Ethnologies

Voices Not our Own

Laurel Doucette

Volume 15, Number 2, 1993

Femmes et traditions
Women & Tradition

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1083202ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1083202ar

Publisher(s)

Association Canadienne d'Ethnologie et de Folklore

ISSN

1481-5974 (print)
1708-0401 (digital)

Article abstract

The underdevelopment of folklore studies in Canada can best be understood by examining the relevance of scholarly activity in the field to the Canadian academic milieu and, more broadly, to Canadian society. A feminist critique of the intellectual models and scholarly practices of folklore studies in Canada reveals that the activity continues to be influenced by several major intellectual constructs, namely modernization theory, colonialism, romantic nationalism, and structural functionalism; and that all of these combine to preserve cognitive models and power structures which impair the full participation of Canadian women ethnologists. Reclaiming the field of Canadian cultural studies requires the adoption of a new intellectual and attitudinal framework, one based on feminist principles of equality, inclusiveness, and empowerment, and grounded in experience, our own and that of the peoples whose cultures we study.

VOICES NOT OUR OWN*

Laurel DOUCETTE
St. John's, Newfoundland

Over the past two decades, the complaint that the field of folklore studies is nationally underdeveloped has formed a persistent theme in discourse related to Canadian scholarship in the subject area.[1] The motif is often accompanied by comparisons between the situation here and in the United States, comparisons which serve functions of explanation as well as illustration.[2] The widespread and longstanding tendency in Canadian social studies to explain ourselves in terms of other societies, most notably those of Britain and the United States, has been identified as a weakness which other disciplines have overcome in the last two decades.[3] Nevertheless, it persists in folklore studies as excuses for lack of advancement emerge: scholarly activities in the field are not respected because they are not known, the government does not spend enough money on folklore research, folklorists are not trying hard enough, and so on. The broader social and political ramifications of this ongoing disciplinary malaise were stated poignantly by Jean Du Berger:

> I cannot help but ask myself, as folklorist and ethnologist, how to explain the striking ignorance which continues to characterize the perceptions which the cultural communities

---

* I am sincerely grateful to the members of the Undisciplined Women's Collective who, in discussions held over the past months, provided much of the material that prompted this article, and kindly gave me the permission — and the encouragement — to use it. I am also grateful for insights, information, and critical comments received from Ellen Balka, Pauline Greenhill, Gordon Inglis, Linda Kealey, Ralph Pastore, Gerald Pocius, and Diane Tye. Interpretations, misconceptions, and errors are, of course, entirely my own.

1. For comments on underdevelopment, whether on the level of theory or of practice, see the following works by Carole Henderson Carpenter: "Folklore Scholarship and the Sociopolitical Milieu in Canada", *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 10, 1973, p. 97; *Many Voices: A Study of Folklore Activities in Canada and Their Role in Canadian Culture*, Canadian Centre for Folk Culture Studies Paper 26, Ottawa, National Museums of Canada, 1979, p. 157-160; "President's Report", *Bulletin of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada* 13:1/2, 1989, p. 3. See also I. Sheldon Posen, "President's Report: Much More Than Folklore", *Bulletin of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada* 15:2/3, 1991, p. 3-8. Neil V. Rosenberg has commented on theoretical underdevelopment at the regional level in "Regionalism and Folklore in Atlantic Canada", *Canadian Folklore Perspectives*, Kenneth S. Goldstein and Neil V. Rosenberg, eds., St. John's, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1978, p. 9.
2. See for example Carole Carpenter, "Politics and Pragmatism in Early North American Folklore Scholarship", *Canadian Folklore canadien* 13:1, 1991, p. 11-21.
3. See John Myles, "Understanding Canada: Comparative Political Economy Perspectives", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 2, 1989, p. 1-9.

> of Canada have of one another... After all these books and articles published about our cultures, I wonder: how is it possible that this ignorance can be so great?[4]

Feminist discourse would suggest that in intellectual activities, the inability to get past certain basic questions may be an indication that the questions themselves are at fault.[5] Perhaps rather than asking why folklore studies are not more advanced and have not made a greater impact, we should be asking what is wrong with the discipline that it is not better accepted within Canadian national life and Canadian scholarship. Perhaps it is time to consider whether the fault does not lie with the discipline itself and the way it has been practiced here. Is it relevant to Canadian life and the Canadian scholarly milieu? Does it relate to intellectual paradigms currently employed in this country? Does it deserve a place in the academy?

In addressing these questions, we are in fact not breaking new ground, but only attempting to come to terms with some of the issues which progressive scholars of many countries have been confronting over the past two decades or more in relation to their disciplines, and which folklorists have begun more recently to address.[6] The past 20 years have seen considerable questioning of paradigms and practices, especially in those scholarly disciplines dealing with culture and society.[7] Such re-evaluations acknowledge the realities of the post-colonial world we now inhabit; many also reflect the influence of feminist thought in challenging, rejecting or reconstituting academic perspectives to bring them more in line with the realities of that world.[8]

Canadian ethnologists, and particularly Canadian women ethnologists, have been slow to follow suit in relation to studies of our own culture in our own country. The reasons for our reluctance are complex: hesitations about admitting

4. Jean Du Berger, "President's Report", *Bulletin of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada* 14:1/2, 1990, p. 3.
5. Michelle Z. Rosaldo, "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminist and Cross-Cultural Understanding", *Signs* 5, 1980, p. 389-417.
6. See for example Stephen Stern, "The Influence of Diversity on Folklore Studies in the Decades of the 1980s and '90s", *Western Folklore* 50, 1991, p. 21-27.
7. Among the many works that could be cited in this context, the following have been particularly influential: Stanley R. Barrett, *The Rebirth of Anthropological Theory*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1984; James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1986; Dell Hymes, ed., *Reinventing Anthropology*, New York, Random House, 1972; Diane Lewis, "Anthropology and Colonialism", *Current Anthropology* 14, 1973, p. 581-602; George E. Marcus and Michael M. J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1986; Renato Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1989; William Roseberry, *Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University Press, 1989.
8. See Christie Farnham, ed., *The Impact of Feminist Research in the Academy*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1987.

doubts concerning the validity of our chosen occupation most certainly; but also very real anxiety about our economic futures if we expose the weaknesses of our profession to outsiders, or if our criticisms irritate the insiders who make decisions concerning academic success, employment, or financial support for research. But there have been other concerns as well. One is the complexity of analysis in a situation where factors of intellectual significance interplay with issues of gender and of national and regional identity. Another is unease in raising points of discussion which may wrongly be interpreted as bias against newcomers to the country or bias against men; or which may be handily dismissed with such charges. Finally, there is an honest solicitude for the feelings of those scholars whose commitment to the Canadian community we have seen awaken over the years since they first came amongst us.

