the oppressive, irrational ideology of eastern communism, and this is in part due to the irrational pursuit of equality where none naturally exists.

In light of these confusing and disappointing political times – Jared Taylor ended *Ideology and Armed Men* with a quote from Frank Ellis: "Modern liberalism is truly depraved. Even now I am staggered by its boundless capacity for hypocrisy and lying" (2012a, par. 6) – AR clings to the better times gone by, which invariably include eras of pre-immigration, pre-racial integration, and sometimes include eras of pre-Abolition or pre-colonisation, an imagined world in which Western European governments had the forethought to avoid altogether extensive economic, cultural and governmental contact with non-white people. Their reactionary desire to reclaim the ideas of progress, freedom and individual sovereignty for themselves, to the exclusion of all racial and national others, is an attempt to maintain the integrity of the story of modernity by blaming its failings on, in this case, the inherent inferiority of certain races and cultures to live up to the responsibilities of modern citizenship. The "strenuous legal and political

efforts to distinguish, for example, 'true Americans' … from alien others can only be read as a symptom of th[e] disintegration of sovereignty, this erosion of inside-outside boundaries around a state or people presumed unified, cohesive and sovereign" (Brown, 2001, p. 10). AR's efforts to reclaim and refortify the boundaries of the inside-outside binary represent a fear that the modern promise may be lost – "university literature departments would run out of things to do if they stopped writing papers about 'race, class, and gender' in books written before the *current reign of terror*" (Taylor, 2012c, par. 17) – but also a hopefulness that it can be revivified.

Despite the problems that AR recognises in the way the story of modernity played out, they are unable to let go of the ideas that are fundamental to it. Headlines read: "The Decline of the West: A century of genetic deterioration" (December 29, 2011), "Who are the Haters? The American Way of Crushing Free Speech" (December 29, 2011), "Race and Literature: Why is it always Liberal?" (January 30, 2012), "Clamping Down on Free Speech on Campus: Creative ways to muzzle students" (February 3, 2012), "The Islamic Threat: Filip Dewinter on Europe's fight for survival" (February 28, 2012) and "A Radical Left Plan for Racial Survival: An alternative racial politics?" (March 30, 2012):

> Yes, Western Man may have once been King of the World, but today he is being erased from the pages of human history. He is the subject of a Great Erasure—the erasure of whites and whiteness worldwide … his homelands are being colonized by settlers from the Third World, who do not look like him and do not like him …
>
> It is *he* [Western man] who embraced the values of the French Revolution (the psychopathology of the terrorist Left), *he* who became a true believer in the proposition nation, *he* who opened his borders to the rest of the world, *he* who passed the laws that dispossess him.

71

Western Man sponsored his own decline (Kurtagic, 2012, pars. 5-6 & 8).

Calls for "survival" through a return to constitutional rights, appeals to American identitarian politics, and finger pointing at the dysgenic immigrants that have rained on the parade of progress represent a clear attachment to modern values and inventions, despite the authors' beliefs that these values failed. They are haunted by the hopes for Western progress that were once promulgated in discourses such as those produced by, and producing, the UFWA; they cannot let go of their nostalgia for the past, even though the story is fragmented and, as Brown might argue, actually lost to them forever.

I theorise the politics of AR as melancholic because, as with much contemporary politics and political critique, they are reacting to the cracks in the foundation of modern politics by attaching themselves firmly to one way of remembering what used to be. Brown describes Benjamin's notion of melancholia as an "attachment to the object of one's sorrowful loss [that] supersedes the desire to recover from this loss, to live free of it in the present, to be unburdened by it" (2001, p. 169). AR cannot let go of the past because for all of their disappointment and impotent anger at the course of Western history, understood to be monolithic, they cannot reconcile themselves to leaving behind the concepts that were most foundational to the modern project (and by extension the basis for the constitution of their own subjectivities). To leave behind the notions of sovereign personhood and nationhood, progress and freedom would be to come fully to terms with the past through recognition of the contingency of subjectivity,

but because of the addition of racial politics to these ideas which remain central to almost all current political possibilities, to come to terms with the past would be to lose that aspect of identity, that inside-outside distinction, that they most dearly long to hold on to. Melancholy involves a "mournful, conservative, backward-looking attachment to feelings, analyses, or relations that have become fetishized and frozen in the heart of the critic" (Brown, 2001, p. 170). Thus, the desire of AR to uphold the naturalised meanings of race, nation and citizenship in particular ways, despite the fact that they identify problems with these notions and despite foundational critique being lodged from many different sides, stems from an inability to let go of a certain haunting modern sensibility:

> It is … true that Western Man faces competition: his homelands are being colonised by settlers from the Third World, who do not look like him and do not like him. They come looking for his money, they breed competitively, they think and act as a group, and they are aggressive and ruthless…
> And when we look around and see what they [members of the Liberal Left] have done, and we analyze the implications of their actions, the magnitude of their crime is so staggering as to defy comprehension. You would think that individuals of such mind-blowing immorality would have been thrown into a lake full of piranhas long ago. But that is not what we see (Kurtagic, 2012, pars. 6 & 16).

The writers of AR see in the present a kind of disastrous rendering of the ideology that was not supposed to fail them, but they continue to evoke the concepts and logic that gave rise to this perceived disaster in the first place.

The focus on race that accompanies AR's fundamentally modern politics is, as discussed in Chapter 1, not an anomaly but one possible political position that makes sense according to an internal logic that relies in part upon systems of

73

racism. However, I argue that AR is haunted not only by a history of racialised concepts of progress, freedom and sovereignty, but also by a history of such persuasive promise. The immense hopefulness of nation-building in the early twentieth century is not an easy desire to let go; the story was not supposed to disappoint, the realities of race and nation were not supposed to be thrown into question, and the politics of national citizenship, which govern every aspect of our lives despite their problematic nature, were supposed to provide a basis for identity that would enable progress to continue. AR identifies "social issues" that echo, as we will see, some of the great fears of the UFWA. Thus, to begin to construct the image of history that (perhaps temporarily) links the UFWA to AR, I am going to begin by reversing the notion of *history as origin.*

**The spectre that looms**

Jared Taylor, in response to comments on his article *A Radical Left Plan for Racial Survival* (2012d), wrote: "No self-consciously white nation that manages to emerge from the wreckage of the present will make the mistake of empire-building or ethnomasochistic exhibitionism. Nor will it permit mass immigration." What *will* happen in the future? What *has* happened in the past? And how do past and future bear upon the *wreckage* of the present? These questions that conjure an affectual response to, and demand an engagement with, the future, and by extension the past, of the "White nation" are important because they call our attention to history; we, as subjects of modernity, are not supposed to

be fearful of the future. What happened along the way that transformed the telos of modernity from something utopian to something frightening?

At a recent white nationalist conference in Paris (attended by key-note speaker and founder of AR, Jared Taylor), Fabrice Robert, founder of France's Bloc Identitaire party, is quoted as likening attempts at establishing equality through immigration, social welfare programs and multicultural politics to the production of systems of white slavery: "Against this new age of slavery that has laid waste to the world for 30 years, against this crime against humanity that is the denial of identity, against this mentality that would transform humanity into a uniform mush, we call for a return to reason, a return to who we are" (Taylor, 2012b). Because we are familiar with stories of Western progress and versions of history that describe an ever-increasing apprehension of a "better" way to live, stories that seek fault with the modern project and advocate a *return* to a better time do not align themselves with this history. These are literally *politics out of history,* to quote the title of Wendy Brown's book, as the adherence to a concept of modernity that no longer exists (if it ever did) in the present gives rise to a sense of being *out of place or time*. There is a break away from the metanarrative of modernity occurring within AR that simultaneously evokes and relies upon those very modern values and concepts. Recognising this break allows one to begin interrogating the gap between one story and another, which in this case is one version of history as progress and another of history as failure:

> [C]onservatism is as much our enemy as liberalism, if not a worse one. Conservatism defends the previous revolution, which makes conservatives irrelevant, thus providing a rationale for liberalism. We

could even say that conservatives are liberalism's best ally, because they offer respite before the next wave of liberalization.

Ultimately, conservatism and liberalism are both about death: while a conservative complains that things are dying out, a liberal complains that they are not dying out soon enough. One is a necrophile, the other a murderer.

By contrast, tradition is about *life*. It is about an idea that has roots in the distant past, but which is constantly renewing and regenerating itself. And that's very different from conservatism…

Thus remaking Western Man also involves a Great Erasure — one where we are the erasers, where we erase the negativity among us as well as the negation of us.

The remaking of Western Man is not a defensive response; it is an offensive action. It is not a pathetic struggle for survival, but a heroic struggle for glory. And it's not about embalming the man who was, but about creating the man to come… I say let Western Man die so he may be reborn, twice as strong and masterful as before (Kurtagic, 2012, pars. 64-66 & 86).

A promise failed, a Man lost, a path not taken. The language of the above quote seems to represent a desire to shed those things mourned, but is the path that AR readers are called to embark upon *now* really so different from the path of their perceived loss? Is it a sense of the immensity of that loss that propels this language of glory, creation and heroism? *Western Man sponsored his own decline*, so why renew him? This piece of text appears to be focused on moving *forward* rather than dwelling in the melancholic despair of an encounter with loss; but if not *for* the experience of that loss, and if that experience was not haunting, *motivating* this AR author, the desire to craft "anew" the ideal Western Man would not be stated in terms that acknowledge it as a loss in the first place. AR is engaged in a conflict between a desire on the one hand to conjure and to *celebrate* a history lost, and on the other a desire to denounce "Western Man's" failures and imagine new ways to obtain the old goals.

If we imagine AR – and the politics they engender – as the future from a perspective of the past, we can imagine that it represents in some ways the future that the UFWA, if we can speak of them as a singular entity, imagined and perhaps feared. The writers and readers of AR are concerned about improving the (White race and the) nation, as if these ideas have not always already been engrained in "Western" history (Goldberg, 1993; hooks, 1992). The absence of any acknowledgement that these ideas have had an ongoing, foundational existence throughout Western history raises questions. Why is this part of history rendered invisible in AR narratives? Why is the modern story that we are comfortable with being called into question? How does this (sometimes) unfamiliar version of history allow us to interrogate other possible histories and pasts? What stories and subjects are missing from AR's story? This is the point at which we can actually begin to conjure alternative versions of the past by looking into a story that AR left out of its narration of history, but which nonetheless haunts it. What happened in the early settlement days of Canada that certain subjectivities, events, knowledges and ideas became possible while others were to be lost? Can attention to lost possibilities – in this case the ghosts of those subjects who were, and continue to be, disappeared from the category of good citizen on account of the solidified fissures between what were once only imaginary concepts of race – help us to imagine a future where those losses are reckoned with, where the exclusionary practices that systems of nationalism, racism and capitalism rely on no longer have meaning and ghosts disappear in the wake of new imaginary forces?

By turning to the UFWA, whose trace remains (for me) most directly in the texts they left behind but also in the annual and ongoing celebrations of Canadian women's history and in legal records, we can bring into the present words and ideas that have mostly been contained within archives[16], largely inaccessible to those marginalised subjects who may most benefit from their re-emergence and critical interrogation. The history of modernity has rendered absent the more unpalatable, or even violent, aspects of this history in favour of a tale of progress and enlightenment[*]. How interesting, then, is the mourning of modernity's failures by AR and its contributors; when and where ghosts from the past *do* make an obvious appearance, AR is there to lament the tragedy of modernity in order to keep those ghosts silent in their disappeared state.

---

[16] However, it is *only* through text that I have encountered the women of the UFWA; no amount of attentiveness on my part will conjure for me their specific names, faces, voices, who their loved ones were or what they did and thought in their daily lives. In fact, in this case my *attention* to these texts has been bound up in the temptation to (mis)appropriate their lives, their unheard voices, for my own purposes. And while I speak "for" and of them in this text, they were and are far more than an abstract concept of "early Canadian imperialism and racism."

[*] But there are memories that are neither publicly celebrated nor violent: *"My first formative instance of anti-racist pedagogy, along with my initial guidance in the art of being suspicious of rhetorics of power, glorification, superiority, triumphalism, sectarianism, came to me through my mother, who learned them from the side of her family populated by United Farmers and United Farm Women, and persisted in holding to them despite a lack of encouragement to do so from another side of her family. My great-aunt was president of the United Farm Women of Ontario and provincial leader of the United Farm Young People of Ontario. My great-uncle ran for the United Farmers in two elections, led the anti-conscription March on Ottawa in 1916, and was president of the United Farmers' Co-operative Company. A friend of mine who died about 5 years ago at 94 was a United Farm Young People activist who later collaborated with Graham Spry in the initial formation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. But more important than all these identifiers is this: the voices of the UF women and men I once knew are voices I 'miss' in the sense that I don't find them in much that is written about the UF, and not in your thesis -- and also, they are voices I 'miss' in the sense of an attachment to actual persons now severed by loss."*

Pursuing this story of haunting requires that I delve into some of the important texts of the UFWA as a(n arbitrary) starting point, particularly given that I have no other, more personal, way in which to begin. I did not know them, and UFWA history has not, until now, figured into my personal narrative (and even now it does so in *both* unsettling and self-serving ways). Because of this I have chosen to focus on one annual publication from the year 1925 that attempts to summarise the year's work of the UFWA into distinct categories such as Education, Immigration, or Health and Hygiene. These reports from the annual UFA/UFWA conventions contain, in their own words, the ideas and practices that the members themselves most valued, and from this text various insights can be constructed to serve particular ends. We can imagine that these women were engaged in a variety of practices and had varying, and likely contradictory thoughts on these topics that were, nonetheless, translated into text each January. Whether or not these convention reports actually represent the thoughts, feelings and actions of the organisation's members is not an issue that I explore further – *for the purposes of this study,*[17] what matters is that, when the various writers were pressed to solidify thought into text, certain patterns emerged along with the authority and self-validation that long, professional-looking documents seem to possess[*]. At some point in the early 1920s, the convention reports of the UFWA

---

[17] This demarcation of what *matters* for this particular text is itself haunted. Have I banished the ghosts of UFWA members *because* they unsettle my position? If I acknowledge them, does that attendant uncertainty undermine my attention to *other* ghosts?

[*] *"Unlike your encounter with the United Farm Women, mine was personal in a way that invokes in me both a sense of loss (now) and loyalty. That loyalty could easily go the way of nostalgic defensiveness, but instead, I've chosen, with more*

condensed into a set of discrete topics, and this format appears more or less the same in each year of the 1920s and into the 1930s. In the year 1925, the topics were, in order: young people's work, education, marketing, laws concerning women and children, immigration, health and child welfare, diet in health, the library and the community, and educating our children.

These convention reports are particularly interesting because they open up many possibilities for interpretation; in my reading, the UFWA authors combine at the same time quaint utopian ideals, fuelled by an engaged hopefulness, with classifications and demarcations that, while they may have seemed natural or benign to the authors, are an emotionally detached exercise in power – emotionally detached because of an unawareness of the *possibilities* such statements open up. The reports allow us to glimpse critical moments in time, where the *what could have been* grapples with what already was. But the ideas of the UFWA were not necessarily coherent, depending upon how you view them.

