Subjectivities and Truths in Emotion-Based Discourse: The Case of Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36

Nathalie Reid

A Thesis

In the Department

of

Sociology & Anthropology

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts (Sociology) at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

May 2009

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-63301-4
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-63301-4

ABSTRACT

Subjectivities and Truths in Emotion-Based Discourse:
The Case of Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36

Nathalie Reid

Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36 is a complex case within Canada's legal history. The issues at stake were wide-ranged from concerns of equality rights for same-sex parents, parental rights on the education of their children, to concerns about the best interest of children and the impacts of sensitive materials on them. Throughout the case's history, these concerns were discussed provincially and nationally within newspaper editorials, columns, and letters to the editor. The censorship issues that surround the Chamberlain case provide a site to explore how respondents actively create this case's truths and produce emotion effects in the audience through their discourses.

In this thesis I argue that the discourses of respondents speaking about the Chamberlain case produce 'truth claims' that can be aligned with social imperatives of subjectivity formation in autonomy-based liberal and neoliberal societies. These truths are generated by relying on cultural representations of children and equality rights and through the use of various narrative and rhetorical strategies.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my profound gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Valérie de Courville Nicol for her invaluable support, encouragement, and expert guidance throughout this project. I am highly thankful to my thesis committee members Dr. Greg Nielsen and Dr. Bev Best, whose thoughtful comments allowed for the successful completion of my work.

I am grateful to my family for their constant support, encouragement, and enthusiasm throughout my studies.

Lastly, I am thankful to SSHRC and FQRSC for funding this research project.

To my loving family

My father, Charles

My mother, Patricia

My brother, Pat

My grandmother, Rhea

Thank you deeply for your kind words and patience

Table of Contents

Chapter One	An Overview of the Chamberlain Case...1
Chapter Two	Governing Children through Books: A Historical Analysis of Children's Literature from the 18th-21st Century...8
Chapter Three	Theoretical Approaches...44
Chapter Four	Methodology...54
Chapter Five	Subjectivities and Truths Surrounding Equality Rights for Same-Sex Parents...68
Chapter Six	Subjectivities and Truths Surrounding Parental Rights and the Best Interests of Children...94
Chapter Seven	Conclusion...111
References	...113
List of Legal Cases	...124

Chapter One: An Overview of the Chamberlain Case

In April 1997, the Board of the Surrey School District in British Columbia passed a resolution that declined to approve the classroom use of three children's books depicting same-sex parents. The consequence of the resolution had far reaching implications and meant that the books could not be used in education curriculum in kindergarten and grade one classrooms within the District's elementary schools. The public's response to the decision provoked an extensive and heated debate. The decision was brought to the courts where a final judgement on the case was made in December 2002 by the Supreme Court of Canada. The case was well publicized and publicly debated in local and national newspapers.

Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36 provides a site to explore the discourses and rhetoric of respondents to the case in editorials, columns, and letters to the editor. This debate spans over six years and provides perspective into how respondents[1] create truth claims about this case through the 'emotion-based discourses' that they generate in speaking about the case. I return to the concepts of discourse, rhetoric and of 'emotion-based discourses' in the methods chapter.

The first part of this chapter maps the history of *Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36.* The history of this case presents an overview of the case's legal facts. Although the legal aspects of this case are not the center of this project, a brief summary of

[1] 'Respondents' in the context of this thesis includes journalists writing columns, editorialists, and the general public writing letters to the editor. The term is used interchangeably with 'commentator(s)'.

Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36 is relevant when taking into account the discourses produced in response to this case. This chapter briefly discusses the social and cultural context of the case and also provides demographic data on the area where the events of relevance to this case took place. The second part of this section outlines the significance of the case in newsprint media, particularly for the 'emotion-based discourses' that it generated.

Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36: A General Context

Surrey, British Columbia is a suburban municipality located within the Greater Vancouver area. The community is well known for its cultural diversity and large immigrant population. In terms of religious groupings, Protestants form the majority in the city, with a large number of people categorised as non-believers, Catholics and Sikhs. In addition, there are sizable Muslim and Hindu populations in Surrey (Collins, 2006, p. 348). This is a salient point as arguments about book censorship in the case hinged on appeals to the religious values of the community.

In January 1997, James Chamberlain, an elementary school teacher in the community submitted three books to the school board for approval for classroom use. They included: *Asha's Mums, Belinda's Bouquet,* and *One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dad, Blue Dad.* The Surrey School Board responded by disallowing the three early childhood books in all classrooms in Surrey. The censorship challenge was made on the basis that the books were considered inappropriate for young children because they cover 'sensitive issues'

and because they contain themes of positive representations of same-sex families (Shariff and Manley-Casimir, 1999, p. 157; *Chamberlain,* 2002, p. 17; Carter, 2004, p. 82).