As a means of addressing these concerns and seeking ways to overcome them, a number of Canadian women ethnologists, both Canadian-born and New Canadian, have turned to each other in an ongoing series of discussion groups and workshops, held intermittently since 1991 under the general rubric of "Undisciplined Women".[9] The act of sharing experiences and participating in an analysis of related issues has been both liberating and empowering. Among Canadian-born participants in particular, the process has revealed a shared sense of oppression in relation to the discipline of folklore itself, a feeling that goes beyond the particular frustrations and affronts experienced within institutions of work or study. The process has personally brought me to a realization of how counter-productive and dysfunctional our continued silence has been, and how it has barred us from solidarity with those within the profession who share our views, and those in society whose interests should lend direction to our scholarly agendas.

This article draws on critiques of culture and cultural studies offered by many scholars in a range of academic fields, but it is rooted throughout in experience, my own and that of other members of the Undisciplined Women's Collective. For lack of firsthand knowledge of the situation in French-language ethnology in Canada, comments are restricted to the context of English-language scholarship. The decidedly Atlantic perspective of this essay reflects my residence in Newfoundland, but I draw broadly on experience of Canadian life over 52 years, the last 19 of which have been passed in, or on the margins of academic and professional folklore studies. This article presents a critique of the intellectual models and scholarly practices of folklore studies in Canada, followed by a discussion of the prospects for future research on Canadian cultural traditions and the principles on which it might be based. This is not intended as a survey of

9. The phrase represents the tentative title of a volume of articles on women and Canadian traditional culture now in preparation under the editorship of Pauline Greenhill and Diane Tye. Participants in the project, plus others who have contributed through various workshops and study sessions, form the loosely-constituted Undisciplined Women's Collective.

literature, although a sufficient body of material has appeared since Carole Henderson's splendid study, *Many Voices,* to warrant such an overview. The intent of this essay is more modest. In choosing to ignore the discussion of specific works in favour of sketching several broad themes which have underlain scholarly history, I hope to stimulate the theoretical and epistemological discussion we have too long avoided in our concentration on descriptive detail. But that discussion can begin only when each of us has examined our own practice. Failing to identify the intellectual approaches which have influenced our work has frequently led us indirectly to embrace the very conditions which have oppressed us. The intellectual frameworks discussed here rarely surface now in published studies, although they continue to colour relationships within the disciplinary field. They remain as abstract ghosts that haunt our scholarly lives, and as such must be exorcised.

Intellectual Models and Scholarly Practice

Before directly addressing the question of frameworks and approaches, however, there are several questions which demand immediate consideration: where does folklore studies fit in the Canadian academy, or indeed does it fit at all? Is it a social science or a humanity (a question which presumes the validity of the distinction), or are practitioners in the field trying to make it both? How does it rank with other academic disciplines in terms of standards of scholarship? While these questions hark back to a fundamental tension between two schools of thought within folklore studies,[10] they must also be seen in relation to the major reassessments currently being demanded of cultural researchers as they confront the decline of positivism and acknowledge the ethnocentrism of much past anthropological and sociological generalizing.

Nevertheless, there is a need to consider seriously what is the fundamental aim of the scholarly activity in which we engage. Are we applying scientific methods as we test hypotheses and conduct problem-based research, or are we working towards an understanding of the aesthetics of human creations? If we claim to be humanists but refuse to apply aesthetic standards, excluding ourselves from making value judgements on the grounds that cultural products are to be approached from a relativistic perspective, we can expect to be viewed in a questionable manner by other humanists. Similarly, if we claim to be seeking an understanding of human creativity, but neglect to place that creativity within its full historical and social, as well as canonical context, preferring instead to practice the naive celebration of traditional culture, or at best situate it within

10 . For a thorough examination of this point in relation to the history of folklore studies in the United States, see Rosemary Lévy Zumwalt, *American Folklore Scholarship: A Dialogue of Dissent,* Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1988.

some vaguely defined international "folk domain", uninhabited by real human beings, we will be viewed askance by other social scientists.

What one has frequently seen in practice in this country is a tendency first of all to provide (in the guise of humanistic interpretation) an attractive but selective description of a traditional item or practice; and then to attach to the description a conclusion about the social significance of the cultural element. Fence-sitting may have appeal as a strategy to escape criticism of our work by both humanists and social scientists, but it also encourages us to ignore the methodological rigour of other disciplines, and prevents our being taken seriously by them.

The problem of the low prestige of folklore studies is not unique to Canada,[11] but it is one that we can address only by asking what kind of discipline Canadians *want* to practice, and how we want that practice to be identified. The very word "folklore" is problematic, evoking as it does unacceptable social distinctions, and future discussions may bring English-speaking Canadian ethnologists to agreement on a different designation. In the meantime, perhaps it would make more sense within the Canadian scholarly milieu to consider folklore studies not a *discipline* at all, since it adopts rather than generates theory,[12] but rather an inter-disciplinary and/or multi-disciplinary *research activity*. The term "folklore studies" (used throughout this article) has the advantage of paralleling familiar scholarly designations — Canadian studies, Native studies, regional studies, women's studies — and avoids the confusion engendered by the term "folklore" when it is applied to both an academic pursuit and the subject matter of that pursuit.