---

*or less success, to engage with the UFW legacy -- which is also my legacy -- both critically and appreciatively. I've chosen to do that because of a double moral sense: on the one hand, a moral imperative to be loyal to people who formed me -- as actual people rather than 'things to think with'. But the other moral imperative I try to follow is to be loyal to them truthfully; that is, not to appropriate them to a process of defensive self-construction, but to be attentive to who they were and what they stood for 360-degrees ... in the round, good and bad. So, for example, recognizing that my mother's anti-racism was lodged in a context of whiteness which (I can now see) limited it, though without entirely negating it. This is not a process of turning my mother and the other UF people I know into theoretical abstractions, but the opposite -- adding to my memory (and memorialization ...) something that, even after their deaths, liberates them from the clutches of my memorialization to be more dimensionally the human beings that, as a child, I knew and did not know. Human beings who were intimate and nurturing and loved -- and also flawed and contradictory and (increasingly) remote in time and ideology. I learn(ed) to allow them their remoteness to and allow myself to become remote from them, as a way of being critical but also of honouring their once-actual personhood."*

These women were busy imagining a future of equality, cooperation and trust that was, in many ways, an exercise (perhaps even a radical one) in thinking outside of certain modern (liberalist) limits – not *against* the modern, but in the name of a *different* modernity. They provide, therefore, a particularly poignant window into a conflict between past and future, and their politics are in some ways ironic, because the effects that imagining such a utopia has had on the ways in which subjects are formed (and inhabited and experienced) have been grave. The system of racial classification that the UFWA gave (one) voice to, predicated and imbricated as it was upon and with capitalism and imperialism, contributed in part to a history of racialised hatred, enacted through the classification and privilege of citizenship, that is still actively reproduced today[*] (in part by the work of AR to reclaim and reinvigorate it). These histories, which include a wide range of eugenics programs (Kevles, 1995), the enactment of the Jim Crow laws, and the systematically violent assimilation and simultaneous isolation of First Nations individuals into/out of "Canadian" society, have been actively described in the present as matters of the past. This type of description is an attempt to maintain the familiar story of modernity and the rational, democratic West, as well as to contain the fissures in the story that systematised hatred have created. In the

---

[*] However, UFWA politics were more complicated than this: *"Before 1945, the key organization in Canada which supported the British imperialist project and the notion of a white Protestant Canada, was the Orange Order -- now almost forgotten, but once enormously politically powerful: they propped up the MacDonald government, and fed the violent put-down of the Riel provisional government in Manitoba. Before 1945, membership in or alliance with the Orange Order was essential to becoming mayor of Toronto, and many other cities in Ontario. The United Farm Women were sworn enemies of the patriotic jingoism of the Orange Order, and of its militant anti-Catholicism. They also resisted the growth of the Ku Klux Klan in parts of Saskatchewan."*

present, ideas such as those presented in *American Renaissance* make the profundity of racism and hatred known in ways that are deeply disturbing, particularly to those subjects most affected by it. *American Renaissance* makes us uncomfortable (or, perhaps, at times comfortable) precisely because it calls on us to regard those aspects of the past that have been discounted with "we know better now" rhetoric as moments where certain possibilities were lost to us. They call these stories into the present in ways that simultaneously mourn and celebrate.

Thus, AR can be understood as a ghost, a social figure that reflects the past to us in a way that allows us to probe the question of missing histories, as well as a spectre from the future that came to bear upon the present of the UFWA. "The ghost is just the sign, or the empirical evidence if you like, that tells you a haunting is taking place" (Gordon, 2008, p. 8). What is haunting us all is a series of events, people, ideas and feelings that are too numerous and too diffuse to be fully apprehended; put simply and in a way that we can begin to "make sense" of, we are haunted by those moments in time during which certain paths were taken to the exclusion of, or to the opening up of possibility for, others. In all of their attempts to repress those missing stories and subjects that are missing even though we never had them (ibid.), AR provides a window through which we may glimpse one possible beginning of a story, or image of history, that simultaneously closed off particular paths while making other paths possible. The particular possibilities that came into being were formed in part because of the looming presence of the future; the women of the UFWA may have asked themselves, what do we owe the future? What importance will these moments of early Canadian history have for

future citizens? In asking these questions, and in actively working toward creating future subjects through such things as education and the constitution of a United Farm Young People branch, the UFWA were both "a *practical vehicle for the possible transmission of ghosts* as well as partakers in broader discursive politics" (William Ramp, personal communication, June 27, 2012). The motivation to both ask and attempt to answer these questions would have taken into account a variety of future possibilities, one of which would surely have been noted to include the possibility of dysgenic populations, loss of freedoms and rights, a diffuse and diverse national identity held together by little more than convention, fear, crime, economic stagnation, and extreme poverty. AR was the spectre from the future that heralded these dangerous possibilities in terms that would have made sense to the UFWA, and AR authors are no strangers to the idea of future spectres themselves:

> Naturally, we cannot step into a time machine, travel to the twenty-second century, beam back a picture and proclaim, 'This is what our world looks like!' (We are not there yet.) But we can evoke what our world could look like, and what kind of people will be running it, through the way we imagine it (Kurtagic, 2012, par. 72).

**A United Farm Women of Alberta ghost story**

On International Women's Day 2012, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation ran a program to commemorate the history of women's rights in Canada (*Rewind,* March 8, 2012). This history invariably involves reference to the "Famous Five": Irene Parlby, Henrietta Edwards, Emily Murphy, Louise McKinney and Nellie McClung. Irene Parlby was the first president of the United Farm Women of Alberta, a group whose politics were closely associated with the

other four women. This is the part of UFWA history that is continually told and retold because the Famous Five are known for their involvement in the 1929 Persons Case, that moment in history when women became legal persons under Canadian law. Parlby and the other women of the UFWA knew that women were just as capable as men of being upright, moral citizens. And who better than the UFWA to speak to this issue? They were, after all, engaged tirelessly in the pursuit of good citizenship for a nation so new in its constitution, and with such a seemingly hopeful future.

*It is January 1925, and Mrs. Clarke Fraser is presenting to the annual UFWA convention, of which you are a member, a report on the involvement of young people in the UFA and UFWA. This is the first report on the first day of the convention; it likely took you hours to arrive here by sleigh in the biting wind and cold of the Alberta prairies[*]. You listen attentively, as it is the first report of the convention and it concerns a topic that interests you: the work of young UFA members in establishing their own branches – the future of the organisation. Mrs. Fraser's report includes a list of objectives for the establishment of youth UFA branches, the first one being "to train for citizenship" (Fraser, 1925, p. 3). "Citizenship is something real," she says, "not something of which they [youth]*

---

[*] *"Sometimes, even ghosts can die ... in your story here, something has ceased to haunt. Unless they lived in rural areas very close to Edmonton, most delegates would have come not by sleigh, but by train. But today, the dense web of rail lines, the hundreds of small rural stations, elevators and flag stops, the love-hate relations that rural people had with the railways, many of the villages where the stations were located ... and the farms these women came from ... have disappeared both from the physical landscape and even from memory."*

*have read or heard ... It is not a theory to them ... [T]hese young people in working for better conditions in their schools and communities will form the habit of co-operation, and working for the public good at all times will be the natural outcome" (ibid.). This statement does not tell you directly what citizenship means according to Mrs. Fraser, but you feel as if you already know the importance of being a mindful and proper citizen. Her description does tell you that the idea of cooperation for the public good is central, and this is a point you certainly agree with. This theme of cooperation comes up frequently at the local meetings, and in your daily life on a farm that could not survive without help from neighbours, and is a feature of your specifically agrarian politics. It is not surprising then, that cooperation is used to describe the kind of citizenship that young people, who are the future of the nation, should strive towards. In fact, you know that cooperation for the public good is a "natural outcome" of work towards "better conditions," work which the UFA and UFWA locals are always engaged in. Mrs. Fraser elaborates upon her statements: "[T]he young people of the community may come to know each other better, to enrich the social life of the community and to make life happier and better, so that the young people may serve their homes, their communities and their nation more efficiently" (p. 4). This remark conjures in your imagination the necessary opposite – without cooperation amongst citizens, and especially amongst farmers, your life as a farmwoman would grow isolated, bleak, and heavy with the weight of insurmountable work, likely poverty, and hopelessness. Your involvement with the UFWA has made you cognizant of the*

*great possibilities for this young country, if only the responsibility of citizenship is*

*appropriately taken up.*

This description of citizenship that Mrs. Fraser offers, including such vague things as efficiency, work toward "better conditions" and cooperation, does not explicitly tell a reader (particularly one in another century, or one who has travelled *back* a century) what is meant by the idea of good citizenship that the UFWA regularly invoke. Irene Parlby herself is quoted at the end of Mrs. Fraser's report in reference to *her* idea of citizenship: "[I]f we are to rebuild our social structure so that it shall come nearer to the high ideals of a Christian democracy, the bricks with which we build must be the minds and spirits of the young of the nation. We have to develop in them a higher sense of the moral obligations of citizenship. We have to show them that true patriotism does not consist alone of dying like a hero but also in the much more difficult task of living nobly, of facing moral issues like a hero" (quoted in Fraser, 1925, p. 7). This gives a slightly clearer version of ideal citizenship; citizens are Christian, support some concept of democracy, and face moral decision making like "heroes". Furthermore, she clearly defines citizenship as a process in ongoing relationship with the future; a citizen, we may assume, asks him or herself what kind of future is desirable and works toward attaining it. But we may still be left to wonder what exactly is meant by some of these undefined terms as we encounter them from our own interpretive subject-position, knowing that their meanings may have been obvious to the UFWA delegates. Can *anyone* be "trained" for citizenship if these

are the criteria? We know that the farmwomen themselves considered women in general to be capable of upholding the values of citizenship, but could *any* woman? The answer to that comes from a more (in)direct look at what the UFWA convention report authors have to say about a variety of social issues that were important to Albertans during the 1920s.

However, before looking further into some of these other social issues, it is worth noting that the brief statements about citizenship above already produce and reproduce particular classificatory demarcations that carry significant moral weight. As discussed in Chapter 1, settler women of primarily British origin were already operating within particular discursive frameworks of imperialism, democracy, nationalism and rational modernity. Thus, as mundane as it may seem, the very category of citizen and the importance attached to it indicates that where there are citizens, non-citizens may also be found. In order to demarcate the proper citizen, one must also be able to identify the individual who is improperly, or incapably, attempting, or not attempting, to become a citizen. Within a relatively new nation that is part of the British dominion, taking up the role of citizen in an attempt to contribute to the building of that nation is afforded a certain amount of privilege. The fundamental importance of this category already constitutes a point, though we cannot definitively locate it, of departure from a host of potentials and possibilities toward a path of building a culture, a nation, and a body of national identities upon a discursive foundation that always already relies upon the concepts of geopolitical borders, cultural and national essentialism, and the privilege of citizenship in order to make sense.

So who is the citizen, according to the UFWA, and what sorts of privileges are they afforded? The women of the UFWA should know, for they interested themselves greatly in the 1929 Person Case and have had an ongoing relationship with the various discourses of citizenship that may, I speculate, have figured into the case itself. What kind of future were they hoping to conjure, ripe as it was with innumerable possibilities, some frightening and some utopian?

> Is there in Canada today, a more interesting national problem than this one of Immigration, and is there one of which the two opposing positions are more pronounced – one deeming it a mistake to induce settlers to come to Canada under present conditions, the other thinking an aggressive Immigration policy a necessity (Price, 1925, p. 19).

Mrs. Price succinctly defines the topic of immigration as a "national problem", clearly weighing various potential futures in her statement. Is she weighing these possibilities while the spectre of racial and anti-immigration politics looms? She continues:

> The foundation stock of the Canadian people is French and British. It is eminently desirable that that foundation stock be maintained. France has no surplus population. Great Britain has a surplus population and is anxious to settle them in the dominion overseas … Then let us begin in Britain and as we gain experience extend to other countries. Americans make splendid settlers, also many of the European peoples (Price 1925, p. 26).

The connection to the future here is clearer; Mrs. Price already knows that immigrants of a non-White, non-European race do not make "splendid settlers." In addressing the issue of immigration she is perhaps imagining a future where diverse "races" live together, and has an idea of the attendant "problems" this would create. You, the anonymous audience member, might wonder, *what kinds*

88

*of problems would immigration of undesirable types give rise to?* Mrs. J. W.

Field, along with Irene Parlby, may help you understand:

> Conspicuous in the content of most reports received [this year] are accounts of the discussion of the mental defective problem" (Field, 1925, p. 27) … "[T]here was a [mentally defective] boy of 19 working on a dairy farm, who was led on, by the continual suggestions of the farm manager, to do for the owner of the farm, of who he was jealous on account of some attentions paid to his wife. The boy at the instigation of this man attacked and did the owner to death, in the most hideously brutal manner (Parlby, 1924, p. 6).

This frightening story is echoed in the future, though in different, explicitly racialised terms, in AR's paraphrasing of a newspaper report on the attack of Dennis Watts, a 78 year old white man who was attacked by a "gang" of black youths: "…one of the boys delivered a single blow to the back of [Watts'] head during the incident Saturday, knocking the victim to the ground … One boy, he said, put his foot on the back of the victim's neck, while another shout[ed] 'kill him'" (Smith, 2012). Stories such as these make frightening possibilities of the future seem extremely personal, and somehow more possible. They conjure affective responses that allow listeners to figure particular concerns, as well as actions aimed at avoiding or eliminating those concerns, prominently in our identities as subjects who do not wish to associate with mental defectives or inherently violent races (and may even support legislation that proposes to confine the bodies and manage the reproduction of such people[*]). In the process

---

[*] *"United Farm Women, [however], opposed the religious fundamentalism and right-wing paranoia of the Aberhart Social Credit government (which defeated the UFA in 1936), and it was United Farm Women who identified proto-fascist tendencies in Aberhart's Social Credit. The UFWA did actively advocate for the 1928 Sexual Sterilization Act in Alberta. But I feel compelled to note that this Act*

of defining what we are not, we are called into subjectivity as citizens who exist within an epistemological framework where ideas such as democracy, nation, and sovereign subjectivity are taken for granted as natural truths.