After the board's refusal of the books, a series of legal battles at the provincial level followed. In June 1997, Chamberlain, supported by two advocacy groups, Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere (EGALE), and BC Civil Liberties Association, took the Board to court for violating their Charter rights to freedom of expression, equality rights, and freedom of religion (Collins, 2006, p. 348). In response, the Board argued that the books in question were refused classroom use because they made moral claims about gays and lesbians that conflicted with the religious beliefs of some of the parents within the school district. The British Columbia Supreme Court noted that the issues involved in this case brought about an atmosphere of strong public debate. On one side were concerns of civil liberties and human rights (i.e. for freedom of expression by teachers in choosing classroom materials) and equality rights for gays and lesbians through positive representations within materials selected for classroom curriculum. On the other side were issues of parental rights (i.e. freedom of religion, the freedom by parents to raise their children with certain moral beliefs), early education (i.e. whether some materials or content are considered inappropriate for certain age groups), and the role of an elected school board (i.e. whether educational materials should be chosen by a school board or a teacher).

In August a petition was filed with the Supreme Court of BC against the Board. The case was held in June and July, 1998 (BCLA Intellectual Freedom Committee). In December, Justice Mary Saunders ruled in favour of the petitioners, stating that the School Board

was in violation of the School Act because the ban was placed due to personal religious beliefs. The Board attempted to justify the banning of these early childhood books by claiming that they were protecting the religious values of parents within the community. However it was outlined in Justice Saunders' decision that to protect the beliefs of religious parents over the views of parents interested in positive representations of gay families in school curriculum was a violation of the School Act that states schools are required to be secular and pluralistic[2] (*Chamberlain*, 2002, p. 6; Carter, 2006, p. 82).

In June 2000, the Surrey School Board appealed the ruling. The Justices that oversaw this case overturned the previous decision, stating that when 'sensitive' materials are used in the classroom, parents are supposed to be consulted. It was outlined that it should be up to a teacher's discretion what materials to use in a classroom and not the School Board's decision. However, it was also suggested that teachers ought to consult with colleagues, parents, and the principal of their school before they use sensitive materials. The decision was considered a victory for both petitioners and the Board. It upheld the right to freedom of expression by teachers in promoting diversity in school curriculum and in protecting community members from discrimination through positive representation, while it also upheld the rights of parents to be involved in their children's education and consulted on curriculum materials (*Chamberlain*, 2002, p.3).

[2] Secularism in public schools was legally established in the late 1980's as a result of a class action suit by parents in Ontario and British Columbia where the Lord's Prayer was eliminated along with other religious teachings in public schools (*Zylberberg*, 1988; *Russow*, 1989). As a result of these cases, provincial school statutes were amended to state that public schools are to remain secular (Shariff, 2006, p. 478).

In June 2001, Chamberlain took the case to the Supreme Court of Canada. In December 2002, it was ruled that banning books about gay and lesbian parents did not promote the type of diverse, tolerant, and secular atmosphere expected of the public school system (Carter, 2006, p. 83). In her decision regarding the interpretation of the School Act, Chief Justice McLachlin stated:

> The Act's insistence on strict secularism does not mean that religious concerns have no place in the deliberations and decisions of the Board. Board members are entitled, and indeed required, to bring the views of the parents and communities they represent to the deliberation process. Because religion plays an important role in the life of many communities, these views will often be motivated by religious concerns. Religion is an integral aspect of people's lives, and cannot be left at the boardroom door. What secularism does rule out, however, is any attempt to use the religious views of one part of the community to exclude from consideration the values of other members of the community (*Chamberlain*, 2002, p. 12).

Her decision made it clear that school boards should not cater to the beliefs of religious parents to the point of excluding the values of other members of society (i.e. families headed by same-sex parents, and parents desiring their children to learn about diverse family types). It was concluded that the final decision regarding the books was not up to the courts to decide, and the responsibility was declared to be in the jurisdiction of the Surrey School Board (*Chamberlain*, 2002, p. 6). In June 2003, the Board voted for the second time on the three books, and it was ruled once again that they were to be banned. In making their decision, the Board came up with a list of criteria to evaluate whether or not the books were suitable for classroom use. The three children's picture books did not meet these new requirements. The Surrey School Board recommended two other titles featuring same-sex parents represented in the context of other stigmatized family types,

e.g. single parents, divorced parents. These books were viewed as appropriate because they discussed multiple family types (BCLA Intellectual Freedom Committee).

Having mapped the legal history of the case, it is important to note that a significant aspect of the Chamberlain case is the attention it received in local and national newspapers. The issues involved in the case sparked enormous debate, and were covered extensively in columns, editorials, and letters to the editor. These discourses focused on a number of issues involved in the debates, such as parental and child's rights, the age appropriateness of these books for kindergarten and grade 1 students, as well as the advocacy groups whose interests were in motivating a public dialogue on equal rights. A discourse analysis of the emotions produced in these debates by respondents writing in columns, editorials, and letters to the editor reveals how opinions on the case are produced and perpetuated through discourse. I argue that through these discourses respondents produce various truth claims about the Chamberlain case. These truth claims are derived from neoliberal political rationalities regarding equality rights and the subjectivity of childhood that require the promotion of individual responsibility and self-government so as to construct, uphold and maintain various subjectivities. More precisely, I argue that these discourses provide a forum in which individuals govern themselves as well as each other through the techniques of self-governance.