Similarly, perhaps the time has come to jettison the term "folklorist" with its connotations of amateurism and triviality. Like historians involved in native studies, sociologists involved in women's studies, or political scientists involved in Canadian studies, we would be ethnologists involved in folklore studies, a choice that would have the added benefit of more closely corresponding to French-language usage. While the term "folklore studies" was originally adopted with reluctance by the founding committee of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada,[13] the phrase offers distinct advantages. It is broad enough to allow a range of perspectives and theoretical models, and creates the sense of an intellectual forum for collaborative work between scholars of various disciplinary backgrounds.[14] In continuing to term ourselves "folklorists" doing "folk-

11 . See Elliott Oring, "On the Future of American Folklore Studies: A Response", *Western Folklore* 50, 1991, p. 75-81.

12 . Oring, p. 78.

13 . The association could not be incorporated under the preferred name, Canadian Folklore Society, because it had been used previously by another organization.

14 . It is worth noting that in feminist thought, interdisciplinarity has been embraced as a way to not only escape the confines of disciplinary boundaries, but also create and enter novel worlds of insight and meaning. See Trihn Minh-Ha, *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*, London, Routledge, 1991, p. 108.

lore", we are in fact denying the composition of our national professional association, only some of whom have academic training in folklore *per se,* and creating two classes of members.

Changing names will not, however, solve all our problems. In order to set a course for folklore studies in the future, we need to undertake a close and honest consideration of the dominant paradigms, ideologies and concepts that underlie current practice, and assess their acceptability in contemporary Canadian scholarship. As a theoretically underdeveloped scholarly activity, folklore research in anglophone Canada has tended to operate out of intellectual constructs which are seldom made explicit, and which may be hidden even to the researcher. Among them are theoretical frameworks which need to be considered as major influences: modernization theory, colonialism, romantic nationalism, and structural functionalism.

Modernization Theory

The essence of modernization theory as it has been utilized by folklorists, knowingly or otherwise, is easily summarized. Supposedly, in the traditional past, extended families lived together in harmony within small, tradition-based rural communities. In these natural, moral societies, each with a discrete culture oriented towards the sacred, relationships were egalitarian and values were community based. This timeless, utopian past contrasts with a modern present characterized by rapid change, where nuclear families, experiencing generational conflicts, inhabit a highly stratified mass society, oriented towards secular, individualistic values. However, in a situation of general cultural decline and widespread assimilation, there survive enclaves of traditional activity which represent vestiges of authenticity. The supposed sudden shift from one type of society to another is frequently tied to some incident identified as a catalyst.

Modernization theory has been identified as a *theory* (hypothetical explanation rather than historical fact) since at least the 1970s.[15] By the 1980s it was increasingly rejected by mainstream anthropology.[16] However, it survives among the general population of many societies as an explanation of historic change. Unfortunately, it is a conceptualization from the realm of popular culture which is still accepted as a description of reality by many involved in folklore studies;[17]

15 . See Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15, 1973, p. 199-226.

16 . See for example M. Estellie Smith, "The Process of Sociocultural Continuity", *Current Anthropology* 23, 1982, p. 127-142.

17 . For a more detailed critical assessment of the use of modernization theory in the field of folklore studies, see Laurel Doucette, "The Emergence of New Expressive Skills in Retirement and Later Life in Contemporary Newfoundland", doctoral thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1985, p. 50-66; and Gerald L. Pocius, *A Place to Belong: Community Order and Everyday Space in Calvert, Newfoundland,* Athens, University of Georgia Press, and Montreal/Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991, p. 272-299.

or even if not intellectually accepted may still be evoked in discourse through utilization of the vocabulary of modernization.[18] Under this model, tradition tends to be reified as "legacy" that survives and gets "passed on". Even when scholars have studied such "retained" cultural traditions in context, they generally have not looked beyond the immediate setting of the community to see the event or practice within the broader context of regional/national/worldwide social and economic change. Thus the concept of "context" has been a shallow one, covering the immediate arena of activity, plus narrowly traced historic-geographic links to the locus of origin, but little else.

Perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of the weaknesses of the modernization paradigm can be found in Eric Wolf's monumental work *Europe and the People Without History*,[19] a detailed analysis of how the changes brought about by European capitalism have affected various geographic areas of the world since 1400. As an explanation of cultural change, modernization theory is too simplistic a description of the complex social, economic and political change that has been reverberating around the world for the past 500 years. As Wolf points out, it is a model that denies history (in the sense of gradual transformations over time) to our own ancestors, as well as to twentieth century indigenous and peasant societies, and to ethnic minorities within dominant cultures.[20] Here in Canada, this same distinction between the people with "history" and the people with "culture" has been reflected in the departmentalization of the Canadian Museum of Civilization (formerly the National Museum of Man) into discrete divisions for Anglo and French Canadians (History Division), Native Peoples (Ethnology Division), and Ethnic groups (Folk Culture Division) — a clear reflection of the political power of the conquering peoples of the country.[21]

Modernization theory is particularly problematic for scholars in folklore studies, because it artificially fragments the subject matter of human cultural traditions. The theory creates a dichotomy in the political economy of real life (how people get by, how they survive), dividing it into two separate disciplines: history for *us* (Europeans/Western peoples/the White elite) and anthropology for *them* (all the other peoples of the world). Such a dichotomy, grounded on racial and ethnic distinctions, denies the current demographic reality of most nations of the world, Canada included. As various writers have pointed out, the model is also

18 . For diction dangerously close to the language of modernization theory, see the Doucette entry in "Abstracts of Papers", *Bulletin of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada* 15:2/3, 1991, p. 21.

19 . Berkeley, University of California Press, 1982.

20 . Wolf, p. 3-23.

21 . The ethnology/folklore distinction at the Canadian Museum of Civilization has a history which touches on some of the major figures and central conceptualizations of Canadian cultural studies. See Gordon Inglis, "In Bed with The Elephant: Anthropology in Anglophone Canada", *Ethnos* 47, 1982, p. 82-102; and Tom McFeat, *Three Hundred Years of Anthropology in Canada*, Occasional Papers in Anthropology N° 7, Halifax, Department of Anthropology, St. Mary's University, 1980, p. 9-10.

patronizing, for it turns a large segment of the world's population into victims of change, subject(ed) to the history of the West without any capacity for making choices on their own.[22] No consideration is given to the possibility that people may welcome change for their own reasons, or may actively strategize, negotiate, and plan for it.