To return, then, to the question I posed to the UFWA above, just who *can* take up the privilege of citizenship? Subjects who are called to citizenship in the discourses of the UFWA have particular characteristics and hold particular values: they are loyal to the nation and contribute economically; they cooperate and put the interests of the nation and of the local community ahead of their individual interests[*]; they are, specifically, of good "stock", which usually means white and of Western European descent; they are intelligent; and they are neither threatening nor dangerous. Defining citizens in these terms necessarily defines the non-citizen, who is dangerous, frightening, lazy, black or otherwise racialised, mentally and genetically defective. The non-citizen, in other words, does not advance the agenda of progress in the pursuit of an increasingly "better" nation, with an increasingly better population. However, the UFWA seem to suggest that citizenship is a matter of training and education that should theoretically be available to anyone; on the topic of education for "all" youth, Irene Parlby stated

---

*was replaced by a more draconian one by the later Aberhart Social Credit government, and that it was the medical and social-service practices to which these acts gave cover, once they came into force, that activated the connection between racism and eugenics."*

[*] *"The political legacy of the UFW crops up in the Co-Operative Commonwealth Federation (later the New Democratic Party) which many of its members joined, and in the later population of the Canadian left, including the anti-imperialist left, by ex-members of the United Farm Young People -- which the UFW effectively ran. [It is also present] in various internationalist movements (which started as pacifist movements and became over time a seedbed of anti-imperialism): throughout its existence, the UFW was explicitly internationalist."*

at the 1925 convention that "the boy or girl who can find joy in the sunset, revelation in the dawn, whose heart holds the key to nature's music, whose friends are in the books of all ages, and whose soul is in time with the Infinite, will find no temptation in beer parlours or gambling dens or other snares of the world, the flesh and the devil" (p. 42). Developing a soul that is in time with the Infinite is merely a matter of good education, and a belief that education occurs in all spheres and at all ages of life. Parlby asks: "Are the modern boys and girls who are passing out from our schools all over the western world anything approaching the description of human beings fully developed mentally, physically, morally, and spiritually?" (p. 43). This is an idealistic question, one that is pregnant with hopes and desires, but also one whose purpose is to draw attention to the ways in which human beings, or citizens, are falling short in developing to the highest imagined degree. We know from their commentary elsewhere that in fact, certain people are not capable, or not worthy, of being offered training for such a high responsibility as citizenship, which is defined most often in terms of what it is not.

Parlby's question calls our attention now, as it surely did the other members of the UFWA in 1925, to the imaginative links between past, present and future. Interestingly, in the year 1925 the UFWA invited Jessie Montgomery, a librarian from the University of Alberta, to speak to them about the importance of literature in developing properly cultured citizens. Montgomery chose to address the convention with a story by Lord Dunsany; the story is about the Inner Lands, the patrons of which are continually hiking over the surrounding

mountains only to disappear forever. Athelvok traverses the mountains one day and finds the reason why none have returned: "Athelvok, looking on the wonderful Sea, knew why it was that the dead never return, for there is something that the dead feel and know, and the living would never understand even though the dead should come and speak to them about it*"* (Montgomery, 1925, p. 36). The dead (and the imaginary) *do* know and feel something important that has been lost, and the dead *do* return and speak to the living; it need not be acknowledged in order to have an effect. In their concern for the future of the nation the women of the UFWA were always already in conversation with the past, for the past bears upon the present and "populates" the future with certain possibilities. But not only were they in conversation with the past, they were also in conversation with future spectres that served as warnings of the paths they might begin to pave, or the consequences of failing to take such paths. Their existence in the present was always bound up in these complicated relationships between past, present and future, and AR, in the contemporary moment, is engaged in similar conversations. It is almost possible to hear the voice of AR in 1925, warning of the possible consequences of the presence of those anonymous, undesirable subjects:

> They started out on the margins—a freak show of defectives, alcoholics, thugs, and psychopaths, led by tainted geniuses with pyrotechnic oratory. First they terrorized, then they marched through our institutions, and, for lack of an effective opposition, they made themselves masters of our society, able to wrap themselves in the cloak of institutional legitimacy. And since people admire and are attracted to power, the ideas of the terrorist Left look important to many simply because they come from above (Kurtagic, 2012).

**A conversation with the future**

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic
walls;
Where words come out from the depths of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of
dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward … into ever-widening thought and action –
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake

-Rabindranath Tagore[18], Where the Mind is Without Fear,


Brown, paraphrasing Derrida, asks, "are ghosts and spirits what inevitably arise at the end or death of something – an era, desire, attachment, belief, figure or narrative?" (2001, p. 145). The poem above, quoted by Jessie Montgomery in address to the 1925 UFWA convention (p. 40), describes the promise and the hope of modernity, and during the time of the UFWA it was likely inspiring, though the way in which it was taken up was haunted by the spectre of those other, sinister possibilities. Now, the poem above may remind AR of the crushing disappointment of that promise. But despite this disappointment, there still remains that hopefulness that AR cannot seem to let go, though they may not be inclined to explain their longing in those terms. This hopefulness is evident in the very fact that AR exists and has a political agenda for reclaiming the future. They may be able to recognise that the hopes of the UFWA were not realised, but what

---

[18] It is interesting to draw attention to the fact that while I have used this poem as an illustration of the UFWA's belief in the promise of modernity and progress, its author was both non-white and opposed to British imperialism in India. This fact was, no doubt, known by at least some of the UFWA members present at Jessie Montgomery's presentation.

they may not recognise is that those hopes *could not* be realised because their epistemological and ontological foundations never held the telos they thought it did; the disappointment was due not to the interference of Liberal ideology and non-white individuals, but to failures inherent in the logics of modern nationalism and imperialism. If we never conjure up the ghosts of such early moments when the concepts of nationalism and race became so thoroughly embedded into the history of North American development and politics, then we can never reckon satisfactorily with the "untenable predicates" (Brown, 2001) of such a modern project.

Thus, AR remains haunted by this history that they cannot name in order to critique, or to realise that what they thought was possible never was. They cling, in their melancholic state, to that missing thing that they feel has been lost, but which remains unidentifiable and out of reach. If progress failed somewhere along the way, if something else other than "what is" *should* have existed, then what is it? Their memories cannot conjure an answer to this, but history may provide it. Without fully acknowledging that history and its particular contingencies, however, they are condemned to mourn the dead who haunt them, and to attempt to imagine a future despite the narrow limitations that remain in their refusal to give up a story they feel is rightfully theirs. They have traced a modern history, using the logic they believed it inherently possessed, to particular points where it all went wrong; if history is monolithic, and progress, freedom, and autonomous citizenship exist ontologically, then sources must exist that can be located. Continuing this logic of modernity, they call upon empirical evidence

from the present to convince themselves that they have indeed discovered the Truth; progress ceased to occur where non-white people intervened. Now that the source has been identified, steps can be taken to set the course of progress right again.

This kind of conversation with the past, however, only allows a particular type of imagination for the future *and* for the past. So long as we continue to rely upon the logic, laws, language and linear histories of modernity, we cannot imagine a future that does not interminably reproduce the same haunted experiences. AR continues to misplace the unacknowledged object(s) of their criticism – the ideas and discourses that gave rise to a particular metanarrative of modernity – in order to *re*place them with fears and stories of racial inequality. For instance, in a recent article entitled *The Battle over Photo IDs for Voters* (Kay, 2012), the opening line reads: "The right to vote has always been central to the black civil-rights movement." Conspicuously absent from this statement is mention of the concept of civil rights as foundational to liberal individualism, western democracies and nation-states, the existence of which is necessary to AR's politics. Instead, the idea of "the right to vote" is attached to a particular social movement on the part of people whom AR's authors do not believe deserve status as citizens. In the construction of this article, Joseph Kay invokes an order of power that allows him to draw upon concepts of universal humanity and rights-based democracy while simultaneously restricting the application of these concepts from whole groups of people on the basis of a perceived link between corporeality and politics. The operation of power in this particular case is an

example of Foucault's concept of political rationality (Smart, 2002), which emphasises that governmental power does not occur within a coherent system organised around a consistent set of internal logic. Instead, acts of political power are often illogical in and of themselves; they have powerful effects because particular orders of discourses, histories and practices align in such a way as to make them *make sense*, if only momentarily (Brown, 2001).

Attempting to undermine AR's politics by discovering flaws in the logic of what are sometimes conceived as overarching systems (of positivism, imperialism, racism) will not, as Foucault (1991a) and Brown (2001) point out, reduce contemporary politics, with their reliance upon stories of modernity, to a flawed premise that we can simply abandon and move forward from. It is more effective to examine history in the hopes of revealing the particular contingencies of certain political moments upon histories that are often lost, incomplete, or unrecognisable. This is how linking the case of AR to the history of the UFWA, and vice versa, as a "case study of haunting" (Gordon, 2008) aids in the articulation of contingency. "[A] case of haunting [is] a story about what happens when we admit the ghost – that special instance of the merging of the visible and the invisible, the dead and the living, the past and the present – into the making of worldly relations and into the making of our own accounts of the world" (Gordon, 2008, p. 24). When we see, for instance, the ways in which the poem quoted above can be similarly understood in two different histories, or when we can understand the easily-vilified racial politics of one group in terms of the celebrated, and seemingly distant, history of another, or when we reverse the

96

typical order of causality and see the present as the imagined future of the past, then we begin to apprehend the contingency of rationalities and politics that have real, embodied consequences for subjects both included and excluded.

I have asked myself, how can the future of politics be imagined differently? Can I imagine myself living in a future where the meaning of race no longer carries the weight of histories and ideas that fell into particular patterns of repetition and formed the basis upon which our entire experience of the world and our own bodies is shaped? With this small foray into approaching two moments of history the answer to this remains unclear. However, putting together a view of the social world that takes into account the importance of ghosts and the experience of being haunted, both by the past and the future, may allow one to make sense of the present and its relationship to the future in fundamentally different ways. Most importantly, and most simply, it allows one to make sense of the present in ways that acknowledge how complicated and ungraspable social life is in the face of accounts that simplify, claim to *know* in incontestable ways, or reduce politics to the taking of one side over another (Gordon, 2008). I have tried to write about AR's politics by making their position understandable as a conflicted reaction to a perceived version of events/politics, and I have tried to do something similar with the UFWA because I do not believe that discounting their ideas as outdated remnants of a monolithic epistemology, or as simply *wrong*, does them, or the reality of being produced as a marginalised subject within their

discourses, justice[*]. Instead, I have attempted to see both past and future in the present in ways that I hope unsettle the concepts I have aimed to critique, as well as the language and concepts upon which this critique relies.

This type of history does not necessarily rely *only* on narrative devices such as linearity, unilateral causality, progress or individual autonomy. In fact, as I wrote the early chapters of this thesis it began to feel like the practice of writing what I thought would be seen as most "legitimate" (with a reliance upon these abovementioned concepts) was itself a technique in perpetuating the problematic systems and exclusions that I wished to critique. Are not the histories of writing practices, of institutionalised knowledge production, and the modern study of history itself intimately bound up with the earliest emergences of "exploration," colonisation, imperialism, Orientialism (Said, 1979)? Specifically, how can we "understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient [or the racialised Other more generally] politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively" without implicating standardised, authorised modes of communication and their role in making possible particular productions of racial and colonial knowledges, particular imaginaries and visions of both past and

---

[*] *"Parlby and McClung* were *avid eugenicists. And the language of 'race' (though it meant something rather different in the 1920's than now) does run through the discourse of a wide range of UFWA voices… [But] on the other hand, other discursive possibilities also existed among UFWA members, and some of these were also activated, in the name of the UFWA, or as later extensions and modifications of UFWA discourse. These other possibilities undermined nationalism, imperialism, liberal individualism (UFWA members condemned "competitive individualism"), capitalism and even racism. Undermined them in limited ways, sure. But still undermined them."*

future (Said, 1979, p. 3)?  It is therefore imperative to come to terms with the ways in which "the especially crude and reductive notions of culture that form the substance of racial politics today are clearly associated with an older discourse of racial and ethnic difference which is everywhere entangled in the history of the idea of culture in the modern West" (Gilroy, 1993, p. 7), and to imagine ways to subvert this entanglement.

The idea of creating such subversions does not, therefore, lose reference to the individual as conscious *actor*. The very fact that I have referred to my study as an intentional construction of an alternative history means that I am constructing myself with the individual agency to undertake such a task, and this is what I believe Gordon means when she says that life is complicated and not always coherent; I cannot write this account, this *critique*, of modern history *outside* of it, for I am a subject whom it has constructed in particular ways and I understand *myself* in its terms. However, it is my hope that this discussion of history helps readers to see how the past and future always impose themselves upon the present, and that it is possible to actively conjure these impositions and construct them in various ways, but the version of the histories I have looked at here is not complete, in the sense that it does not account for *all* of the complexities of AR, the UFWA, myself or the subjects excluded from citizenship, nor is it a substitute for other versions[19]. There is always room for other dimensions of the story, or angles of the "image", that may or may not include countless other facets, "as much [from] our unpredictable future as our memorable and unspeakable past"

---

[19] What this *incompleteness* means in terms of research, social justice, ethics and politics is discussed in Chapter 5.

(Gordon, 1999, p. 121). What makes an understanding of social life as haunted most valuable "is this claim to our willful consciousness and to our imaginative capacity to change course to make the future ours" (ibid.):

> Current distortions of history imply that today's 'celebration of diversity' was inevitable, that with a few regrettable exceptions, Americans have always yearned for the racial mish-mash this nation is becoming. This is deceitful nonsense designed to cut Americans off from their racial roots and to make today's race realists seem 'un-American.' The opposite is true. A sound understanding of race has always been part of our nation, and America cannot endure without a return to such an understanding (Sims, 2011).

This quote from an AR article entitled *Racial Unity and the American Republic* calls our attention to the past. From that past (or those pasts) come other voices which allow for but do not necessarily affirm what AR hears there; voices which imagine a future that AR now inhabits and claims for themselves – claiming to speak on behalf of such voices, to speak for them, appropriating them to its present fear. How might we, seeking to make sense of but also to refuse AR's fear, imagine those voices imagining themselves, and imagining us?

*You, an audience-member at the 1925 UFWA convention, are listening to the various reports with great interest, and great concern for the future of your nation. Comments on immigration, mental deficiency, crime and illegitimacy arouse some of your fears and reinforce the importance of groups like the UFWA, who actively remind us of the potential problems we'll face if we do not call each other now to bear the responsibility of citizenship with care and forethought. What might happen if Canadians lose sight of a collective goal and a collective*

*identity, or concern themselves with short-term gain at the expense of long-term unity and improvement? Should we turn off-course you can imagine some of the unfortunate situations future citizens may find themselves in – conflict between groups of disparate interests, decline in the quality of citizenship, political unrest, perhaps even violence, civil war, national dissolution. Imagining the future, with both hopefulness and trepidation, reinforces in the present the purpose for your attendance at this convention. Right now, the progress that the UFWA have made over the past year is promising, and those vague possibilities that always loom in the background seem distant. However, neither you nor your colleagues can entirely forget the fact that the politics of your association would have no convincing premise if those possibilities, heralded from those future citizens within your imaginations, did not also seem to be always on the verge of appearing…*

**Coda**

And what of the appearance of the past in the present? AR's task is a historical, and therefore imaginative, one. Events are taken up and stories written, as seemingly singular events "[become] the possibility of writing a story, a history; an event is passed on" (Gordon, 2008, p. 152). These possibilities are always already effects of past and future, too numerous to grasp, but in the writing of histories the past and future are often conceived in natural, rather than imaginary, relation to one another. And so AR writes a "ghost story" and I write another one, about ghosts both same and different, a ghost story about a ghost

story. In both of our cases it is the idea of the future that animates our desire to look at the past, to look for things missing, things "gone wrong", things that are forgotten at some times by some people, and things that are never forgotten, never let go. We are paying attention to the same sets of memories, future and past, whether we know it or not.