Thesis Statement and Research Questions

This thesis examines the emotion-based discourses produced by respondents in newspaper columns, editorials, and letters to the editor written in response to *Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36.* The case involved a censorship challenge

to three children's picture books in Surrey, British Columbia where discourses of equality rights, family values, and the role of education became heavily intertwined with appeals to emotion, ethics, and morality. In this way, this thesis analyzes the rhetoric, i.e. attempts to influence, within these discourses in order to delimit how emotions are conjured and described, and how the use of emotions and narrative strategies are exercised to associate truth claims to this case. Through this analysis, I demonstrate how the use of emotion-based discourses by columnists, editorialists, and the general public attempt to shape opinions about the case. In doing so, this thesis asks: how do discourses in the Chamberlain case rely on emotions and rhetorical strategies to produce 'effects of truth'[3] and alter public perceptions of the issues involved in this case? Along with this question I ask: what subjectivities do these discourses create, and how are they maintained?

[3] 'Effects of truth' is a concept used by Foucault in, amongst other places: Foucault, Michel. (1994) Entretien avec Michel Foucault. Dits et écrits, tome 4, 1980-1999. Paris: Gallimard, p. 41-95. Also discussed in : de Courville Nicol, Valérie. (2006). Pour une sociologie culturelle foucaldienne...de la peur. Sociologie et Sociétés 38 (2), 133-357.

Chapter Two: Governing Children through Books: A Historical Analysis of Children's Literature from the 18th-21st Century

Situating the Chamberlain Case within a Body of Literature

Before taking up a discourse analysis of columns, editorials and letters to the editor, I turn to research on the history of children's literature. My intention is to gain a better understanding of the constructed category of 'childhood' and insight into the historical process of bringing this concept into practice. More specifically, I am interested in the power-knowledge networks that permeate this historical process that impacts how childhood is defined and governed, which in turn effects the shifting definition of adult-child relations as well as what is considered 'appropriate' children's books.[4] Essential to my analysis of this historical process is that children's literature speaks to the values authors hope to teach children and thus acts as a space through which the subjectivity of childhood can be shaped. I argue that the subjectivity of childhood is governed not only within books but also through the control of books, i.e. censorship that involves restriction, and the banning of books. While children's literature can be viewed as a medium through which the subjectivity of childhood can be governed, I argue that it also acts as a space that illustrates the fears of adults in society during a particular era, and as a space where adults can manage these fears.

This investigation provides perspective on the emotion of fear in the discourse of censorship, and also offers a framework for analysis of the discourses surrounding a contemporary censorship case. More specifically, the examination of the processes of

[4] A distinction is made here between research in the sociology of childhood that relies of historical sociology, and governmentality research that looks at historical processes so as to question the constitution of the concept of childhood. This distinction is borrowed from: Bell, Vikki. (1993). "Governing Childhood: Neo-Liberalism and the Law," Economy and Society. 22(3). Pp. 390-405.

'governing through fear' and 'governing through censorship' associated with children's literature provides insights into the historical and cultural context in which the Chamberlain case emerged. It offers perspective into how children's literature acts as a site used to manage and control the subjectivities of children. The chapter begins with a definition of the concept of 'governing' as defined by governmentality theory. This is followed by a description of how fear and censorship act as governing processes in the literary genre of children's literature. This is proceeded by examples within the history of children's literature of these processes as well as examples of their transformation and shifting forms alongside the changing definition of 'childhood' from the seventeenth century until today.

Governing Childhood: The Constitution of the Subjectivity of 'the Child'

This literature review explores how fear and censorship *of* and *in* children's books have been used as techniques for socialization. I also examine the ways that children partake in this governing process by embodying the fear that motivates adults to exercise these governing practices (i.e. fear of disobedience, improper socialization, deviance). Thus, the definition of governing in the context of this thesis, specifically in terms of the use of techniques of fear and censorship to govern, is not a question of control or dominance exerted by adults over children. In governmentality theory the notion of power as repressive is rejected in favour of a view of power as a dynamic force that is inevitable in all social relations from family relations, to institutional, administrative, and group relations (Foucault, 2003, p. 93). When power is exercised, knowledge is produced about subjects. For Foucault, power and knowledge are inextricably interrelated where power

relations can not exist without the correlative production of knowledge and truths (Foucault, 1984, p. 175). Power rather than being coercive or repressive is viewed in governmentality theory as dynamic in that it shifts. Power is also viewed as productive in that power-knowledge relations produce subjectivities. In this way, power is conceived of as producing subjects, and forms of knowledge and truths that constitute those subjectivities (Foucault, 1982, p. 219-220).

Connected with the notion of power within governmentality theory is the concept of biopower. Foucault defines biopolitics as a form of politics that developed in the eighteenth century that is concerned with the administration of the conditions of life of a population. This political rationality considers the population as "a living entity composed of vital processes" (Dean, 1999, p. 209). Biopower operates by governing life, i.e. through interventions that govern the health, habitation, urban environment, working conditions, and education of various populations. Foucault (1977) found that through bio-power, the child becomes much of the focus of this governing, in that by intervening in matters that involve the child (i.e. medical practitioners at birth, educationalists at school, etc.) the subjectivity of 'childhood' is created and advanced through power-knowledge networks. These issues are discussed further in the following section.