Finally, the modernization model is linked to nineteenth century social-evolutionary theory, which placed Europeans at the apex of civilization. They are the "modern" people who view with interest the "old-fashioned" native, peasant or folk peoples of the world, and study them in an effort to regain their *own* past — either their ethnic/peasant past through folklore studies, or the ancient past of the human race through anthropology. In other words, the study suits the agenda of the researcher, not of the people studied.[23]

Unfortunately, many folklore scholars have operated out of the modernization model in the past without even realizing it is their basic paradigm, and some, as Gerald Pocius has noted, continue to do so.[24] Many would reject modernization theory if questioned on it, or they would try to alter the model by talking of folklore as "communication" or "performance", but the conceptualization still underlies their work. The past (before emigration, before Confederation, before the Conquest, before Columbus) is seen as a timeless golden age, and subsequent history is interpreted only in terms of cultural retention or loss.

Colonialism

Modernization theory presents a model of society which is both a product of and serves to justify colonial domination. As superior modern people, "we" have the right to both study and direct the lives of others for what we determine to be their own good; and in what Renato Rosaldo calls "imperialist nostalgia" we record the passing of the culture which we are helping to destroy.[25]

While much scholarly attention has been given to colonialism as the single major factor in the creation of anthropology,[26] relationships between colonial

22 . This point is made by Ralph T. Pastore, "Beothuk Florescence: Newfoundland's Aboriginal People in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", paper delivered to the Atlantic Canada Studies Conference, St. John's, 1992; and by Bruce G. Trigger, "Evolutionism, Relativism and Putting Native Peoples into Historical Context", *Culture* 2, 1986, p. 65-79.

23 . In addition to Lewis, p. 584, and Marcus and Fischer, p. 1, see the following authors on this point: Jacob Pandian, *Anthropology and the Western Tradition: Toward an Authentic Anthropology*, Prospect Heights, Illinois, Waveland Press, 1985, p. 90; and David E. Whisnant, *All That Is Native and Fine: The Politics of Culture in an American Region*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1983, p. 260.

24 . Pocius, p. 276-279.

25 . R. Rosaldo, p. 68-87.

26 . In addition to previously cited authors such as Lewis and Pandian, see William S. Willis, Jr., "Skeletons in the Anthropological Closet", *Reinventing Anthropology*, Dell Hymes, ed., New York, Random House, 1972, p. 121-152.

attitudes and folklore scholarship have not been as carefully studied. The early and continued presence of foreign scholars doing field research in Canada was noted by Carole Carpenter, who also observed that such interest was often based on a view of the country as isolated, slow to industrialize, and therefore a source of "pure" folk tradition.[27]

The continued separation of the people studied from the people doing the studying, creating an alienation of the discipline from the local reality, is particularly visible in Newfoundland, the site of the country's only English language degree programme in folklore studies.[28] Because of a lack of academically trained Canadians, foreign scholars were needed to establish the department at Memorial University in its founding period. But the practice of importing faculty — always from Britain or the United States — has continued down to the present,[29] thus prolonging a troublesome situation long since dealt with elsewhere in Canadian academe.[30] When any department is made up chiefly of scholars with personal and professional ties elsewhere, who perceive the centres of intellectual activity to be elsewhere, and who utilize theoretical paradigms developed elsewhere, there can be little hope of the development of intellectual approaches which will reflect the realities of life as it is lived by local people. Such scholars may seek rather to justify their own employment by claiming objectivity in analyzing a culture they know only in a fragmented and ahistorical way; and by emphasizing the international nature of folk tradition to the detriment of the study of its local, regional, and national dimensions.

In the case of Newfoundland, a particularly schizophrenic situation has arisen. Within the Folklore Department, information on Canada is filtered through British or American professors, and taught to Newfoundlanders. Information about Newfoundland is passed on to mainland Canadian students through the reverse route. Because they have come into a country where the majority of citizens are the same colour as themselves and speak the same language, foreign academics frequently do not realize that we perceive ourselves as different and may resent their intrusion into our culture and their appropriation of its study. Ignoring the complexities of the Canadian sense of identity, and accepting our

27. See Carole Henderson Carpenter, "Folklore Scholarship and the Sociopolitical Milieu in Canada", p. 105-106; and also *Many Voices*, p. 159.

28. The startlingly different circumstances of French-language cultural studies in Canada, where the bulk of research has always been done by those native to the culture, merits scholarly attention, especially in terms of examining the epistemological implications of such a situation.

29. Of the ten permanent folklore faculty members at the St. John's and Corner Brook campuses of Memorial University, one is a native Newfoundlander. The other nine are British or American in origin, although a number now hold Canadian citizenship. There is one female faculty member.

30. See William K. Carroll, Linda Christiansen-Ruffman, Raymond F. Currie and Deborah Harrison, eds., *Fragile Truths: Twenty-Five Years of Sociology and Anthropology in Canada*, Ottawa, Carleton University Press, 1992, for a detailed study of controversies surrounding the Canadianization of academic disciplines.

perpetual inter-regional bickering at face value, they take it upon themselves to interpret one group of Canadians to another. With intellectual discourse undergoing constant "translation" by a foreign voice, it is difficult to develop approaches informed by our own sensibilities, sensibilities that are not artificially constructed but grow out of our experience of life here. This is not to deny the reality of the immigrant experience as an essential part of Canadian identity; but being parachuted in to assume a position as an instant cultural expert does not constitute the most common Canadian immigrant experience.