This chapter was written with the idea in mind that both AR and the UFWA (and me, as the author of this text) *never knew each other* but were nonetheless entangled in uncanny conversation, fuelling each other's conceptions of the West, of modern nationhood, and of the pasts and futures of their own histories. But as wonderfully surprised as I was to encounter the following AR excerpt, perhaps bumping into the same memories is inevitable if we are all imagining the same sorts of questions. In a very recently published article entitled *Looking to History for the Way Forward: A Case from Canada,* the politics of AR and their history- and race-making project are seen in direct conversation with the early construction of Canada as a nation founded upon the concept of race, and this conversation is propelled by their imagination for the future. *Naturally, they cannot step into a time machine*, but they can imagine, and this article temporarily relieves me of my role as mediator between them because AR and the UFWA do, as it turns out, *know each other*:

*"It is hard to think of behavior that is genuinely exclusive to one race. Naming one's daughter Quaneesha or leaving one's estate to the Sons of Confederate Veterans are as close as anything I can think of, but there are others*

*that are not far off: having 30 children by 11 women, volunteering for the Red Cross, or living under a bridge after a career with the NFL. Certain things just seem to be quintessentially black or white. That is why, if we turn to examples from history where whites collectively stood up for the preservation of white culture with an understanding of what is at stake for its future, we can learn something about how to come to terms with the need for white consciousness, however "politically incorrect" that may be. Because the staggering differences between races are so obvious – we can all name them, regardless of how "anti-racist" some of us may consider ourselves – it is our job to help people feel okay about standing up for white consciousness.*

*Part of standing up for white consciousness includes encouraging an overt recognition of biological racial differences on the parts of politicians and educators, who are only, we can assume, content to ignore these differences for the sake of being 'politically correct.' We know that race is a good indicator of test scores, worker reliability, athletic ability, crime rates, and many other things, so it is, of course, foolish to ignore it. Race is also an indicator of the likelihood of having certain diseases and/or intellectual deficiencies, but it is not often that you will hear someone admitting this. Many of us are aware of the legacies of Francis Galton, Charles Davenport, Linus Pauling and Karl Pearson (amongst others), but their contributions to the science of racial and ethnic disparities are often ignored and feared by those whose cultures and genes are implicated – the eugenics/nationalist movement I am about to describe took seriously these alarming facts.*

*It is not often that we can look to Canada for inspiration in how to imagine a world where whites do not have to suffer the indignity of racial "diversity," as Canada seems to be equally overrun with Liberal sentimentalism. However, I recently discovered in more detail a little-known eugenics movement (yes, that historical taboo) that occurred in Alberta, Canada, that I believe deserves attention. If for no other reason than bringing to the fore yet another example of whites fighting for their right to enjoy the unparalleled cultured society they built, this eugenics story, featuring the United Farm Women of Alberta, is indeed 'more fuel for the fire.' It is my hope that such an example from the past will give confidence to those of us who are not content to silence the truth when the quality and morality of society is at stake.*

*The United Farm Women of Alberta (UFWA) were the women's branch of the United Farmers of Alberta (UFA), a political party that formed the Alberta provincial government from 1921 to 1935. The women's branch took up the cause of discussing and managing the morality of the population in general; these discussions often centered on the reality of racial difference (especially low IQ, criminal and alcoholic behavior, inclination toward poverty, sexual promiscuity, and unhygienic living conditions). In fact, the eugenics movement included a disproportionate number of women and is one legacy of some early feminists who aligned themselves with national concerns (we are willing to concede that not all feminists were Liberal sympathizers). This particular group of women understood one very important fact: left to their own devices, non-whites gradually corrupt*

*and degrade every facet of society until they have brought it down to their own primitive level.*

*That is why, throughout the 1920s, the UFWA petitioned the Alberta government to open large-scale institutions designed to house the mentally defective – and why, furthermore, they understood very well who would be populating these institutions (hint: it wasn't Western European whites). The province of Alberta actually passed eugenics legislation in 1928, which enabled institutional board members to forcibly sterilize mental defectives who were at risk of procreating and thereby passing on their dangerous genetic proclivities. What impresses me is that the people of Alberta understood perfectly well that things such as alcoholism, poverty, violence and low IQ are clearly tied into race; how is it possible that such blatantly obvious facts have disappeared from the common consciousness? Moreover, the UFWA in particular understood the grave consequences that mental defectives (read: blacks or other non-whites), if allowed to propagate freely, would have upon the future of the nation. The question asked then that we continue to ask now is: How can a modern, progressive, democratic nation exist if the population is intellectually incapable of upholding these values?*

*For those of you who may not know, Alberta is a province in the Western part of Canada that was originally inhabited by several American Indian tribes. Large-scale immigration to Alberta began in the late nineteenth century and included mostly Western European and American families, with a significant proportion of Eastern Europeans as well. Despite knowledge at the time of the*

*intellectual shortcomings of Eastern Europeans as compared to Western, a simple shortage of people to farm the land necessitated that other ethnic groups be recruited from Europe. In the early twentieth century, with the advent of mass IQ testing and in response to increasing rates of crime, illegitimate births and alcoholism, it was discovered that the sources of these problems (with generally corresponding IQ scores) were disproportionately people of American Indian or Eastern European descent. This knowledge, which was appropriately taken very seriously, led to concern about the quality of the settlers coming to the Canadian West; as we are seeing currently in America, in the early twentieth century whites with high IQs were reproducing at alarmingly lower rates than non-whites and people with low IQs. Along with the push to institutionalize and/or sterilize the people who were most unfit to reproduce (what has been called 'negative eugenics') came programs and incentives to encourage desirable families to have more children ('positive eugenics'). The UFWA also campaigned hard to curb immigration rates and make the immigration process more rigorous for those who would be allowed in. I'm sure I don't have to remind anyone that for most of its history the United States had an immigration policy designed to keep the country predominantly white, but with gradual changes (which took place without the consent of the American people), current Liberal policy is setting us on the track to become a Third-World nation, just as early twentieth century leaders feared – the UFWA's position on immigration remains extremely relevant today.*

*The eugenics and institutionalization movements in Alberta were hugely successful until, as we are all grimly familiar with, the Liberal Left clamped down*

*upon reason and truth. It also didn't help that Germany adopted a now-famous eugenics policy in 1933, only a few years after leading examples were set by Alberta and California. But another lesson that we may learn from early Alberta politics is the value not only of ensuring that undesirable races do not thrive within our nations, but also of emphasizing the immense cultural contributions that whites have made, and continue to make where they are not maligned and marginalized, throughout history. In addition to the abovementioned projects, the UFWA campaigned for reformed education and for a collective appreciation of Western culture (including literature, theatre and philosophy). They knew perfectly well due to their contact with American Indians that European culture was something precious to be protected and revered; it is not surprising that within a few years of arriving in the Canadian prairies, European settlers had turned what was a veritable wasteland in the hands of the native population into a thriving agricultural economy and beacon of Western civilization.*

*Americans (and, though I am less able to speak for them, Canadians) have long had a less national and more broadly racial sense of identity. This is because European quarrels were far away, and Americans married across national lines and lost their European identities. But most importantly, it is because they lived with blacks and American Indians that they developed a racial sense of unity that transcended national borders. Unlike Europeans who rarely saw a non-white, Americans knew that while they might be of British or German or Dutch stock, what united them was that they were white. The UFWA knew this as well. They knew that white culture was to be valued and collectively maintained, and that*

*this could be accomplished on the one hand by discouraging undesirables from invading and degrading their societies, and on the other by encouraging whites themselves to become aware with pride of the accomplishments of white historical figures. But this part of history, when being white was celebrated and white culture was fostered, has slipped through our fingers and been beaten down by Liberal propaganda. The eugenics programs of Alberta did not remain popular enough to have a lasting impact on the quality or politics of Canadian citizens, but by some accounts Alberta has retained more of a sense of what it means to be white than the rest of the country (there have been several, albeit relatively short-lived, white nationalist groups founded in the province) – who knows, Alberta may be the source of a white consciousness movement sooner than we think.*

*All of these reasons are why, upon my discovery of Alberta's history, I felt compelled to share it here. If it was possible once, it is possible again, both here and there. We can all learn a lesson from the women and men who settled the Canadian West, because their vision for the future should be our own. It is evident that most people in our own nation are fed up with the status quo and that something new needs to be imagined. They want to see fundamental change and are willing to try radical solutions. That is how the 'gentleman' now residing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue ended up there three and a half years ago: in many people's eyes at the time, he represented fundamental (though misguided) change. There is evidence, then, that people are willing to try radical solutions, and that many white people secretly want a solution like ours – they want to reclaim their white identity for the future they know can exist. The problem is that they dare not*

*say it, partly because they do not know who we are, partly because they do not know where we are going, and partly because they do not know how to assert their identity with a clear conscience.*

*We continue to pay a fantastic price because of the fear that we cannot afford to abandon the illusion of racial equality. And that is precisely why we can turn to history to help us describe the way forward. The odds we face are daunting, but we must do everything we can to build an America we would be proud to leave to our descendants" (Johnson, 2012).*

# Chapter 5

Feelings of Wonder and Eeriness



Fig. 1: *In Passing,* Split toned gelatine silver print from series *Uchronie Fragments*, 2008, Osheen Harruthoonyan [www.osheen.ca]. Reprinted with permission.

Fig. 2: *Gudjonsson's Room*, Split toned gelatine silver print from series *Elephants*, 2007, Osheen Harruthoonyan [www.osheen.ca]. Reprinted with permission.

I was sitting in my parents' living room flipping through a magazine when an article containing the first photograph above (see Figure 1) caught my attention. My thinking had recently been occupied with ideas of haunting and my writing of the previous chapter, and the image immediately felt meaningful to me. *In Passing* is a ghostly image; the fact that I found this image in the comfort of

my parents' home and at a moment when I was least expecting it is itself an example of the uncanny ways in which haunting is encountered in everyday life. I searched for the artist's name online and discovered the second image, which also grabbed my attention and began a process of thinking about haunting and memory that surprised me. Would I have noticed these images if I wasn't already "tuned in" to thinking about and acknowledging haunting? Finding these photographs in such an unlikely place and at *the right time* is an uncanny event – my parents' living room, a room I grew up in and feel at home in despite the fact that I haven't lived there for years, became a site where I encountered something that unsettled me in its unfamiliarity, yet attracted me because it conjured particular feelings about history, memory and subjectivity. I was jolted out of a sense of easy familiarity and into a sense of eeriness at a time in which it was least expected.

Because of the uncanny timing of my discovery of these photographs I thought there might be no better way to begin this (almost) final chapter than with a discussion of them. They are interesting for at least two reasons: first, as an example of the way in which haunting can be seen in unlikely and untimely moments if we allow ourselves to recognise when we are encountering someone else's memories; and second, because they illustrate in a way that words cannot the sensation of being haunted, of moving through and within memory in ways that are sometimes articulated, and sometimes unacknowledged (or perhaps disavowed.)

The photographs offer a way to *sense* the haunting experiences of memory, both our own and those of others, in a modality other than language. *In*

*Passing* shows the superimposition of a form photographed from different angles, layered on top of itself, facing both forward and backward and giving the illusion of movement across both time and place. The figure seems to be bumping into itself repeatedly, wandering back and forth, becoming clearer at moments and more transparent at others. This seems an apt description of the way in which moments replete with memories make us pause, for reasons that are not always clear (and not always welcome). It also helps to visualise time as nonlinear, as complicated and confusing events that do not *only* occur in series but also simultaneously, blurring the distinctions between past, present and future that we problematically rely upon in conveying our narratives. Rendering sensory another aspect of the hauntedness of social life, *Gudjonsson's Room* (see Figure 2) depicts (perhaps ironically) a *living* room occupied by two subjects who seem to be cut out of the image; some objects are clear (particularly the framed photographs, which can be taken as transparent reflections of a past that is assumed to be *knowable*), others are blurred, darkened or transparent (the moments of the present, which are always uncertain). The dream-like scene evokes feelings of wonder and eeriness. Who are these shadowy people? Whose room is this and when? Viewing this scene is like encountering the subtly shifting, never entirely graspable memories of someone and somewhere else. The outline of two figures, surrounded by objects of varying clarity, seems to me a depiction of the fleeting fragility of subjectivity – *who* these subjects are depends upon the particular and complicated ways in which their surroundings, their *memories*, both individual and historical, come together moment to moment in order to constitute and re-

constitute their subjective *experience*. And who they are *represented to be* depends also on the moment to moment (re)constitution of the *viewing* subject and their particular identification with or understanding of the image. The subjects of this image, as well as the subject *viewing* the image, are both there, in their edges and outline, and not-there in their blankness, similarly to the ways in which memories and histories are always already *not* not-there in all moments, across all places.

The direction I have decided to take in this chapter is based upon some of the questions to which these photographs – particularly *Gudjonsson's Room* – give rise. What does it mean to be constituted as a subject in a moment-to-moment way, contingent upon the kinds of memories we encounter and the way in which we piece them together? While this is again an epistemological question, an investigation in this direction also allows me to make reference to my own subjectivity as writer and the constitution of subjectivity (including embodiment) in terms of citizenship that was alluded to, but not fully developed, in the previous chapters. Haunting as an epistemology (and ontology, politics, morality) requires practices not only of piecing together broader historical moments of social life, but also of recognising the things that haunt our very attempts at doing so; it is both profoundly historical and political, as well as profoundly personal.

Gordon describes haunting as "an experience or a phenomenon in which the normal divisions between past, present and future are not holding up because things or people or knowledge which were supposed to be gone or not-there are making their presence known and felt, almost always in disruptive and unsettling

ways" (Gordon, 1999, p. 119). The "missing" subjects from *Gudjonsson's Room* can thus be understood as ghosts, even if they are only *made* to be ghosts by *other* ghosts (the photographs on the tables, their memories of Others both known and unknown), who render them absent. The artist has reversed the normal way of seeing things, and this reversal is what we experience as uncanny. But despite not being there in recognisable form, the missing couple does still exist subjectively and experientially (perhaps they are the subjects whose invisibility is necessary to my, or your, experience as a citizen in a western democratic nation). If we take these photographs as visual representations of the kind of approach to history and temporality that Gordon suggests, then we might wonder how it is that glimpses of, and feelings about, the memories we encounter each day, *whether we lay claim to them or not,* do not always take precedence in our consciousness, even if/as they *organise* that consciousness. After writing the previous chapter, I was left with many more questions than answers. To attempt to bring some sort of "conclusion" to this study would be in opposition with its aims, but as I am writing the near-final chapter of this project I would like to continue to raise questions rather than close them off: questions about what it means to produce knowledge and to *be produced by it* in the process; about contradictions, invisibilities and sense-making; about the ethics of writing and coming to terms with an inability to ever fully know the meanings and implications of crystallising thoughts into words; and about removing/replacing limits from imagination while

remaining mindful of the ways in which imagination will *always* but haunted by something, someone, or sometime[*].