Fear in Children's Books as a Governing Process

The research that has been done on the history of children's books is abundant (Storr, 1970; MacLeod, 1975; MacLeod, 1994; Donelson and Nilsen, 1997; Zipes, 2001; Stallcup, 2002). Of the scholars interested in this history, Stallcup's (2002) work on the

topic is notable for its examination of fear in children's books. In her research, Stallcup has found that the use of fear *in* the books[5] read to children existed in earlier centuries and continues to exist however in a different form in the twenty-first century. She argues that early forms of fear *in* these books were explicit, and were used to frighten children into good behavior. Fear was also produced *in* books to encourage bravery and courageousness. She states that as child-adult relations shifted throughout the decades, adults became more protective of children and began to worry about what consequences these materials had on them. The anxiety generated by parents/adults over the possible consequences of using fear as a governing technique in children's books resulted in the practice becoming culturally inappropriate in North America around the twentieth century. Books that explicitly induced fear were replaced or rewritten to alleviate fear in children rather than encourage worry, anxiety, and other intense emotions. Stallcup argues however that rather than eliminating fear from children's books, the use of fear altered form. She notes that although fear *in* children's books is no longer as overt, it is still apparent that fear is used to ensure adult authority and influence over children. Stallcup's theory as to why these themes continue to be present within children's literature is that cultural representations of children serve to produce and reinforce adults' fears, thereby prompting and legitimizing efforts to govern them. These points are explained further in later sections in this chapter.

[5] The use of fear in the context of this thesis can range from stories that have fear as the theme (e.g. scary stories) to books where fear is not the general theme of the story but is nevertheless generated within the book (e.g. fear of consequences of bad behavior, fear of authority figures).

Censorship in Children's Books as a Governing Process

Contemporary research on censorship challenges from the twentieth century onward is frequently framed by scholars through a legal lens where definitions of censorship come directly from the law. For example, Carefoote, a rare books archivist in Toronto, defines censorship, as the "removal, suppression or restricted circulation of literary, artistic, educational materials because they are morally objectionable by the standard of the censor" (p. 13). Carefoote's (2007) definition of censorship is considered to be a narrow definition of censorship in that it views censorship solely as the banning of books.

While Carefoote's definition of censorship includes books that are restricted in access, it does not take into account censorship *in* books. I argue that a more broad definition of censorship should include a distinction between censorship *in* and *of* books. Censorship *in* books relates to the production of a book (e.g. what topics can be discussed, how books are edited or altered when they are imported, etc). Censorship *of* books relates to banning or restricted access of books (e.g. taking books out of school libraries, importation restrictions on books, suppression by bookstores of books, etc).[6] The same can be said for governing through fear. The technique of governing through fear, similarly to governing through censorship, occurs *in* as well as *outside* of children's books. In the previous section I argued that the use of fear *in* children's books was practised in order to frighten children into good behavior. As is elaborated on in later sections, fear *of* children's books is also significant in the governance of children through children's books in that censorship is based on the fear that reading shapes subjectivities.

[6] In this thesis a distinction between censorship *of* children's books and *in* children's books is made. This is denoted through the use of italics. Censorship *of* children's books includes banning, suppression, and selection of books, whereas censorship *in* children's books refers to editing of imported books, and restrictions on the subjects discussed within books.

It can therefore be argued that censorship is used to control the subjectivity formation of children by restricting what they read. Thus, governing through fear *of* children's books can be considered synonymous with the concept of censorship. Examples of governing through fear and censorship will be given in the following section with distinctions made for the two techniques when the governing process is occurring *in* and *of* children's books.

Lastly, it is important to notes that while censorship within this history can be interpreted as a technique by which adults attempt to shape literature and influence what children learn, censorship of children's books should also be viewed as an expression of fear in adults regarding the perceived impacts of books on children. I elaborate on this argument in later sections.

Barriers to a History of Children's Literature

In my analysis of the scholarly work on the history of children's literature I found that researchers examining this history encounter the difficult obstacle of how to define the notion of 'children's literature'. Of the authors that I looked at that discussed this history in detail, most define children's literature as texts for children or books intentionally written with children readers/audiences in mind (MacLeod, 1975; Hunt, 1990; Hunt, 1991; Hunt, 2001). As the following section will show, the books that were read to children in earlier centuries such as fairytales and instructional books were written with adults as the perceived audience and were not specifically written for children or with children in mind even though they were frequently read to or by them. Historians of

children's literature typically mark the start of children's literature in the nineteenth century when authors began to write books where children were considered to be the intended audience. Being that this point is where the histories that I analysed locate the start of children's literature, I also understand it as such while recognizing that other accounts of this history may include in the definition of children's literature books written for adult audience although read to children. Hunt (1990) recognizes this debate within academia and cites the example of Adams (1986) as a scholar whose work makes the claim that books that were routinely associated with children, even if their purpose was didactic or not written specifically for children, can also be classified as children's literature. She argues that texts as far back as 2112 BC fall under this canon (p. 14). While I attempt to take into account early forms of books written for children in my historical analysis, the diversity amongst historians as to 'what counts' as children's literature and when the literary genre precisely began complicates this task and is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Children's Literature: The Instructional Book