Because of hiring practices which have had little to do with scholarly considerations, but a great deal to do with maintaining existing power balances and personal relationships,[31] all Canadian students at Memorial, but particularly Newfoundlanders, have been forced to study their own culture from the perspective of the "other" and to view themselves as objects of study.[32] From the time of the establishment of the Folklore Department, its international appeal was founded on the availability of a province full of cultural specimens who could be viewed at will and would perform willingly; and foreign academics, gleaning a knowledge of local culture in large measure from the class assignments of their students, were ready to serve as tour guides for the experience.[33]

Intellectual approaches adopted within the department have generally reflected a foreign perspective. British scholars have taken interest in Newfoundland culture as a remnant of lost British culture, and their approach has been survivalistic. American scholars, frequently more interested in understanding cultural conditions back home (or in translating their scholarship into jobs there), have explored those interests by applying American concepts to the Canadian situation. Both groups, convinced of the universality of British or American scholarship, have been oblivious to their own ethnocentrism. While appropriating the culture of Newfoundland to serve career goals, they have manipulated hiring processes in such a way as to preserve the established perspective of the department by precluding the hiring of anyone who might challenge it. The definition of expertise in folklore studies as a knowledge of "items" rather than a knowledge of place encourages and validates international job-hunting and

31 . The hiring practices of the Department of Folklore were described in Richard Hiatt, "Problems in the Department of Folklore at the Memorial University of Newfoundland with Particular Reference to the Disputed Appointment to a Tenure Track Position in 1990 and Fair Appointment Practice", a report prepared for the Canadian Association of University Teachers Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee in relation to the hiring of a British academic trained in geography. Hiatt concluded (p. 7) that "the appointment was severely flawed in process, violating specific tenets of CAUT Policies on Canadianization, Initial Appointments, Positive Action to Improve the Status of Women and Fairness in Hiring".

32 . See Bernard McGrane, *Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1989.

33 . The experience of serving as a cultural "specimen" for visiting academics is reported by F. L. Jackson in "The Marxist Mystification of Newfoundland History", *Newfoundland Studies* 6, 1990, p. 270.

hiring.[34] It is an imperialist tool of immense proportions, for it privileges as "neutral", "scientific", and "objective" the view of the outsider and reduces to negligible value the unique perspective of those native to a culture.

Despite the efforts of some faculty members within the Department of Folklore at Memorial, the intellectual hegemony evident there will not likely come to an end until current faculty begin to retire, and a balance of perspectives — surely the situation most likely to produce insightful scholarship — can be achieved. As a result, in the only folklore degree programme available in Canada to anglophone students, under-representation of the native Canadian and native Newfoundland voice continues, as does under-representation of the full spectrum of Canadian immigrant experience; students remain pawns to internecine power struggles; and substantial segments of the provincial and national experience, in particular troubling elements like inter-regional and inter-group tensions, economic disparity, and the ecological and social disaster of fisheries decline, are going unexamined.

The failure to Canadianize the academic field of folklore studies has been particularly noticeable where bicultural studies are concerned. A lack of interest in and respect for the cultural scholarship of Quebec has prohibited the development of any extensive dialogue between Memorial and centres of francophone research.[35] It is noteworthy that Canada's first bilingual folklore journal, *Culture & Tradition*, was founded not by faculty members but by students.[36] Those of us who were present at the founding meeting felt our warm reception in Quebec by Laval University students and faculty members presaged a future of close scholarly collaboration between the two institutions. The future we envisaged never materialized, for cross-cultural, bilingual analysis, in itself a "foreign" concept to the teaching staff at Memorial, was never on their agenda.

Romantic Nationalism

A third conceptual model closely related to modernization theory is romantic nationalism, an eighteenth and nineteenth century European sociopolitical orientation which unfortunately has persisted in studies of traditional culture. The concept of culture which underlies folklore studies has frequently not been the anthropological concept of the totality of practices, ideas, attitudes, and

34 . I am grateful to Gerald Pocius for this insight.

35 . Such communication as exists between Memorial and centres of francophone research is conducted almost exclusively through the one bilingual faculty member of the Department of Folklore.

36 . The idea for a joint bilingual periodical featuring essays by students was generated during a "semaine ethnographique" organized by students in the Arts et traditions populaires programme at Laval in 1976; the first edition of *Culture & Tradition* appeared later that year.

technologies which go to make up the way a group of people live, nor the idea of ongoing processes incorporating all of these. Rather it has been the concept of culture as the heritage of a specific folk/ethnic group, a concept which arose in Germany during the Enlightenment period, and was linked to the assertion of political rights to a nation state.[37] As the "founding paradigm" of folklore studies,[38] romantic nationalism has been profoundly influential in shaping scholarly activity along lines reflective of national circumstances.[39] "Ethnology/ folkliv" in Europe and "folklore/folklife" in England were founded essentially as peasant studies. In Scotland and Ireland, regions of colonial conquest, they were and are nationalistic studies. Historic links between romantic nationalism and folklore in Canada have been traced by Carole Carpenter and by Janet McNaughton.[40]

Because it has been a persistent social phenomenon, romantic nationalism deserves our attention as an object of analysis, particularly in relation to collecting activities which are in themselves cultural statements about regional and national identity.[41] But as a scholarly paradigm, romantic nationalism should be rejected as an ethnocentric, anti-intellectual, uncritical stance which results in celebration of culture, but seldom in worthwhile analysis of it. The approach persists, however, as a structure of domination, and in that capacity it is very political in several separate ways. In the first place, it is a useful attitude for those who have learned that the uncritical celebration of local or ethnic heritage can help insure financial security, especially when an administrator or elected official can use a department or programme to illustrate commitment to the local community. Secondly, it is a handy way of manipulating regional or ethnic sensibilities for purposes of factionalizing a population and enhancing one's own position as champion of local culture. And finally, it is also political on another level. Because it suppresses any hint of social stratification within the "volk", it is

37 . An enlightening discussion of understandings of the concept of culture throughout western history is found in Pandian, p. 28-36.

38 . Jennifer Fox, "The Creator Gods: Romantic Nationalism and the En-genderment of Women in Folklore", *Journal of American Folklore* 100, 1987, p. 563-572.

39 . In a 1968 article, Tamás Hofer went so far as to suggest that the birth of ethnography in Europe (the study of European national cultures by members of those cultures) should be seen as part of a "revitalization movement" as described by Anthony F. C. Wallace. See Hofer, "Comparative Notes on the Professional Personality of Two Disciplines: Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages", *Current Anthropology* 9, 1968, p. 311-315; and Wallace, "Revitalization Movements", *American Anthropologist* 58, 1956, p. 264-281.