**Producing and being produced by**

The subjects missing from *Gudjonsson's Room* are similar to the subjects missing from the narratives of AR and the UFWA – *there*, but disavowed, or disappeared. How do both the UFWA and AR rely upon this disavowal in order to produce themselves as subjects of a particular kind? How has this disavowal produced me as a national subject, and as a subject who is in a position to "know"? The disappearance of the Other from these narratives occurs within already existing discursive frameworks; for instance, the production of national citizenship out of "settler society" relied entirely upon the constitution of indigenous peoples as Other (the process of which was directly connected to Western politics and practices, including "exploration" and the making of Western histories), and as capable of citizenship only when that Otherness is abandoned or renounced[20] (Thobani, 2007). How do my actions and the

---

[*] This very project was begun within the context of a larger one, and these conditions are reflected in the early chapters. "*So you had to struggle, first, to make your topic your own. And then, much later, you began a further struggle not only to deconstruct the givenness of your topic but also to deconstruct your ways of claiming ownership of it. You are still engaged in that latter struggle. What this means is that your suddenly being arrested by the photos in your parents' living room is quite a different experience from the hauntings which developed through this thesis -- the latter emerged slowly, perhaps even grudgingly, in the course of sometimes-frustrating and lengthy reflection.*"

[20] While a renouncing of Otherness is constructed as a condition of citizenship, even when it *is* renounced citizenship is still withheld. The case of Residential Schools in Canada, for instance, can be understood as an attempt to force a

movements of my body on a daily basis reinforce white supremacy and the privilege of being a citizen by existing within certain parameters? Who is rendered invisible, or missing, because of *how* I take up the responsibilities of citizenship every day, having been called into citizenship in particular ways, and because I am regularly complicit in the celebration of, in my case, Canadianness – from watching the fireworks on Canada Day while my partner, who is not a Canadian citizen, wears as many maple leaves as possible in the hopes of successfully performing Canadian identity, to sitting in an immigration lawyer's office and nodding while he tells my partner what a wonderful choice he is making in choosing Canada[21], I am implicated in the reproduction of the meaning of Canadian citizenship. Such acts, which seem like mundane occurrences, are significant because they are, in many ways, unavoidably caught up in much broader ideologies that have violent effects for the many subjects that they exclude; reproducing such meanings is an ongoing process that happens without acknowledgement, even when we have had our attention drawn critically the meaning of citizenship and the violences it enables.

---

renunciation of "nativeness" while at the same time imposing segregation and making *impossible* any acceptable performance of whiteness.

[21] Immigration, for him, is constructed as a choice when in fact *it is "Canada" who already chose him* – he is white, he is already a citizen of a modern, liberal democratic European nation, he speaks both French and English, and he is educated and employable according to standards of productivity and potential contribution to the *betterment of society* that were established in part by people such as the members of the UFWA. He already performs Western national citizenship in ways that are familiar and acceptable. It is those racial and national Others – primarily members of "Third World" nations – who need to make a case for themselves at Canada's borders (Thobani, 2007).

The existences of the UFWA and AR (as well as of myself, and yourself) are contingent upon those subjects whom they exclude, both ideologically and materially, through simultaneous identification and disregard. The lives of settler families on Alberta prairies were made bearable in part by the physical labour of those people, mostly Chinese men, who built the railroad but were denied status as citizens as well as access to their own families. The ability of settlers to survive was augmented by (an) indigenous wisdom, but the givers of this wisdom would be required to renounce it in order to be "allowed" the benefits of citizenship (which, as mentioned in a footnote above, would ultimately remain unattainable). On the other hand, AR's existence is dependent upon a system of racial slavery that gave rise to the institutions, ideas, and physical organisation of the social world they now draw upon in order to make claims about racial and national superiority. The foundational categories that contain (and construct) who is White and who is Black were both the instruments and the effects of building a culture and a politics around the exclusion and marginalisation of the other in order to maintain the existence of the one (Carby, 2009; Fanon, 1967; Hall, 2007; hooks, 1992). The missing subjects, then, are those whose invisibility is necessary to the maintenance of subjects on the *inside*, or whose exclusion and production as simultaneous objects of hatred and desire are necessary in defining the very boundary between inside/outside. Subjects come into being through the *practices* of memory, history, knowledge, and the *embedding* of these practices into the material world around them; in particular, I have been interested in the "creative, contested, contradictory and laborious work of constructing racial identities in

narrative acts … [and how] the racialised self is invented in the process of an encounter, produced, in other words, as a subject dialogically constituted in and through its relation to an other or others" (Carby, 2009, p. 625). How is my own embodied experience as a (racial) subject haunted by these things – my own memories and the memories of others, the knowledges I take up and the knowledges I produce, the subjects and stories who remain invisible to me because my everyday practices render them so? But importantly (and also wonderfully, unsettlingly), none of these invisible subjects and stories are gone, despite the fact that they may be temporarily (but never quite) forgotten: "[They] will always be there waiting for you" (Morrison, 1987, quoted in Gordon, 1999, p. 117).

They were waiting as the process of writing motivated me by drawing my attention to their existence in ways that I had not anticipated, and had an effect on the ways in which my everyday existence (thoughts, practices) changed in an attempt to become more mindful of their ephemeral appearances. And really, it was the act of writing, and thinking through writing, that allowed me to interrogate the histories of race and nationalism, evoke ghosts and blur the modern concepts that constrained my imagination of these histories, and ultimately to attend to the ways in which writing was both an act of knowledge production on my part, and an act that produced me as a subject in very particular ways. The act of producing text, as one particular practice of knowledge (re)production, has multiple, convoluted layers that are ripe with tensions between being critical and being intelligible, adhering to particular politics and then

writing in contradiction to them, attempting to fragment a familiar version of a story and weaving together a new one in its wake. I had to reproduce stories that were not my own, but in such a way as to rejoin them into a story I *did* produce. I wondered constantly whether or not my representations of others were just – knowing that I owed something both to those subjects harmed by articulations of racism with liberal individualism, as well as to those people whose histories are thrown into question *because* of their relationship to these articulations, I wondered if I was capable of actually giving it[*]. I had to reproduce categories of subjectivity and temporality in my attempt to critique them; I had to assume that the meaning of "race" was evident enough to make my claims intelligible, despite the fact that I wish I did not have to rely on this meaning. I had to rely on words for past, present and future despite the fact that I do not wish to view time or history as composed *exclusively* of linear, causal events. But most of all, in the act of writing and creating knowledge, I had to constitute and re-constitute myself as a particular subject, with particular privileges, in opposition to the invisible

---

[*] *"Is it necessary for you -- as opposed to me -- to go further to highlight or spell out in detail the alternative possibilities given by the complex and multi-possible aspects of UFWA discourse, for example? Do I, as a discursive child of the UFWA, 'owe' it something that you should not be expected to owe it? These moral obligations boil down to a question of 'appropriation'. If I 'take' from them, do I do so with consideration? Is mutuality possible? Or am I ripping them off? What I try to do instead is to pay a sort of anti-appropriative, or anti-exploitative attention in which UFWA members become fellow-subjects, not only the embodied, relational subjects of my memories, but subjects who were, like I am today, caught in a discursive web they were only partially aware of, who reproduced or left open dark possibilities of discourse and action -- as I myself do. People who, like me, sought to critique and act against their circumstances, and to act for something better, but could only do so as always already indwellers in regimes of present power. But this is all based on* my *particular relation to the UFWA. Yours is quite different, and so is your approach."*

subjects that I attempted to render visible. Interestingly (but not surprisingly), the same ghosts that haunt both the UFWA and AR also haunt my writing and my subjective existence.

There are two features of this text to which I would like to pay particular attention in order to further illuminate some of the complications and contradictions inherent in producing, and being produced by, knowledge. The first is the use throughout the text of the phrase "to make sense," my reliance upon which, I believe, provides some interesting insights into the contradictory and multiple meanings of texts, and the often unself-conscious way in which meaning is deployed. The second is the order in which the text was produced and the points of disjuncture within it that occurred rather unintentionally, yet mindfully on some level. The second point speaks very clearly to the first, as the order in which things[22] are encountered has the potential to either corroborate or disturb our sense of understanding whatever thing we are encountering or attending to at the time. Put simply, and to be illuminated further momentarily, the order in which things are encountered, and whether or not there are disjunctures within/between them, has a lot to do with the process of *making sense*.

---

[22] I have used the word "things" at various points throughout this thesis despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that it is a very banal word. It would be impossible to enumerate and name, without risk in the process of closing off meaning, the infinite possible "things" that make up our everyday experience of subjective consciousness. "Things", in this sense, is meant to refer to the totality of sensory and conscious experiences *in the fleeting moment of sensation* in such a way as to refute their reducibility to discourses, events, moments, relationships, etc. It is in this moment, perhaps, that the potential for sensations to unsettle us lies.

The phrase "to make sense" has two contradictory meanings, as discussed in Chapter 4. Though I was always aware of my use of this phrase in the act of writing, I was not aware of how often it came up and how my intended (and unintended) meaning of it shifted from place to place. One meaning, as I understand and at times intended it, is the process by which events, ideas, objects or subjects take on meaning within a framework of knowledge that renders them intelligible according to its own system (fragmented though it may be). In this sense, to make some/thing *make sense* is to impart coherent meaning to it through references to other meanings in logical and consistent ways. In the alternate sense, the meaning is nearly opposite. To literally make some/thing sensory is to attend to the hidden or invisible aspects of social life that are not apparent, often because they *do not* "make sense" in the first meaning of the phrase. In this way, making sensory such matters as ghosts is a process of unmaking and remaking what are apparently systematically coherent meanings. In my footnote in Chapter 4 I wrote that I intentionally left the meaning of my "make sense" phrases open – can making sense happen both ways, simultaneously?

In terms of my own subjectivity, I made sense of, and was made sense by, the inquiry involved in the writing of this thesis, in both meanings of the phrase. I was imbued with authorial intent and the capacity to write sentences and ideas that were intelligible to others because they fit a particular set of knowledges. I came to understand myself as the product of a culture of systematic racism, which on one hand requires (productively, I think) imagining an exclusively linear connection between past and present – in this case, the imbrication of race with

settler feminism in the early twentieth century is conceived of as laying a foundation upon which a racist culture could be built. This is a sense-making project in the first sense of the phrase; I found a way to fit myself into a chain of historical events in ways that fit quite readily with modern sensibilities, despite their underlying critique. On the other hand, I found myself paying attention to ghosts, and not paying attention to the fact that some of my thoughts about race, history, politics, the research process and subjectivity were quite incompatible with others. This was a practice in sense-making that served to undo the chain of logic into which I had fit myself. Attending to the hauntings that I, like the figure in *In Passing,* bumped into when I began to interrogate the memories of others required that I also let go of a view of myself as cohesive, or as the simple product of a transparent history; as it turns out, things are much more complicated than that. Not only are the stories of the UFWA and AR vastly more complicated than could ever be satisfactorily (from a positivist perspective) described or accounted for, but my attempt to grasp these stories and their meanings could not be entirely consistent *because* of their complexity, and because my own thoughts and experiences are complicated as well. This is indicative of the way that knowledge production and subjectivity are inextricably bound to one another (Foucault, 1979; Smart, 2002; Weedon, 1987); not only am I positioned in the act of research and writing as a subject who knows, but I also actively constitute both myself and others as objects/subjects of that knowledge in the first place. But as Stuart Hall points out, subjectivity, despite being fleeting, is not entirely an illusion:

> It is *something* - not a mere trick of the imagination. It has its histories
> - and histories have their real, material and symbolic effects. The past

continues to speak to us. But it no longer addresses us as a simple, factual 'past', since our relation to it, like the child's relation to the mother, is always-already 'after the break'. It is always constructed through memory, fantasy, narrative and myth (1990, p. 226).

And in being *some/thing,* I would like to claim, as Gordon (2008) maintains we can and should, the subjective agency to do with history, and with ghosts, what seems the intuitively right thing to do, moment to moment, with an understanding that what seems "intuitively right" is arrived at *through* attention to and engagement with other voices, living and dead, past present and future, as well as our own. *Claiming* this responsibility is risky, not only because *I am not alone* and am therefore accountable to others, but because my subjectivity, through which I *act*, has consequences; writing this text opens up the possibility of encounters and responses that I cannot anticipate.

I wrote the chapters of this thesis in chronological order and have left them very nearly as they were originally written. Consequently, there is a marked difference that gradually occurred somewhere between the first and second halves, and this difference is evident not only in the different theoretical approaches toward "understanding" particular sets of discourse, but also in the epistemological assumptions underlying such claims and the language used to describe them. The first chapter situates the UFWA and AR in linear relation to each other; I argued that the discourses produced in the early twentieth century, themselves both product and instrument of already existing discourses, laid a foundation for a particular way of thinking about, valuing and categorising race in contemporary cultures of racism (Goldberg, 1993). I wrote about early liberal feminism in Canada as though it is a singular event, relegated to a singular time

period – the past, where it is meant to stay. Using this logic to make knowledge claims, and using the language of "connections," "linkages" and "legacies," represented an adherence on my part to modernist epistemology and history; events happen in unidirectional order, with causal influence upon one another, and in ways that are both understandable and monadic. In a way, it is possible for me to understand myself as a ghost in the early parts of this thesis – my presence and my identity, itself constituted by innumerable and complicated hauntings, was in part (comfortably) constructed into this modernist story without any acknowledgement on my part that I was *there*. It would take many more pages of writing before I would be able to recognise that a particular aspect of my subjectivity was *missing* from, but ultimately informing, my early story of the UFWA and AR, and that that missing presence would eventually unsettle the entire process of inquiry involved in this project.

Moreover, my thoughts about the topic of my research changed significantly across the time it took to write each section. When it came time to write the "analysis" chapter, it turned out quite differently than I could ever have anticipated in the early stages of developing this project, and much of this is due to the concrete institutional and relational conditions under which I began my project. Chapter 4 is an attempt to deconstruct linearity, traditional history and modernist logic, not by abandoning these ideas altogether, but by exploring alternatives, even if those alternatives occur *as well as* rather than *instead of*. It does, however, abandon any hope of understanding or explanation, in the sense that is commonly employed in positivistic social scientific research. I made a

"case study in haunting" (Gordon, 2008) rather than a systematic analysis that would rely on a positivist understanding of the transparency of textual "evidence" and organised around a consistent internal logic. Is this approach entirely inconsistent with earlier chapters[*]?