Historians that research the history of children's literature mark the religious and evangelical writing traditions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as fundamental to the development of children's books (MacLeod, 1975; Zipes, 1981; Donelson and Nilsen, 1997; Hunt, 2001, p. xiiii). According to Donelson and Nilsen's (1997) history of children's literature, prior to 1800, the books that were read to children and young adults were religious and used to instil moral lessons. An example of a book read to children during this era was John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The themes in this book were

reminders to young people that they were merely small adults that should prepare for the world ahead of them (p. 45). MacLeod's (1975) and Zipes'(1981) histories of children's literature make a similar observation: that up until the late eighteenth century, books for children consisted of instructional literature on social and individual values and were designed to socialize young children (MacLeod, 1975, p. 10; Zipes, 1981, p. 20).

Zipes (1981) notes that there were significant class issues in the creation of children's instructional books, and in the later establishment of children's literature as a literary category. Instructional books for children developed in the seventeenth century with the rise of the middle-class. Zipes argues that individuals belonging to the middle-class increasingly demanded that children be obedient, as well as industrious and malleable workers. These books served the benefits of clergymen, teachers, the government, and publishers who had vested interests in the socialization of children (p. 20).

In the 1820s, children's literature was culturally accepted as separate from other forms of literature. This marked the foundation of authors writing stories specifically for children (MacLeod, 1975, p. 10, 20, 31; Zipes, 1981, p. 20). Children's literature was recognized as a literary category once adult perceptions of children shifted from the view that children were similar to adults towards the view that they were distinct from adults (MacLeod, 1975, p. 10, 43). Ariès, a cultural historian of children and childhoods, concurs with McLeod's view that children's literature developed following the transformation of adult perspectives on children. He discusses the constructed nature of the concept of "the child" which was created in the late eighteenth century at a time when

children were seen by society as separate from adults and placed in contrast to one another (Ariès, 1962, p.33).

Nineteenth Century Children's Literature: The Shifting Concept of the Child

In Ariès' (1962) examination of previous eras, he argues that there is little before the seventeenth century that resembles our current concept of the child. Ariès' historical analysis of the medical records, portraits, costumes, literature, language, the history of education, and various social documents, found that the ways in which we view the child in the twentieth-first century are not present during earlier times. He argues that the concept of 'the child' or 'childhood' became a category socially and culturally in later centuries, and was commonly acknowledged and accepted in the nineteenth century. His intention is not to focus on the absence of 'childhood' or 'children' in earlier centuries, but rather to expose them as constructs (p. 33).

MacLeod (1975), Kincaid (1992), and Donelson and Nilsen (1997) also note that the nineteenth century marked an era where society's perception of children as small adults altered towards a view of children as a distinct category. According to Donelson and Nilsen, and McLeod this shift was due to urbanization, the widespread establishment of public schools, increased interest in children's education for the future of the United States, and the creation of child labour laws that prevented children from working at young ages (MacLeod, 1975, p.9-10; Donelson and Nilsen, 1997, p.45). Kincaid (1992) attributes the construction of binaries and dichotomies that outline the boundaries between adults and children to be reflective of the sentiment by adults at the time that

their positions and authority were being threatened in a society that made no cultural distinctions between the two (p. 7).

As I have outlined, the shifting attitude in the definition of adult-children relations that resulted in the creation of a literary genre specifically for children has been interpreted by historians as a period where adults become increasingly invested in the education of future generations for the better good of society. This period can also be understood as a time where the construction of 'childhood' as a special state or category distinct from adulthood justify increased public surveillance and protection towards children. Donzelot's (1979) and Bell's (1993) governmentality approaches to childhood contend that during the last few decades of the eighteenth century until the end of the nineteenth century, childhood underwent change as a result of a shifting perspective of 'the family'. Under this doctrine the father of the family was viewed as the sovereign power and entitled to patriarchal authority (Bell, 1993, p. 393). Through liberalism, the relationship between parents and children was reconfigured. The subordination of children and women within the family by patriarchal authority was considered to be an old power that was no longer conducive to the norms of a society that treated each member of the family as individuals. The reshaping of the notion of 'the family' consequently resulted in greater autonomy for women and children from the patriarchal authority that existed previously (Donzelot, 1979, xxi). As a result of this increased autonomy the state was given more opportunity to monitor the population. This monitoring took the form of moralization and normalization through the establishment of programs and agencies such as schools, hygiene inspections, and philanthropic advice (Donzelot, 1979, p. 16-7; Bell,

1993, p. 393). Children were at the center of these changes and governing practices. Through legal provisions, the transfer of sovereignty from the father to philanthropists, magistrates and doctors was enabled (MacLeod, 1975, p.9; Donzelot, 1979, p.19).