40 . See Carpenter, *Many Voices*, for an extensive discussion of the topic. For an examination of early Quebec developments which had profound influence on the national level, see McNaughton, "A Study of the CPR-Sponsored Quebec Folk Song and Handicraft Festivals, 1927-1930," master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1982; and "French-Canadian Nationalism and the Beginnings of Folklore Studies in Quebec", *Canadian Folklore canadien* 7: 1/2, 1985, p. 129-147.

41 . I am indebted to Pauline Greenhill for pointing to the distinction between romantic nationalism as a political statement and romantic nationalism as a means of oppression.

deeply conservative, acting to maintain the position of the elite while preserving, but in memory alone, the culture of the less advantaged.[42]

In Newfoundland, the ideology of romantic nationalism can be seen in the history of the Department of Folklore. The narrative of its establishment has been raised to the status of foundation myth, and the department, charged with preserving the once national/now provincial heritage, has been elevated to an exalted rank, free of the standards applied to other Memorial departments and only recently made subject to internal review, despite its troubled history.[43] The vision of the department's mandate has not changed since its foundation in the late 1960s, and the dominant operational paradigms, if not conscious intellectual ones, remain firmly embedded in turn-of-the-century comparativistic methodology and in the "anthropologist-as-hero" mentality of the post World War I "classical period" of academic anthropology.[44]

Structural Functionalism

As with romantic nationalism and colonialism, the theoretical model of structural functionalism exhibits inherent power dimensions.[45] An intellectual approach which focuses on "the analysis of internal functioning in putatively isolated" societies,[46] it was the dominant anthropological/sociological paradigm from the 1920s to the 1960s. A product of the post World War I era when "the virtue of Western civilization itself seemed questionable", structural functionalism reflected a disillusionment with Western society and a yearning for pristine traditional cultures, "perfectly integrated societies, inevitably static because all of their institutions were mutually reinforcing, their peoples united in consensual

---

42 . Insightful examinations of the political implications of the romanticization of Newfoundland outport culture have been provided by Patrick O'Flaherty, "Looking Backwards: The Milieu of the Old Newfoundland Outports", *The Blasty Bough*, Clyde Rose, ed., St. John's, Breakwater Books, 1976, p. 145-158; and by James Overton, "A Newfoundland Culture?", *Journal of Canadian Studies* 23:1/2, 1988, p. 5-22.

43 . Described by Hiatt in 1991 as a "troubled department" with problems that were "severe and long-standing" (p. 3), the Department underwent a review initiated by the Memorial School of Graduate Studies in the early months of 1993.

44 . For insightful analysis of romanticism in this period, see George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

45 . While the terms "functionalism" and "structural functionalism" are frequently used interchangeably, the latter is chosen here due to the fact that researchers in the field of folklore studies have more commonly focused on structural or systemic function, rather than on the personal uses of customary behaviour. For a selection of essays placing structural functionalism in historical perspective, see George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1984. A survey and critique of functionalist thought is presented in Jonathan Turner and Alexandra Maryanski, *Functionalism*, Menlo Park, California, Benjamin/Cummings, 1979.

46 . Wolf, p. 15.

agreement".[47] Having originated in British social anthropology where it was grounded in field studies of still-operating indigenous communities within British colonial possessions, the model held a strong appeal for North American anthropologists, themselves disillusioned with the fragmented and dysfunctional aboriginal cultures they had observed across the continent.[48]

By the post World War II period, the period when folklore was developing as a discipline in the United States, the functionalist model, suggesting that "most expressive elements of culture contribute toward an integration of society", had become pre-eminent.[49] As a result, the search for positive social function pervaded much of the scholarly literature of the 1960s and 1970s. In Canada, the model persists, both within and without the academy.[50] It still underlies a great deal of research on the cultural traditions of ethnic, regional or other small groups, even when overtly researchers may be addressing questions of "identity" or "meaning" or "social role".[51] No longer a favoured approach in sociology or anthropology, it is considered positivistic and mechanistic, a model inherently supportive of the patriarchal, sexist, and racist status quo of many societies.[52] Applied to studies of traditional culture, the structural functionalist paradigm suggests that, if a custom has lasted this long, it must benefit the society — it provides stability, continuity, etc. Under this model, the research questions are limited and the answers are predictable.[53] There is no consideration of the fact that

47 . Henrika Kuklick, "Tribal Exemplars: Images of Political Authority in British Anthropology, 1885-1945", *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology*, George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., p. 69-70.

48 . This insight was provided by Ralph Pastore, who noted that the disillusionment was tempered with some hope for cultural revival, since North American native populations, long in a state of decline, were beginning to exhibit demographic increase in the post World War I period.

49 . Peter Narváez, "Folkloristics, Cultural Studies and Popular Culture", *Canadian Folklore canadien* 14, 1992, p. 24. As Narváez notes, a highly influential article from this period was William R. Bascom, "Four Functions of Folklore", *Journal of American Folklore* 67, 1954, p. 333-349. For a historical view of the links between the American functionalist approach and folklore studies at Memorial University, see Neil Rosenberg's biographical sketch of Herbert Halpert, founder of the Memorial programme and a major influence, either directly or indirectly, on the scholarly work of several current faculty members ("Herbert Halpert: A Biographical Sketch", *Folklore Studies in Honour of Herbert Halpert: A Festschrift*, Kenneth S. Goldstein and Neil V. Rosenberg, eds., St. John's, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1980, p. 1-13).

50 . Narváez sees functionalism persisting on a broader scale as "the predominant interpretive method in the social study of folklore" (p. 24).

51 . Although functionalism is now rarely evoked as an explanatory paradigm, it is interesting to note how it continues to shape approaches to specific research topics. English-language participants in the 1993 meeting of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada examined the functions of sunbonnets, community musical traditions, narratives about dogs, legends about priests, mascots, occupational and labour songs, family behaviours, quilts, and oral narratives about a drowning. See *Bulletin of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada*, 17:1/2 (May 1993), p. 11-25.

52 . See Barrett, p. 19-32; and Lewis, p. 584.