After writing Chapter 4, I worried that I may have to go back and significantly change, or even re-write, earlier chapters in order to give the impression that this project was internally consistent, and that I was already a "knower" from the very beginning. But it was not written like that, and it seemed somewhat of a falsity, and would certainly be at philosophical odds with my values as a researcher, to re-construct the project in that way. It would be at odds with my values because I do not view my "researching" self as a subject who already knows; the process of inquiry happened *while* I was writing rather than before (Richardson, 1988). Leaving the chapters to a large extent as they were originally written provides, I believe, a valuable insight into the way that research is practiced – where a project begins is not always where it ends up (see, for instance, Carolyn Ellis, 2009). The disjuncture between one way of approaching this research and another is appropriate because that is exactly what my hope turned out to be for this research; as the process of research unfolded, I became more clear about wanting to draw attention to things taken for granted and

---

[*] *"In your proem, the person who asks you 'What are you doing in your thesis?' is constructed as intimidating, bringing to the fore your own preliminary doubts and fears about not making sense. But having written the thesis, having "made sense" to yourself in the process of writing it, you now have something to take back to that figure -- a figure perhaps now representing your readers. And perhaps you might now consider your readers not simply as possible sources of intimidation (though they always will be that ...) but as future partners in dialogue. And perhaps what you 'owe' is less to the UFWA than to them."*

unsettle them in the process. Now, I want to show that the social world under study and the subjectivity of the person making that study are not consistently understandable or stable across time. I did not plan for there to be a disjuncture, but its presence coincidentally makes a point that I only realised after completing the fourth chapter. This is where it is important to draw attention to the claim of authorial intent in the face of tension between intent on the one hand (which is often conflated with a position of *already knowing*), and inconsistency on the other; my thoughts about the project were contradictory, but inconsistency is not necessarily undesirable, nor may complete consistency actually be an achievable quality. I meant what I wrote at every stage and my decision to leave in and attend to some of these disjunctures was made thoughtfully[*], despite the fact that I did not predict their occurrence.

Recognising that the later chapters were written from a different epistemological position is not to say that the earlier chapters of this work are valuable *only* in that they make a point about the process of inquiry. Any aspect of social life can be approached in multiple ways, and I believe that there may be great value in occasionally relying on language and concepts that are problematic in order to interrogate what it is that makes them problematic in the first place. The theoretical work done in the first chapters is important despite (and in certain respects *because of*) the fact that I resort to modernist logic. Its importance lies in the use of language such as "systematic racism", "racist culture", and "the

---

[*] *"You have given yourself permission to follow your intuitions, and doing so has empowered you to write. But now, do you treat those intuitions as sacrosanct, or do you offer them -- and what they gave you -- as an invitation to response?"*

foundational imbrication of racism and imperialism;" these phrases draw attention the ways in which violences and injustices *are* systematically and institutionally produced, as well as suffered as actualities, through particular, patterned arrangements of power that have undeniably material consequences for the subjects of their aim. Using such language and such a concept of the relationship of the present to the past is useful for what was an intended purpose. The way that that language and epistemology stood in marked contrast to my later understanding of the research became useful later for a decidedly different purpose: it shows that I, as researcher, do not *know* in entirely cohesive ways, that the issues I am trying to understand are not necessarily better apprehended (if they can be apprehended at all) one way than another, at least not in a sense that I can ultimately be judge of. At various times throughout the research process my subjectivity was constituted differently. Viewing the research process as both a production of knowledge on the part of the researcher, as well as the production of the researcher as an effect of that knowledge, offers another layer to the interrogation itself and gives rise again to some of the metaphysical questions that have become so integral to critical, postfoundational research; the asking of these questions then indicates the opening up of dialogue, critique and engagement with the worlds of others.

**The writing and uses of history**

I have described this project throughout the thesis as one of constructing an alternative history. As mentioned in the above section, I have wondered about

the ethics and potential implications of writing about history, and one important issue that arises in all research is whether or not the subjects or groups researched have been justly represented. To that end, I would like to disclose an important feature of this text; the *American Renaissance* article "re-printed" at the end of Chapter 4 was not written by Thomas Johnson; *I* wrote it (as you may or may not have guessed).

The article is composed in part of sentences or parts of sentences that were taken from a variety of already-published AR articles. The bulk of it, however, was written by me, in the way I imagine *it could have been*. It is a constructive act of imagination that both disregards conventional notions of evidence and serves as a parody of a particular, violent history, as well as of the ways in which historical claims are understood as intelligible. I tried to inhabit a particular authorial voice in order to turn it on itself; the analytic work that I hope this accomplishes occurs in large part by delaying this "reveal" (in fact, I contemplated leaving only a small disclosing footnote with no in-depth explanation at all). Not providing any satisfactory explanation would have forced *you*, the reader, to wonder about it on your own terms, and there is something appealing about leaving something so unresolved given the issues I am exploring here. However, I decided that an explanation *is* in order, along with an invitation to you to consider some of the following questions: what was your reaction to the article when you first read it? Was it believable, surprising, obviously not *"real"*? Were you relieved to find such a bit of textual evidence that made previous claims about "connections" more concrete? Or did encountering such "evidence" disturb

what was previously described as an imagined, or mediated, relationship between AR and the UFWA? What are you thinking now, knowing that I fabricated an article and impersonated the magazine it "belongs" to? Is that an injustice to AR? To the UFWA[*]? Is it wrong to create an article that makes such violent claims, and makes them in a way that we commonly encounter, a way that seems intelligible?

In my view, the article serves several purposes. First, it draws attention to a number of metaphysical questions about authorship and evidence because it is an imitation; it shows that a text may be believable if it adheres to "rules" that are familiar. Part of the work of disruption is accomplished through the blurring of the distinction between "authentic" AR articles, or evidence more generally, and a fictional imposter, as the construction of histories and knowledge claims that lend support to AR's politics is simply a matter of adopting a particular authorial position and drawing upon particular techniques for *making sense* within a set of familiar parameters. AR didn't write it, but *they could have*. I don't believe that any of the claims in the article would be refuted by AR authors; in fact, I wouldn't be surprised if they considered it publishable material.

I was encouraged by Gordon's use of fiction and imagination to disrupt the idea of history by simultaneously disregarding as well as adhering to its rules, producing something at once fallacious and yet perfectly within the realm of the sayable. Must I be concerned about the "accuracy" of my representation of

---

[*] *"I cannot and should not expect you to be bound by the same moral imperatives as me, because your encounter with the UFWA was as a dossier, and that is something very different from my encounter, and generates different imperatives. But can our different approaches and loyalties be brought into dialogue?"*

history, especially given *this* history's violences? My answer to that is yes, I am concerned about the ethics of doing such a thing, but not enough to leave the article out of the thesis. Perhaps I do not owe the UFWA and AR the same things that someone else, with a different set of memories and circumstances, might; but perhaps those accounts need to be written *as well,* and most importantly with an aim to conversation and mutual critique with, rather than *instead of.* The imagined article is an attempt to subvert the things that brought it into the realm of possibility in the first place; if I have succeeded at imitating a certain authorial voice by drawing upon its own techniques in order to expose them, then I have gone partway toward rethinking, or re-imagining, what it could look like to produce knowledge that disrupts as it reproduces.

Second, it provides the opportunity to ask readers directly about their reactions to, and expectations of, texts that produce, or imitate the production of, particular knowledges, and to invite them to engage critically with my story. This opportunity is twofold; questions arise about what it means to parody AR using their own techniques and to draw the UFWA into a conversation that never really took place, but questions also arise about the place of that parody within the larger text of this thesis, itself a knowledge-producing text that relies upon its own techniques of persuasion. What counts as knowledge? What does "revealing" the artificiality of a text accomplish? Can the parodied text be considered artificial at all? I am not claiming to have answers to these questions, but I think there is something useful, or generative, about the contradiction of writing a critique of modern history-making that includes a completely imaginary putting-together of

131

pieces of modern history in a way that reinforces it (it is, after all, a connection that AR could very well have made themselves, and it reproduces a familiar logic), but disrupts it in its falsity. The potential that this creates for readers to think about their own expectations is valuable if it draws attention to the taken for granted ways in which we understand knowledge claims. What are your expectations of research and knowledge production, particularly as it is made in this academic context, and do they always align with your politics? Has what I have written here always aligned with mine?

This leads me to the third point, which is that the imaginary article draws attention to the making and uses of histories. History is always already an act of imagination – certain patterns are more likely to be reproduced than others, but stories of past and future are always constructed and are always the product of particular politics (Foucault, 1979; Said, 1979; Brown, 2008). The ways in which certain historical imaginaries become possibilities are, however, closely linked to the way in which we perceive historical facts; history is *not* (usually) open to being radically re-invented, despite its imaginary qualities, because imaginary representations are still tied in some way to perceptions of *what and who really happened*. Showing how a history can be fabricated in order to make AR's point about racial difference makes obvious the ways in which history is amenable to the purposes of the author, albeit within these confines.

But the rest of this thesis is a fiction as well, and it required that I make my own version of history to serve my own purposes, which are also informed by a particular politics: "questions of narrative structuring, constructedness, analytic

standpoint, and historical provisionality of claims to knowledge … [point] to the ways in which our stories can be understood as fictions of the real" (Gordon, 2008, p. 11). I cannot indict AR's strategic use of history without also recognising my own; my version of history is constructed within many of the same confines, including the arrangement of this text into an institutionally prescribed form, the institutional context in which it will be read, and the benefit to me from having produced an intelligible, academic text that will give me institutional credit. But on the other hand, my version is an attempt to explore, however much it wavers, an alternative epistemology and politics, a critique of knowledge production where knowledge is conceived as fiction rather than truth, and the social world under "study" is taken to be more complicated, more intensely personal and sensual than could ever be satisfactorily described; the foundation for this critique is the discursively violent production of subjects who are systematically subjected to other violences, both epistemic and physical.

My aim, therefore, is to trouble the use of history to justify violence, hatred, exclusion, subjection and inequality on the basis of race, and this is (partially) accomplished by drawing attention to the frames of reference that make such exclusions ongoing, everyday occurrences. Without alternatives to modern history-making, familiar venues of knowledge production and dissemination, or systems of judging claims to make more or less sense according to how well they correspond to modern epistemology, it becomes increasingly difficult to create knowledge that disrupts these systematic, but often invisible, modes of exclusion. As mentioned in Chapter 4, it is not only the content of modern histories, nor the

fact that this content takes on common-sense status, that makes them problematic; it is the *very practice* of modern history-making, with its reliance upon modern sensibilities (linearity, empiricism, objectivity, distinctions between knowers and objects of knowledge, the existence of a stable social reality and stable subjectivities, etc.), that makes racial prejudices and inequalities, in their present form as foundational to discourses of nationalism and citizenship, possible in the first place (Gilroy, 1993; Said, 1979). That is why I chose not only to call into question the specific claims and techniques of AR and the UFWA, but also to attempt, while still within narrow confines, to write a history that does not always adhere to the familiar rules of history-making, imbricated as they are with the (re)production of racism. And because I am operating within the limits of language and the limited possible ways in which language can be arranged and communicated while remaining understandable, a fabricated, inauthentic article is one possible way in which the fictional qualities of knowledge production can be brought directly to the fore.

However, just like my critique of AR and the effects of their use of history, my own use of history must be done thoughtfully and with a mind toward acknowledging who and what is (re)produced through it. This thesis is in many ways about voices – voices of the UFWA and AR, voices of those subjects rendered missing or marginalized, my own voice in reconstructing (or imitating) a version of history that stands in contrast to the versions of others. It is about *my encounter* with them, but it is also about stories, imagination and *fictions of the real*, what it means to write a thesis and what it means for others to encounter it. I

134

have insisted that my version of things is just that: one version amongst many. So what about the others?

I am left with a conflict between believing in the multiplicity and fictional quality of truth claims on the one hand, and feeling as though *my* version is "better" on the other; better because it *critiques* relations of *power* and the resulting experiences of subjectivity and embodiment that I find harmful, violent, falsely unequal and highly problematic. But the grounds of my critique, which are rooted in an epistemology of fracture, imagination and multiplicity, actually throw into question the critique itself. If my version of the histories of the UFWA, AR, nation-making, and my own subjectivity is only one version, and if it shares equal claims to veracity as that of AR, for instance, then the question becomes *what is the relationship between antifoundational epistemology and the politics of critique?*

To fully investigate this relationship would require the writing of another thesis. To begin to answer it in relatively simple terms, however, it comes down to the questions of ethics raised in Chapters 2 and 5. The practice of knowledge production requires asking an ongoing question: *what is the right thing to do right now?* What are my politics right now? How do I feel about what I perceive as an injustice *right now*? I cannot account for all things at once – to do so, or to believe that doing so is possible, refers again to the foundationalist epistemology I am trying to avoid. And I am trying to avoid it *because* any attempt imagining an alternative epistemology is a fruitful and politically desirable event; alternative ways of knowing draw attention to the ways in which we think about and

experience the world and our own bodies, and this may perhaps raise the smallest doubt that our thoughts and experiences are natural and immutable, the smallest hope, or fear, depending upon who you are and the particular circumstances you are in, that things can be different. The things we then choose to attend to are the effect of our daily lives, the memories we encounter in them and the ways they make us feel. But this thesis is not only the result of how I feel; the politics by which I am informed rest on a number of assumptions as well, perhaps most obviously about the meaning of *power*, which I have taken for granted as something real that exists and operates in ways to produce particular exclusions.

It is this assumption that leads me to be concerned primarily with the voices of the people whose subjectivities have been violently denied, or confined in particular ways, as effects of discourses of the type engaged in (though differently) by AR and the UFWA, and this concern outweighs (but by no means eradicates), at the moment, my concern for the voices of the UFWA members or AR authors themselves, or the people whose lives and experiences rely upon a particular conception of their mothers, fathers, and friends, when their mothers, fathers and friends write articles for AR or were proud members of the UFWA. And if we all have our own versions of things, informed by our own experiences and politics, then how can we recognize one another with respect, and recognize *in* one another the indescribably complicated reasons that we write or tell the stories we do?

Part of the reason that our lives are indescribably complicated is that they are complicated *in relation* to one another and in relation to the various forces,

events, *things,* that make up the world in which we live. Who did I write this thesis to and for? Who is going to respond and how? How are their responses, imagined or otherwise, and my challenge to them mutually co-constitutive? Knowledge and experiences that make or unmake sense do so in relation to the knowledges and experiences of others. So in recognizing that I may have not delivered what I owe to the people I have (mis)represented or left out altogether, I must acknowledge the conflicts that have arisen in, or become apparent through, my encounter with them and the various voices, including my own, that are struggling to be heard (or to be heard differently) throughout this text, as well as in my thoughts as I continue to think about it, in the thoughts of the people who read this thesis, and in the daily lives of all people whose embodied existences rely on the meanings of race and nation.