Coupled with state monitoring of the population under liberalism, was the deployment of the ideal of "laissez-faire" where parents were set tasks around the upbringing of children, and provided with advice on how to go about it. This advice was given with the understanding that it was up to parents to fulfill their duty, however the threat of intervention would remain in the event of their failure (Donzelot, 1979, p. 295; Bell, 1993, p. 394). The cooperation of the family was set up as voluntary, for their own wellbeing, and as a crucial process in the normalization processes of a liberal society. With these changes in social conditions, parents could be monitored in order to ensure that they were adequately supervising their children, while they were also used to control dangerous children (Bell, 1993, p. 393). Through state norms and philanthropic moralization, the family was required to maintain and supervise its children if it did not want itself to become an object of surveillance. Donzelot (1979) labels this 'governing through the family' (p. 92).

Taking a similar governmentality approach to children's literature, de Courville Nicol (2004) makes the claim that the creation of the genre relates not only to changing perspectives of the notion of 'childhood' but also the social imperative under liberalism of shaping the subjectivities of children in particular ways. She contends that emerging liberal societies were moved by the social imperative to develop new spaces and

techniques of subjectivity formation in the constitution of self-governing subjects. Growing concerns surrounding the impact of books on "threatening" populations- notably women, children and the working classes- can be situated in this context.

There is a consensus amongst both governmentality and historical perspectives on childhood and children's literature that the nineteenth century was a period in which the conceptualization of childhood and perceptions of children in relation to adults was evolving. Historical perspectives offer insight into the emergence of childhood through an examination of its differential treatment in language, dress, and artistic portrayal, and in changes of approaches to parenting and educational practices which resulted in the categorization of a period of life now recognized as 'childhood'. The governmentality perspectives that I outlined also examine the construction of the subjectivity of 'childhood'. However, rather than tracing the notion of childhood historically, a governmentality approach's interests lie in understanding the power-knowledge networks and social imperatives that are ingrained in these historical processes that bring into practice the concept of 'childhood'. This is the approach that I take up in this thesis. I argue that the consequence of shifts in perspectives of adult-child relations as well as social imperatives under liberalism developed a medium that would facilitate the processes of governing children through fear and through censorship.

This section outlined how the concept of childhood is socially constructed. It also discussed how the creation of this category and social imperatives (i.e. need to protect and monitor children) under liberalism resulted in the development of a literary genre

specifically for children. I argued that as a result of shifting perspectives in adult-children relations, as well as changing social and cultural conditions that required an increased need to protect and monitor children produced new spaces and techniques for the constitution of the subjectivity of 'the child' and 'childhood'. With the development of children's literature, I argue that children's books provided a forum through which the subjectivity of childhood could be advanced by practices of governing through censorship and fear. The remaining sections of this chapter discuss these arguments.

Censorship in Nineteenth Century Children's Literature

Donelson and Nilsen (1997) outline two types of fictional novel that became popular with young adults in the 1850s: domestic and dime novels. Domestic novels were written for young girls and preached morality, women's submission to men, the value of cultural, social, and political conservatism, and the glories of suffering. Dime novels, when they were first published were intended for adult audiences. Publishers soon discovered that many readers were young boys. From this genre of book developed other forms of novels including mysteries, forms of science fiction, and westerns. Dime novels were typically considered to be melodramatic with stereotyped characters, and themes of moral undertones (p. 49). Despite the promise of some adventure in these novels, Donelson and Nilsen (1997) as well as Zipes (1981) note that whether the books were dime novels, romance novels, adventure books, biblical stories, fairytales, or nursery rhymes, they all served a common purpose: to socialize readers into the cultural norms of the middle-class and to instil moral lessons (Donelson and Nilsen, 1997, p.49; Zipes, 1981, p. 20). There are no clear indications from the history of children's literature that there was explicit

censorship occurring *in* the books that children were reading. However there are indications that children were prescribed certain books based on gender, for example boys were meant to read adventure books, while girls read about the domestic duties of the home or romance novels. The prescription of these books through selection (i.e. recommending particular types of books to children, or suggesting books to children by gender) can be considered a way in which the practice of governance of children through books was present during the beginning of this century.

McLeod (1975) highlights the 1860s as a distinct decade where hundreds of non-school books became available as The U.S. began to invest in moulding its youth (p. 19). These included books on history, biography, poetry, and fiction. Donelson and Nilsen (1997) note, similarly to Zipes (1981), that despite the shift in attitude towards children, the literature produced for them continued to be pious, sombre, and moralistic reflecting adult values (p. 414). McLeod (1975, p. 20) agrees with Donelson and Nilsen that the majority of children's literature tended to be moralistic. McLeod points out that regardless of the moral undertones of children's books, the publication of fiction books were highly debated as they were considered frivolous and a dangerous influence on children. They were eventually permitted (p. 22).

It is not surprising that during this time there began to be public concern about the books that children were reading. Shifting attitudes towards children did not only result in changes in education and in the books that children read but in many aspects of the lives of children that were perceived to be in need of protection (i.e. child labour, housing, and

the age of consent).[7] Rose (1989) argues similarly to Foucault (1977) that with the construction of the concept of 'childhood', childhood became constituted as an object of scientific gaze through psychology, social workers, educationalists, and other experts in monitoring, categorizing, and managing children and childhood. This is to say that a certain conception of childhood was a means to justify the increased surveillance, and protection of the lives of children. Censorship *in* and *of* children's books is one method that was exercised in order to manage and survey children.