53 . See Elliott Oring, "Three Functions of Folklore: Traditional Functionalism as Explanation in Folkloristics", *Journal of American Folklore* 89, 1976, p. 67-80, for a critique of functionalist analysis.

societies are not homogeneous, that what provides stability and security for one group may oppress another, and that the structures of a society may be "internally rational yet unjust".[54]

Conceptual Orientations and Theoretical Underdevelopment

Given the power relationships they represent and reinforce, it is no wonder that modernization theory, colonialism, romantic nationalism, and structural functionalism have formed a cluster of conceptual orientations which have dominated folklore studies in this country. Outside of Quebec, structuralism has had little influence, except for a type of formalist structuralism used for micro-studies of an aesthetic nature. Communications theory and the so-called "performance" approach have been in more frequent use over the past 15 years. It is of course true that any theoretical approach, used judiciously as a heuristic device, may provide important insights; and these approaches have been useful in correcting the functionalist tendency to situate cultural manifestations within systemic frameworks. Nevertheless, it is important to note that performance theory in its proliferation of minute detail suits an ahistorical perspective, creating an illusion of comprehension which masks the fact that there may be no broader context provided to the event studied. It is one of many intellectual approaches which allow one to ignore the macro context by focusing on the immediate micro context in great detail.[55]

Discussions of the prevalent intellectual approaches of Canadian folklore studies in English have brought us back to a point made at the beginning of this article — the general underdevelopment of the research area, particularly in terms of appropriate and intellectually stimulating theoretical analysis. Such underdevelopment, of course, may result from a feeling that the available theory is divorced from daily life and cultural experience. And this is a reaction which is particularly true of Canadian women ethnologists, who have been doubly oppressed by the dominant intellectual models. Modernization theory, romantic nationalism, and structural functionalism all exalt a supposedly "golden" age when women had few legal and political rights, and frequently lived lives of drudgery and physical victimization. Intellectual colonialism preserves both cognitive models and power structures which preclude an examination of the reality of that past, or indeed the reality of the present, for women.

54 . Catharine A. MacKinnon, "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory", *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology*, Nannerl Keohane, Michelle Z. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi, eds., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1982, p. 2.

55 . Stern, p. 22.

The androcentrism of all academic disciplines,[56] combined with the prevalence of these major negative factors in folklore studies,[57] is increasingly causing Canadian women ethnologists to drift towards women's studies, not because of a desire to concentrate research efforts exclusively on gender issues, but because of the reinforcement offered there, both in terms of professional respect and in terms of personal valuation. To many of us, the dominant voice in Canadian folklore studies has for too long been a foreign male voice, a voice which has cast the field of study in its own image and rendered us silent and invisible.

Determining Directions

Reactions to the various preliminary versions of this article have made it obvious that the critique presented here of English-language Canadian folklore studies is culturally meaningful — these views speak to our sense of identity; they speak to our experiences and to our ambitions. And just as feminist thought, reflecting contemporary trends variously labelled postmodern/postcolonial/poststructuralist, has provided the framework for a critique of problems embedded in the practice of folklore studies, it can provide direction in setting a course for reclaiming the field. What is required is nothing less than a paradigm shift,[58] the adoption of a model that provides not a positivistic explanation but rather an intellectual and attitudinal framework within which to pursue our own research goals.

The establishment of such a framework implies the recognition, first of all, that all scholarly work is culture-based. Methodologies, theories of interpretation, ethnographic texts — these are not objective, unbiased products of neutral research, but are culturally-influenced products of specific economic, social and political ideologies and circumstances,[59] and serve to validate those ideologies (romantic nationalism, colonialism, capitalism, etc.).

It also implies a recognition that in neglecting to accept this fact in the past, cultural researchers have run the risk of contributing to the intellectual and perhaps very real victimization of their subjects. This may be true of Canadian ethnologists now, working here in our own country with our fellow-citizens,[60] as

56 . Carol P. Christ, "Toward a Paradigm Shift in the Academy and in Religious Studies", *The Impact of Feminist Research in the Academy,* Christie Farnham, ed., Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987, p. 53-54; Thelma McCormack, "Feminism and the New Crisis in Methodology", *The Effects of Feminist Approaches on Research Methodology,* Winnie Tomm, ed., Waterloo, Wilfred Laurier Press, 1989, p. 30.

57 . Fox, p. 564-565.

58 . Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

59 . James Clifford, "Introduction: Partial Truths", *Writing Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., p. 2.

60 . In relation to the cultural exploitation of rural Americans by urban Americans, see Whisnant.

surely as it was true in the past of many scholars working in some outpost of a colonial empire.[61]

Secondly, the adoption of a new approach implies a rejection of positivism. Ethnologists need to abandon the hope of establishing general laws of social behaviour, except perhaps in very limited circumstances, and accept the fact that much of this generalizing in the past was Eurocentric and androcentric. We must also recognize that there can be more than one valid view of a social/cultural event, including the view (or views) of insiders to the culture — members of the community being studied.[62]

Thirdly, our approach must be grounded always in experience, our own and that of the subjects of our study.[63] We need to acknowledge that because of the effects of colonialism and romantic nationalism, our understandings of traditional culture have not been integrated into the life of contemporary society. In this country, English-language folklore scholars are concentrated in the Atlantic region. Yet we have been ignoring the distressing economic facts of daily life for thousands of Atlantic citizens while we analyze their culture.[64] We have yet to find a way to incorporate economic and cultural knowledge into one description that will have validity and serve some useful purpose for the community. This will happen only when we refuse to tolerate strategies of power and appropriation or to be appeased by ploys of tokenism, and insist that, contrary to "scientific colonialism",[65] the centre for the study of this society must lie inside it, not in the scholarly traditions of other nations. To bring this about, we need to

61 . See Talal Asad, ed., *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, London, Ithaca Press, 1973.

62 . In addition to Lewis, p. 584, and R. Rosaldo, p. 21, see Robert Paine, "Our Authorial Authority", *Culture* 9:2, 1990, p. 35-47.

63 . This point has been made eloquently by a number of feminist scholars. See Nannerl Keohane, Michelle S. Rosaldo, and Barbara C. Gelpi, eds., p. xii; and Ruth Roach Pierson, "Experience, Difference, Dominance and Voice in the Writing of Canadian Women's History," *Writing Women's History: International Perspectives*, Karen Offen, Ruth Roach Pierson, and Jane Kendall, eds., Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1991, p. 94.