But beyond this process of self-reflection, what is to be done about the questions of writing and representation raised here? Part of the answer lies in a move to encounter and to engage with alternative versions from people who construct what *they* owe (perhaps to AR, to the UFWA, or entirely different sets of memories and histories), and to facilitate a mutual conversation and critique between them. The ethical questions concern me, but I cannot come to terms with them alone. Perhaps someone will encounter these histories and be motivated, as I was, to write an alternative; perhaps I will encounter someone else's memories and be motivated to re-imagine my own account. But it is only through encounters with *others* that these questions may become more thoughtfully articulated, so that the responses may be listened to more closely.

**Subjectivity and corporeality**

In Chapter 2, I stated that "it is always important to ask oneself why [a story] was articulated this way and not that; what are the constructive implications of this particular articulation for myself and for others?" (p. 24). To return to the issues of embodiment and the ethics of writing, which were largely left behind in Chapter 4, I believe that asking this question again in this concluding chapter is prudent. The question is really threefold: How do categories of citizenship construct particular corporealities, and vice versa? How does my re-telling of a history serve to unsettle and/or reinforce these corporealities? How is my own embodied subjectivity predicated upon both the histories I have interrogated here, as well as the act of interrogating them? And lastly, how, in articulating these questions, do I now speak and act with a mind toward accountability for the people with whom my life is mutually constituted?

The category of citizenship is an inherently corporeal one. Producing or referring to this category is an act of segregating and demarcating the boundaries between who is included within national borders and thus afforded the attending privilege of real citizenship, and who remains on the outside of that distinction; this demarcation carries real, embodied consequences. Can I physically reside within a country, without fear of being forcibly removed? Can I reside within a country without fear of physical violence? Can I reside within a country without being subject to ongoing questions about where I am "really from" (Thobani, 2007)? Can I hold the privilege of citizenship without feeling as though I am a debtor to some act of benevolence on the part of those who are "really" on the

inside (my debt being on the basis of the colour of my skin, the clothing I wear, the cultural practices I engage in)? Is citizenship available to me only on the basis that I disavow the cultural context in which I came to be an embodied subject? And beyond these questions that pertain to the everyday life of subjects, there are questions of how citizenship is defined on the basis of international movements of bodies. Without the flux of bodily migration between nations there would be no opportunity for those very national borders to be continually reinforced, or continually re-inscribed with meaning.

As I detailed in Chapter 1, "citizenship, as the quintessential hallmark of liberal democracy, was … racialised from its very importation into the country" (Thobani, 2007, p. 82). In Canada's case, citizenship has been an endeavour in preserving whiteness and the attendant system of white supremacy that has (tenuous) roots in modern imperialism. Thus, citizenship is symbolic of already existing orders of racial power; it was created with a mind to progress, but who is included and benefitted by this story of progress has been severely delimited on the basis of racial and cultural essentialism. Where citizenship is evoked (and it is evoked *constantly* in the ways we imagine ourselves to be members of nations, the ways we imagine our bodily migrations to be limited and controlled according to national borders), a certain epistemic violence is perpetrated; it is a discursive act of exclusion, and it is manifest in innumerable ways. From the ways in which our bodies are managed, documented and surveilled in travel, to news about elections, governments and armies, to national celebrations, to my neighbour's placement of an Iranian flag in his window at a time and place where to be

Muslim is often construed as threatening to white, Western values, we are aware of divisions between inside/outside and the immense impact of such a distinction. And in the singular (but not clearly discrete) example of the UFWA and AR, we have seen a very few of the possible ways in which racism and nationalism are continually invoked and reproduced through discourse, the telling of histories, myths, memories, and imaginations.

Thus, language and practices participate in (but do not determine) the construction of particular corporealities: "meaningful, textual, sensual, lived, performative, fleshed bodies can only exist within and through articulations of culture(s). In this way, the body is always already entangled in the dialectics of cultural production" (Newman & Giardina, 2011, p. 40). While my research has not looked explicitly at embodiment, it is nonetheless inherently bound up in the politics of the production of embodied subjects, particularly and most intimately myself. To reiterate a point made in Chapter 2, as hard as I tried to write this historical account conscientiously, paying mind to the ways in which my representation of particular people, events and subjects could produce harmful effects or reproduce knowledges that intrude upon the bodily existences of others, I cannot account for the all of the possible ways in which my writing is complicit in the politics it attempts to critique, nor for the ways in which "speaking for" others entangles me within that complicity in unexpected ways. Because of the limits of language and subjectivity, I know that I have relied upon problematic ideas. I, like everyone, operate within particular discursive limits (Hall, 2007) that define the realm of what is sayable. I have invoked categories of race and

citizenship in order to deconstruct them, and I have pieced together histories of people who might disagree with my rendition, as well as of people whose material lives and self-consciousnesses might be harmed by the perpetuation or resurrection of such histories. Translating thought into text requires that I participate in the construction of particular corporealities, for myself and for others, in ways that I cannot fully imagine now, and which I may see differently when I look back at this research in the future. Andrew Sparkes aptly describes my own feelings about attending to the processes by which knowledge is made:

> As part of this process, I have begun to recognise the implications of Richardson's (1994) thoughts on writing as a method of inquiry and her recent call to extend our reflexivity to the study of our writing practices. Here, we are invited to reflect on and share with other researchers our "writing stories," or stories about how we came to construct the particular texts that we did (1996, p. 484).

It is my hope that my attention to the rememories (to borrow a term from Toni Morrison that has been used by Gordon in an attempt to think imaginatively beyond the limits of *history*) of the UFWA and AR in the various ways that I have done here will leave many more questions open than closed, and will evoke or invite response and critique from those subjects in relation to whom *my* subjectivity is constructed. It is certainly the case that I opened many questions about my own embodied subjectivity and about the process of knowledge production. In acknowledging the oft-concealed histories of what it means to be a white citizen of a Western democracy, I have had to come to terms with the fact that I am a subject whose existence depends in large part upon the ongoing subjection and disavowal of Others who are not like me, who are constructed as

embodying the edges of the particular social world to which I "belong." I have had to re-member parts of my own subjective and embodied history in light of this, and I have had my attention drawn more closely to my everyday practices and encounters because of it. I have become more sensitive to the moments when something has eerily reminded me of something else, or when my thoughts turn to something unexpectedly in the moment of encountering the memories of someone or sometime else. I see in my own body and its practices the presence of such hauntings I have investigated in this research, and I am at a loss as to how to imagine a different embodied politics despite attempts to become more aware of hidden histories and their non-linear relation to one another (and this is where my desire to *engage* with others is felt most keenly). I am a subject of the *image of history* I attempted to capture[*], and I am both there, as an effect and instrument of it, and not-there, in that I cannot yet know all of the particularities and convergences of the memories that operate from *moment to moment to constitute and re-constitute my subjectivity* and the subjectivities of others.

To return, then, to the idea of *making sense*, I wonder about the act of rendering sensory the "missing subjects" that I refer to in Chapter 4. If I am re-

---

[*] *"In finding yourself 'at a loss', in recognizing hauntings in your embodied practices, your self-conceptions, your thinking, do you become in a way, an eerie, unsettled and unsettling companion (or even daughter ...) of United Farm Women, sharing in some way their experience of dwelling in houses they and you wish to dismantle, but without knowing quite how, being still half-within? To push a bit further, are you in a process of learning to be critical of the UFWA while also learning not to 'other' the UFWA as a convenient means to distance yourself from the dilemmas you share (albeit in different ways) with them? Is it that lostness which allows you also now to become more open to wondering about those who were/are 'othered' by the discourse that the UFWA statements are implicated in, wondering about how they are also other to you?"*

membered and re-constituted in the act of writing, there might be some way in which thinking about alternative histories in ways that account for their vast complexity is an act of re-membering other subjects as well – that is, putting them together again (as the opposite of *dismember*) in ways that begin to make them visible, or begin to conjure in one's imagination what they might look like. If boundaries between past, present and future are, as I have attempted to describe here, unclear (thus making distinctions between them an act in service of the politics of traditional history), then we need only make ourselves available to the experiences of haunting, and learn to listen for and *answer to* the voices we hear, in order to begin to see what and who are seemingly not-there. *Who are those shadowy subjects?*

**Coda**



Fig. 3: *Freg & Oli,* Split toned gelatin silver print from series *Elephants*, 2007, Osheen Harruthoonyan [www.osheen.ca]. Reprinted with permission.

In the final paragraph of *Ghostly Matters* (2008), Gordon writes that "ultimately haunting is about how to transform a shadow of a life into an undiminished life whose shadows touch softly in the spirit of a peaceful reconciliation" (p. 208). When we see a haunting (as in the case of AR and the

UFWA) or when we realise that the very same (and more) spectres are haunting our thoughts and actions as we go about recognising that case of haunting, it is a process of unveiling things hidden. I have not "finished" this process here, but I hope I have begun it; just as the image *Freg & Oli* (see Figure 3) simultaneously evokes feelings of nostalgia as well as an eerie sense of discomfort, so too does a recognition of the superimposition of past, present and future, or the presences of long-forgotten ghosts. Understanding time in this way is both the effect and the instrument of a certain kind of *sensuous* knowledge (Gordon, 2008). Sensuous knowledge is embodied, affective; it is a process of animation, both on the part of the sign containing the remnants of ghosts (which in this case included texts, unself-conscious acts that reproduce notions of citizenship), and on the part of the subject who attends to it. The subject who recognises a ghost is animated, *motivated*: "You are *already* involved, implicated, in one way or another, and this is why, if you don't banish it, or kill it, or reduce it to something you can already manage, when it appears to you, the ghost will inaugurate the necessity of doing something about it" (ibid., p. 205-206). In coming to recognise ghosts[23] in the racial politics of AR and the UFWA, I was moved to write about them in a particular way, to recognise my own complicity in and dependence upon them,

---

[23] The process of recognition, referred to numerous times throughout this thesis, may be better described as a process of *mis*recognition, whereby the act of recognition always involves the making of an illusory distinction between the thing recognised and others (Helstein, 2007). In recognising a haunting, for instance, one must draw arbitrary borders around that thing which haunts in order to name it, but it is important to remain aware that such an identification is never made transparently.

and to pay more thoughtful attention to my own embodiment, memories, imagination and sense of eeriness, of out-of-placeness, in my everyday life.

An epistemology that requires attention to sensualities, corporealities, histories and memories will necessarily implicate the individualized subject who inquires about, or who encounters, daily aspects of social life that leave him or her wondering about possible connections, vague familiarities, what it means to feel the loss of something that you cannot identify, or that you would be uncomfortable calling your own. Accepting that you are *already involved* in ways that are too numerous and convoluted to describe is an act of vulnerability: *have I really had a part in this?* Which may be followed by: *how can I conjure and describe this loss, and my part in it, and how can I contribute imaginatively to reckoning with it, in part by appealing to an engaged relation with others?* But beyond what I have so far been motivated to do here, I have yet to see what attention to ghosts may mean for me and the future production of knowledge(s) in which I may be involved. However, the parts of this thesis that focus on my own subjectivity in relation to the subjectivities of others are particularly important for opening up further questions about *what is to be done*; encountering moments, feelings or images that speak to us about the complicated interactions between past and future that are giving rise *to this moment* incites within us the desire to imagine and *do* differently (Gordon, 1999, 2008). Imagining differently requires also that we imagine ourselves, and *do ourselves,* differently, as constantly and vulnerably coming into being through knowledge, politics and power, with the hope that the experiences of ongoing violence and subjugation may be reckoned

with:

> How can we organise these huge, randomly varied, and diverse things we call human subjects into positions where they can recognise one another for long enough to act together, and thus to take up a position that one of these days they might live out and act through as an identity. Identity is at the end, not the beginning, of the paradigm. Identity is what is at stake in any viable notion of political organization (Hall, quoted in Giroux, 2011, p. 6).

I do not pretend that this particular case study in haunting points the way toward a previously unimagined transformation of some kind, but the above quote may point toward some of the possibilities of political and pedagogical action. As a study in methodology and epistemology, however, I hope that this text helps to evoke imaginative ways of recognising and understanding everyday social and historical encounters that are not *entirely* or *fatally* limited by modern logic; the process of understanding (in very fragmented and fleeting ways) does not have to *make sense* only as enclosed within a dominant system of knowledge, and it may very well (un)*make sense* if it attends to things such as ghosts, spectres, imaginaries, intuitive and affective responses. Or, as in this particular case, it may do some combination of both. Making a case study in haunting (and I say *making* because it is a constructive process rather than an enactment of a pre-determined process, the idea that research is "done" when it is done in institutionally acceptable ways) as Gordon encourages us to do, is to open oneself to the possibility that (temporarily) unseen, unheard or unfelt presences can be illuminated creatively, imaginatively, and, most importantly, critically and with a mind toward social justice (which usually involves reflection upon the ways in which we are complicit, *already involved*, and yet capable of seeing or conjuring

things in intentionally disruptive ways). It involves an ongoing interrogation –
what is missing? How can I understand the depth of that loss? And how can I
piece things together in order to name it and begin to come to terms with it? It
requires that we welcome *feelings of wonder and eeriness* as signs that
some/thing, someone or sometime else is present, acting upon us in ways that we
can only ever imagine.

# Chapter 6

Introduction to Chapter 1, Redux

> We will not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will
> be to arrive where we started and to know the place for the first time.

> -T. S. Eliot, <u>No. 4 of Four Quartets</u>, 1942

This project began with general questions about the meaning and history of race: how has race been historically constructed? What is the importance of history for contemporary understandings of race? How have categories of race been bound up with other exclusionary categories, such as nationhood or citizenship? As particular avenues through which to investigate, or interrogate, these questions, I chose to look directly at two particular groups, events, ideas, discourses or moments in time (or all of the above). My reasons for choosing these two particular groups seemed, at the time, rather arbitrary. In fact, I am inclined to say that the specifics about *who* or *what* these groups are is not nearly so important as the simple fact that they, like innumerable others, have explicitly figured the concepts of race, nation and citizenship prominently within their concerns. And what is perhaps *most* interesting is that their concerns, like innumerable others, are articulated in direct conversation with the past in the hopes of informing the future. So while this is a project about race on the one hand, it is perhaps more concerned with examining and re-constructing, or re-configuring, moments in history in relation to one another. A further set of questions may be therefore asked: how have these two groups understood

themselves in relation to history, and what informs this understanding? How does a modern concept of history contribute to ongoing violences and inequalities on the basis of race? How does the construction of a white, nationalist identity rely upon a particular relational configuration between past, present and future?

There are infinite ways in which to begin interrogating these questions and working toward imagining other possibilities for being. But here is the basic methodological problem that arises when one actually begins to make research that is critical of broad, systematically (re)produced knowledges of race: how have national histories produced embodied subjects whose consciousnesses and experiences of the world are bounded by inequalities and violences through their continual (re)construction as objects toward which the knowledges that enable these inequalities are aimed? To what extent is it possible to work toward undermining and destabilising the histories of nations and citizens, along with their imbrication with racism, colonialism and imperialism, without reifying, reproducing or relying upon the very ideas, language and forms that are foundational to these histories/discourses/knowledges? And if it is possible, then *how,* and to what effect?