Fear and Moral Lessons in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Children's Books

Storr's (1970) research on fear and evil in children's books in the nineteenth century found that moral lessons were frequently taught to children by frightening and horrifying children into good behavior. Death was a frequent and visible aspect of a Victorian child's life, and it was not uncommon or unusual that children's authors would write and illustrate themes of death. Storr makes the observation that it was not just death that was described in detail in children's books to teach moral lessons but also poverty, brutality, lunacy, feeble-mindedness, alcoholism, gross-injustice, along with other horrifying aspects of life during this century that contemporary authors would be more hesitant to introduce to children (p. 24). She notes that the one topic that remained censored from children's literature was sex. According to Storr, this is a marked departure from the

[7] Jackson and Scott (1999) outline that during the nineteenth century public concern about children resulted in campaigns to exclude children from mining work so that they would not be exposed to lewd conduct and language. They also note that philanthropists during this century were particularly concerned with housing conditions of the poor where it was thought that incest was likely to occur in homes where whole families slept in one room. The authors also highlight the purity movement which exposed 'child prostitution' and led to the raising of the age of consent to sixteen (p. 87).

eighteenth century where some aspects of sex were discussed in children's literature such as illegitimate babies and themes of high romance. However, by the mid 1850s, the physical aspects of sex were no longer mentioned and sex was conspicuously absent however frequently implied. Storr's perspective on the openness in which Georgian (1714-1837) and Victorian (1837-1901) authors discussed issues such as death relates to the attitude of a time when it was believed to be permissible to shock and scare children into good behavior (p. 25).

Fairytales are an example of a type of children's book that played a powerful role in childhood through their abilities to stir up a wide range of emotions and feelings such as fear and sympathy while also offering wit, wisdom, warning, and counsel (Tatar, 1987, p. xxvii). According to McLeod (1975), when fairytales first emerged in the United States, they were viewed, similarly to children's fiction books, as shocking, monstrous, and as a bad influence on children. The criticism that folk and fairytales experienced in the nineteenth century was an expression of an early form of censorship. Although these books were not banned, they were frowned upon by society. In later centuries, this attitude towards fairytales changed and these types of books became very popular. They also played an interesting role in governing children through fear (p. 24) as I explain in more detail in the next section.

Fear in Twentieth Century Children's Literature: A Case Study of Grimms' Tales

During the first three decades of the twentieth century, fairytales were accepted in the United States. Eventually they became well-liked, common in many households, and frequently read to children. Enjoying extraordinary success were the fairytales written by the Grimms' brothers. Since their first publication in two volumes in Europe and Britain in 1812 and 1815, Grimms' tales have entertained, inspired, influenced, and instructed (Tatar, 1987, p. xiii). According to Zipes (2001), many collections of these tales were imported for American audiences. By the 1930s and 1940s, the United States saw a rise in American folklore, American writers for children, and experts in libraries on children's literature. In the 1930s teachers, librarians, and academics from Boston and New York set the tone on fairytales, particularly Grimm's tales, specifically how they should be taught, told, and read. At the time, people in America largely considered fairytales to be frivolous, subversive, pagan, escapist, and potentially dangerous for the health and sanity of children. Publishers, editors, librarians, and teachers were placed with the responsibility of reforming the reputation of fairytales so as to demonstrate that they were not dangerous for the minds of children. This aspect in the history of fairy and folk tales suggests that these actors played a role in censorship through the techniques they used to alter the status of these books. This censorship took the form of editing stories to meet the cultural standards of American audiences, and directing storytellers and readers on how a book should be read or told (p.84). In Hunt's (2001) research on folktales and fairytales, he found that for much of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was an ongoing debate as to the impact of these tales on children (p. 276).

Published in 1962, Edward Gory's book *Gashlycrumb Tinies* is an example of a contemporary book that pays homage to Grimm's tales of the Victorian era, and popular American fear inducing children's stories of earlier decades. The book is small in shape, designed for the hands of children, upbeat rhyming, short, with pictures of children on every page, and appears to be a traditional alphabet book designated for children learning to read. However, the storyline is the depiction of the gruesome death of twenty-six children. Stallcup (2002) makes the argument that the portrayal of these grisly deaths of children in *Gashlycrumb Tinies* was a tribute to children's books of the Victorian times where violence was used to instil fear in young readers so as to frighten them into obedience through threatening severe punishment. Similarly to Storr (1970), Stallcup argues that the intent of books of this era was to control children through implicit and explicit threats of violence (p. 126). Stallcup notes that Gory's book is typical of children's books of the eighteenth and nineteenth century where young characters commonly faced violent punishment and death as a result of transgressing social boundaries and challenging adult authority. This type of punishment was viewed as culturally appropriate because the fear that these books produced in children was a reflection of the adult fear that if children were not scared by consequences they would run wild or threaten adult social order (p. 125, 131).