64 . Cf. William Roseberry's comment on Clifford Geertz who, in his detailed interpretation of the cultural meanings of Balinese cockfighting, relegated the violent deaths of thousands of Balinese citizens in 1965 political uprisings to a footnote. See Roseberry, p. 232; and Geertz, "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight", *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York, Basic, 1973, p. 452. Current folklore students at Memorial who have organized a series of forums to address the fishery crisis provide a notable exception to this tendency.

65 . Johan Galtung, "After Camelot", *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot*, Irving Horowitz, ed., Cambridge, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1967, p. 296. Galtung defined "scientific colonialism" as "a process whereby the center of gravity for the acquisition of knowledge about the nation is located outside the nation itself". The right of a people to study their own culture has been asserted by Claude Lévi-Strauss, "Anthropology: Its Achievements and Failures", *Current Anthropology* 7, 1966, p. 126, in relation to developing nations; and by Trigger, p. 78, in relation to Canadian Native peoples. Inglis (p. 85) notes that as early as 1912, Edward Sapir, head of the newly established anthropological division of the Geological Survey of Canada, recognized that Canadians would soon want a share in the research being conducted in Canada by anthropologists from other countries.

avail ourselves of the advanced scholarship of established national disciplines, and ground our work firmly in the Canadian scholarly milieu.

In fact, if we seek to comprehend social and cultural behaviour, we *must* assume responsibility for the study our own culture, and we must make that study as broadly inclusive as possible. We must reject the unitary view of society which folklore scholars long maintained, and accept the fact of divisions, not only on bases we have been willing to accept (ethnicity, region, religion), but also along axes we have been prone to ignore (gender, class, sexual orientation).[66] In particular we must be cognizant of the political economy of daily life, facing up to the fact that much of what we study is the culture of the disadvantaged, although we neglect to name it as such. No longer pretending to remain the disinterested observer (a culturally-impossible feat, in any event), we must locate our commitment in the groups we study, not as *we* define their interests, but as *they* do, and pledge ourselves to the betterment of their lives, on their terms.

Such an approach demands a dedication to feminist ideals: a commitment to social change which brings about equality and justice; a cooperative, empowering, non-hierarchical approach in all that we do; and a spirit of inclusiveness, both on the level of theory and of practice. This means that rather than splitting human cultural experience into conceptual "bits",[67] one bit for native populations, one bit for the elite, one bit for the "folk", we should aim towards a holistic approach. In terms of ethnographic practice, we should be active in promoting the incorporation of all groups in Canadian society into our scholarly projects, not just as subjects of study but as co-workers. We must work to make bilingualism the asset it could be in terms of collaborative work and the cross-fertilization of ideas. And the regional sensibilities which have been used to factionalize us in the past must be turned into tools for the better comprehension of cultural dimensions of our common experiences.

For women ethnologists, this means following the lead of anthropology in going beyond the "folklore of women" approach to establish a feminist model of folklore studies.[68] The challenge is to create *our* paradigm for the study of our culture, in all its rich and perplexing diversity, and with all its historical tensions and emergent conflicts; and to do this not in a sense of narrow nationalism but because the culture of this country is the reality we share. We need to dismantle, and reconstitute from new perspectives, the concepts and categories we have taken for granted, examining their often biased underpinnings, clarifying their meanings, and evaluating both their heuristic usefulness to our scholarly work

66 . Roseberry, p. 13-14.

67 . Wolf, p. 3.

68 . The distinction between the anthropology of women and feminist anthropology is drawn by Henrietta Moore, *Feminism and Anthropology*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1988, p. 1-11, and 186-198.

and their relevance to our society.[69] And as our understandings of that increasingly pluralistic society become more sophisticated, so must our scholarly models become more complex.[70]

Since the dominant paradigms of scholarship in any discipline tend to perpetuate themselves, with those in positions of power recognizing only that talent which shares the "orthodox" approach, institutional support is not likely to be forthcoming, at least in the short term, for our endeavours. We must provide our own leadership, establish our own networks, find our own means of communication. The challenge is to generate the required energy when many of us have no economic security, but the alternative is to see our research field continue to stagnate in the backwater of Canadian scholarship.

On the positive side, we now have a generation of scholars, male as well as female, in this country who are committed to the ideals articulated here. Promising studies are under way.[71] Innovative approaches to old subjects are beginning to appear.[72] In striving to transform the particularities of description into a theoretical whole which can then be debated, disputed, and reshaped to the contours of our experience, we are not without scholarly models. The discourses of feminist thought resonate with truth for those of us who have experienced intellectual subordination within our own country and in relation to the study of our own culture, merely because we are female and Canadian. They also offer hope for directing our energies in ways that serve not only ourselves and our national community, but all of humankind.

---

69 . The development of new feminist models of scholarship is discussed by Marilyn J. Boxer, "For and About Women: The Theory and Practice of Women's Studies in the United States", *Feminist Theory: A Critique of Ideology*, p. 237-271; and by Louise Lamphere, "Feminism and Anthropology: The Struggle to Reshape Our Thinking about Gender", *The Impact of Feminist Research in the Academy*, p. 11-23. In relation to folklore studies see Barbara A. Babcock, "Taking Liberties, Writing from the Margins, and Doing It with a Difference", *Journal of American Folklore* 100, 1987, p. 390-411.

70 . Farnham, p. 7.

71 . Including the book, *Undisciplined Women*, now in the final stages of revision.

72 . Consider, for example, Pauline Greenhill's examination of English immigrants in Canada as an ethnic group ("English Immigrants' Narratives of Linguistic and Cultural Confusion: Examples of Ethnic Expression from Ontario", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15, 1992, p. 236-265, and *Ethnicity in the Mainstream: Three Studies of English Canadian Culture in Ontario*, forthcoming from McGill-Queen's in 1994); or Peter Narváez's ongoing work on elements of social dissent in Newfoundland song traditions ("Social Consciousness in Newfoundland Vernacular Song", paper presented at the annual meeting of the Folklore Studies Association of Canada, Ottawa, June 1993).