It is clearly *not* possible to account for all of the effects of one's knowledge claims; nor is it possible, if one holds an anti-foundational epistemological-ontological position, to delineate or determine a methodical approach to such research that does not rely in some way upon foundationalism, or upon traditional understandings of history, or of what it means to write coherently and according to some internal (or external) chain of logic. So as I

think about how to go about beginning, or imagining, research into the general topics of nation, citizenship, race and history, I am particularly concerned about the foundationalist logic that underlies modern history-making (why are *practices* of historical study often understood as ahistorical?) and empiricism (is historical evidence found, or made?). I want to produce knowledge that critiques the inequalities and violences that are enabled by particular concepts and categories of race and nation, but it seems that such a critique can be most effectively directed toward the epistemologies and ontologies that make such concepts possible. Knowledge claims *makes sense* in part through their relation to other knowledges that are understood in particular ways across time. Looking critically at nation- and race-making practices across time requires, therefore, an interrogation of the very concept of history; how are knowledges situated in relation to one another across time, in systematic ways that serve to reproduce the foundation for such knowledges to exist in the first place? And how, then, can critical historical research imagine alternative ways in which to understand history, the present moment, and the relation of both to future imaginaries?

Thus, the task of producing alternative, critical knowledge claims *about* and *through* history is necessarily bound to the politics of the present, navigated through the politics of past and future. This is the point Wendy Brown makes when she describes the political potential of alternative (in this case *genealogical*) history-making: "in posing the question 'who are we [right now]?' genealogy attaches both history and philosophy to a political task…it aims to make visible why particular positions and visions of the future occur to us" (Brown, 2008, p.

151

109). Making such alternative histories requires particular avenues through which to do so, but ultimately involves a more general adherence to a politics and a philosophy of critique, of imagination and of possibility. That is why, in introducing this thesis research, I have not yet mentioned which specific histories I intend to draw upon in navigating the process of history-making (and, consequently, the making of myself and others), nor will I describe with any singularity a proposed vision for the future.

So without promise of "solution" at the end of this thesis, but in hopes of inviting dialogue[24], to begin to expose the contingencies of our historical imaginations I will be looking at two particular historical moments, or events, through which the questions posed above may begin to be investigated. I am taking as a starting point for this project the existence of "racist culture," or a culture of white supremacy, which has emerged and been maintained in particular ways since, and prior to, the foundation of modern nation-states (Goldberg, 1993; hooks, 1992; Omi & Winant, 2006; Thobani, 2007; Winant, 2006). To this end, one of the groups chosen was, I initially thought, a "representative" of early nation-building ideology in Canada; The United Farm Women of Alberta is particularly interesting in this respect because of their role in the early women's rights, agrarian democracy, institutionalisation and eugenics movements of the 1920s (roles that often did not entirely align with other political projects the

---

[24] I have chosen to include Dr. Ramp's voice directly within the text as one way of conceiving, and conveying, knowledge construction as a mutual encounter and as always open to dialogue. This is just one way, and one voice. But including it offers one more opportunity to invite dialogue from others through the complication of knowledge claims made in texts such as this one.

UFWA as an organisation, or individual members, took on, but which, nonetheless, were part of complicated *conditions of possibility* for the emergence/maintenance of race-based national identity). To look at the contemporary moment, which I originally conceived of as comparative due to its perceived distinctness from "the past," I chose the magazine *American Renaissance* for its unabashed propagation of white nationalism and paleoconservative racial politics. As mentioned above, however, there is nothing about these two groups, for lack of a better term, that would make this research project untenable without them. In fact, given the idea that racism is embedded within the very foundation of North American culture, claims about the superiority of the white race and the corresponding degeneracy of non-white races can be thought of as the very logical extreme of systematic racial prejudice of the type that has existed since, and prior to, the inception of modern North American nations; there is no shortage of "material" from which to draw when one wants to investigate these issues.

On top of there being no shortage of "material," there are also innumerable possible ways to go about "tracing," or making, various (dis)articulations between these two groups, produced as they are by already existing sets of racial knowledge, classification and evaluation, and by the modern establishment and ongoing maintenance of Western, liberal democratic nations (amongst infinite others). Acknowledging how vastly complicated social life and history are eventually becomes a productive starting point for me. So while I say that I could just as easily have chosen other histories to navigate, as it turns out

there *is* a particular reason why I chose to look at AR and the UFWA that has to do with the complexity of social life – I chose them because I encountered them at such a time, and in such a way, that they seemed to be connected, even if I couldn't fully articulate why. *Something* about AR seemed to resonate with echoes of UFWA voices, and something about the future imagined by the UFWA seemed to be in uncanny and direct conversation *with* that future. The process of putting together these two histories in ways that recognise their mutual resonance with one another sparked my imagination and shaped the ways that I went about interrogating broader questions about history, subjectivity and knowledge, questions which were exposed to me in part *because* I took up this project. The entire production of this research was intimately bound up in the particularities of these two groups, but it was also bound up in the particularities of my own life and body, the things I noticed, the things that incited a variety of sensations and imaginations, and the things I have not and may never recognise. And what I was therefore motivated to *make* with this multitude of experiences, my own and those of others, became increasingly apparent, at times *through* obfuscation, at every moment throughout the process of experiencing them.

What remains throughout this account is a desire to encounter the stories, imaginations and accounts of others whose memories, and whose encounters with the memories of others, intersect with mine in ways that resonate with, are indifferent to, and/or openly contest them. Out of such encounters may emerge the most thoughtful attention to the histories of the UFWA and AR, their individual delegates, authors and readers, and the vast constellation of other histories and

subjects whose relationships to the same conditions of possibility have yet to be made.

# References

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text* (S. Heath, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.

Benjamin, W. (1974). On the Concept of History. *Gesammelten Schriften, I*(2).

Brady, S. M. (2001). Sterilization of Girls and Women with Intellectual Disabilities. *Violence Against Women, 7*(4), 432-461.

Brown, W. (2001). *Politics out of History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Burton, A. (1994). Women in the Nation: Feminism, Race, and Empire in the 'National' Culture. In A. Burton (Ed.), *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915* (pp. 33-62). Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina Press.

Carby, H. V. (2009). Becoming Modern Racialized Subjects: Detours through our pasts to produce ourselves anew. *Cultural Studies, 23*(4), 624-657.

Carlson, L. (2001). Cognitive Ableism and Disability Studies: Feminist Reflections on the History of Mental Retardation. *Hypatia, 16*(4), 124-146.

Coddington, K. S. (2011). Spectral geographies: haunting and everyday state practices in colonial and present-day Alaska. *Social and Cultural Geography, 12*(7), 743-756.

Comack, E. (2010). Dealing the Race Card: Public Discourse on the Policing of Winnipeg's Inner-city Communities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research, 19*(1), 34-50.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicage Legal Forum*, 139-167.

Daston, L. (2000). The Coming into Being of Scientific Objects. In L. Daston (Ed.), *Biographies of Scientific Objects* (pp. 1-14). Chicago & London: The University of Chicage Press.

de Beauvoir, S. (2011). *The Second Sex*. New York: Vintage Books.

Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Giardina, M. D. (2006). Disciplining qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(6), 769-782.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx*. London: Routledge.

Dowbiggin, I. R. (1997). *Keeping America Sane: Psychiatry and Eugenics in the United States and Canada, 1880-1940*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx Was Right*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Ekberg, M. (2007). The Old Eugenics and the New Eugenics Compared. *Social History of Medicine, 20*(3), 581-593.

Ellis, C. (2009). *Revision: Autoethnographic reflections on life and work*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Field, M. J. W. (1925, January 20-23). *Health and Child Welfare.* Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the United Farm Women of Alberta.

Foucault, M. (1979). *History of Sexuality, Vol. I* (A. Lane, Trans.). London Penguin Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). Discipline and Punish. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 170-205). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1991a). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1991b). Politics and the Study of Discourse. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect* (pp. 53-72). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1991c). Questions of Method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect* (pp. 73-86). Chicago: The University of Chicage Press.

Foucault, M. (2007). The Body of the Condemned. In R. Garner (Ed.), *Social Theory: Continuity and Confrontation* (2 ed., pp. 410-414): Broadview Press.

Fraser, M. C. (1925, January 20-23). *Young People's Work.* Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the United Farm Women of Alberta.

Gardiner, S. L. (2005/2006). White Nationalism Revisited: Demographic Dystopia and White Identity Politics. *Journal of Hate Studies, 4*(1), 59-87.

Giardina, M. D., & Denzin, N. K. (2011). Acts of Activism ↔ Politics of Possibility: Toward a New Performative Cultural Politics. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, 20*(10), 1-9.

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H. (2011). *On Critical Pedagogy*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Oxford, UK & Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Goodey, C. F. (2003). On certainty, reflexivity and the ethics of genetic research into intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 47*(7), 548-554.

Gordon, A. (1999). Making Pictures of Ghosts: The art of Gary Simmons. *Social Identities, 5*(1), 89-124.

Gordon, A. (2008). *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.

Gould, S. J. (1996). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Grekul, J., Krahn, A., & Odynak, D. (2004). Sterilizing the "Feeble-minded": Eugenics in Alberta, Canada, 1929-1972. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 17*(4), 358-384.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1 ed., pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(2), 261-280.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 223-237). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Hall, S. (1996). On postmodernism and articulation. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 131-150). London and New York: Routledge.

Hall, S. (2007). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In T. Das Gupta, C. E. James, R. C. A. Maaka, G.-E. Galabuzi & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings* (pp. 56-60). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Helstein, M. (2007). Seeing Your Sporting Body: Identity, Subjectivity, and Misrecognition. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 24*, 78-103.

Henderson, J. (2003). Inducted Feminism, Inducing 'Personhood': Emily Murphy and Race Making in the Canadian West. In J. Henderson (Ed.), *Settler Feminism and Race Making in Canada* (pp. 159-207). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

hooks, b. (1992). *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

hooks, b. (2000). Racism and Feminism: the issue of accountability. In L. Back & J. Solomos (Eds.), *Theories of Race and Racism* (pp. 373-388). London & New York: Routledge.

Hutcheon, L. (1989). *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Johnson, T. (2012). Looking to the Past for the way Forward: A case from Canada. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/06/looking-to-the-past

Kallianes, V., & Rubenfeld, P. (1997). Disabled Women and Reproductive Rights. *Disability & Society, 12*(2), 203-221.

Kay, J. (2012). The Battle Over Photo IDs for Voters. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/04/the-battle-over-photo-ids-for-voters/

Kevles, D. J. (1995). *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*. Cambrige, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kurtagic, A. (2012). The Great Erasure. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/04/the-great-erasure/

Langford, N. (1997). *Politics, Pitchforks and Pickle Jars: 75 Years of Organized Farm Women of Alberta*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Latour, B. (2000). On the Partial Existence of Existing and Nonexisting Objects. In L. Daston (Ed.), *Biographies of Scientific Objects* (pp. 247-269). Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lemke, T. (2002). Genetic testing, eugenics and risk. *Critical Public Health, 12*(3), 284-290.

Librett, M., & Perrone, D. (2010). Apples and oranges: ethnography and the IRB. *Qualitative Research, 10*(6), 729-747.

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emergeing Influences, Revisited. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4 ed., pp. 97-128). London: Sage.

Lyotard, J.-F. (2007). The Postmodern Condition. In S. Appelrouth & L. D. Edles (Eds.), *Sociological Theory in the Contemporary Era* (pp. 435-444). London: Pine Forge Press.

Miguel, Y. M.-S. (2009). Postcolonialism. *Social Text, 27*(3), 188-193.

Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse: the New Critical Idiom* (2 ed.). London & New York: Routledge.

Mohanty, C. T. (2006). *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*: Duke University Press.

Montgomery, J. (1925, January 20-23). *The Library and the Community.* Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the United Farm Women of Alberta.

Morita, K. (2001). The Eugenic Transition of 1996 in Japan: from law to personal choice. *Disability & Society, 16*(5), 765-771.

Newman, J. (2010). *Embodying Dixie: Studies in the Body Pedagogics of Southern Whiteness*. Melbourne: Common Ground Publishing.

Newman, J. (2012). *12.1: Reflections on Golf, Hysteresis, and the Kinaesthetics of Privilege*. Paper presented at the Eighth International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Newman, J., & Giardina, M. (2011). What is this 'Physical' in Physical Cultural Studies? *Sociology of Sport Journal, 28*, 36-63.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2006). Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s. In D. B. Grusky & S. Szelenyi (Eds.), *The Inequality Reader: Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender* (pp. 197-202). New York: Westview Press.

Parlby, I. (1924). Mental Deficiency *Unknown United Farm Women of Alberta Meeting* (pp. 3-11).

Price, M. R. (1925, January 20-23). *Immigration.* Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Convention of the United Farm Women of Alberta.

Rembis, M. A. (2000). (Re)Defining disability in the 'genetic age': behavioral genetics, 'new' eugenics and the future of impairment. *Disability & Society, 24*(5), 585-597.

Richardson, L. (1988). The Collective Story: Postmodernism and the writing of sociology. *Sociological Focus, 21*(3), 199-208.

Rosenberg, S., Dean, A., & Granzow, K. (2010). Centennial hauntings: Reckoning with the 2005 celebration of Alberta's history. *Memory Studies, 3*(4), 395-412.

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Random House Inc. .

Sims, J. H. (2011). Racial Unity and the American Republic. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2011/12/racial-unity-american-republic/

Smart, B. (2002). *Michel Foucault*. London &New York: Routledge.

Smith, C. (2012). Man tells police group yelled 'Trayvon' , then beat him. *The Gainesville Sun*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/news/2012/04/man-tells-police-group-yelled-trayvon-then-beat-him/

Smith, D. E. (1993). *Texts, Facts and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, P., & Riley, A. (2009). *Postmodern and Poststructural Critical Theory* (2 ed.): Blackwell Publishing.

Sparkes, A. C. (1996). The Fatal Flaw: a narrative of the fragile body-self. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*, 463-494.

Taylor, J. (2012a). Ideology and Armed Men. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/02/ideology-and-armed-men/

Taylor, J. (2012b). An Inspiration for All of Us. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/03/an-inspiration-for-us-all/

Taylor, J. (2012c). Race and Literature: Why is it alway Liberal? *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/01/race-and-literature/

Taylor, J. (2012d). A Radical Left Plan for Racial Survival. *American Renaissance*. Retrieved from http://amren.com/features/2012/03/a-radical-left-plan-for-racial-survival/

Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the making of race and nation in Canada*. Toronton & London University of Toronto Press.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wendel-Hummell, C., & Craig, C. (2009). *The Lasting Legacy of Eugenics on the Right for People with Disabilities to Sexuality and Reproduction*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco.

Wikipedia. (2012). Paranormal. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/paranormal

Winant, H. (2006). *Race and Racism: Toward a Global Future*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Montreal.