Despite the continued use of fairytales and other fear inducing books to govern children, this practice was re-evaluated during the second half of the nineteenth century and the mid-twentieth century (Stearns and Haggerty, 1991). Advice literature for the American

middle-class before and after 1900 began to suggest that the use of fear in child-rearing was a barrier to sensible behavior. Stearns' (2006) research on children's books of this century makes a similar finding noting that compared to the original Grimm's tales from Europe, Gory's tales were highly sanitized version of the original, due to subjects and issues deemed too graphic for American audiences. These tales were edited to meet American cultural standards as can be seen in the Disney versions of these tales and in the later publications of the tales that reflected the American value that fear-inducing situations should be reduced in children's literature (Stearns, 2006, p. 104; Hunt, 2001, p. 275). While some experts warned parents against the use of fear in child-rearing, other experts continued to follow the European mindset that the use of fear in children's literature was a way in which children could celebrate the courageous conquest of fear (Stearns and Haggerty, 1991, p. 63). The use of more explicit fear in children's literature did however diminish significantly in the twentieth century as efforts by parents to instil fear in children began to be deeply condemned. This is not to suggest that contemporary children's books use less fear but that the means of producing fear and its expressions have changed.

Stallcup (2002) also attributes this shift in attitude towards children as a result of the way adults perceive childhood. She argues that contemporary representations of childhood consider it to be a period of purity and innocence where children should be protected from books that might affect their fragile nature (p. 128-9). As society began to change their attitude towards children, children's literature shifted from encouraging moral

challenges to reducing fearful situations and supplying comfort and protection when fear was encountered.

Censorship in Twentieth Century Children's Literature: A Case Study of Curious George

As has been described, the books that children read in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were written from the point of view that children and adults were alike. The literary world only created the separate category of children's literature after social and cultural perceptions of adult-child relations shifted towards the view that children were distinct and social imperatives that necessitated the protection and monitoring of children provided the need for new spaces to govern them. Early forms of censorship were expressed in the criticism some books received as a result of being too frivolous, as causing subversive behavior, and having unknown consequences on the minds of children. As a result of this criticism, some books imported from Europe were rewritten to mitigate public controversy or debate over the stories and tales that were told.

In Stearns' (2006) research on fear and censorship in America, he cites the *Curious George* series as an example of how children's books have been altered throughout the decades and across cultural communities to reflect the values of the societies and times in which they were written and imported. Written in the 1940s by two German immigrants, the original stories of *Curious George* involved a monkey that got into terrifying situations where he is kidnapped, imprisoned, had accidents, and had falls with broken limbs. The book was first written in Germany where the European perspective on children and socialization believed it to be socially acceptable to expose children to

frightening situations as it was considered beneficial in training them to deal with fear. Stearns notes that these views about children and childhood were antithetical to the shifting culture occurring for young American children where adults believed fear-producing situations should be eliminated in children's books (p. 6). Stearns argues that from the 1930s onwards, the impulse by adults in America to protect children through literature had already been applied by softening folktales such as *Cinderella*. By 1952, the *Curious George* series had been altered to present George in fewer scary adventures. This change was coupled with the increased presence of loving human beings that supervised him and kept George out of trouble (p. 7). Later publications of the series relied on the expert advice of a psychologist and paediatrician on the publication staff in order to reduce the opportunity for emotionally challenging adventures. According to Stearns, more recent stories illustrate George as anxious in challenging circumstances and eager to stay at home rather than encountering fear-inducing situations. Stearns notes that the cultural norm of protecting children from fear-inducing situations in children's literature diverged drastically from traditional European emotional standards and norms as well as differed from earlier American standards where fearful situations in books were seen as normal and character building particularly for young boys (p. 7).

Fear in Contemporary Children's Books

As was demonstrated in the case study of the *Curious George* series, in comparison to fear-inducing books of the past, contemporary children's books are predominantly "fear-alleviating" in that they attempt to reduce childhood fears or help children psychologically and emotionally by illustrating how they can overcome frightening

situations. On the surface these books appear to liberate children of their fears and even possibly be subversive of adult authority when children are presented as facing their fears without the help of adults. Stallcup (2002) notes however that underlying these themes are issues of power and governance comparable to children's books of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. According to Stallcup, the exercise of power towards children through fear therefore remains an essential part of child rearing. She also argues that "fear-inducing" books of the eighteenth and nineteenth century and "fear-alleviating" books of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries provide cultural insight into how adults perceive children in terms of this power relationship.

For example, Stallcup (2002) argues that contemporary books seek to reassure children of their fears or imaginary dangers while at the same time demonstrating that there are very real dangers that only adults can manage. Other books illustrate that children do not always have to rely on adults to overcome fears if they develop adult-like characteristics (p. 126-7). Stallcup makes the claim that even though contemporary children's literature rejects fear as a child-rearing tactic, other exercises of power such as surveillance and instruction continue to be used in books to maintain the adult-child relationship and to secure adult authority. This in turn diminishes the possibility for children to be empowered or grow emotionally through these books (p. 127-9). Thus Stallcup notes that in contemporary children's literature alleviating children's fear is not the sole goal of these texts as their subtext reveals cultural assumptions regarding adult relationships with children.

Stallcup (2002) concludes that although contemporary books contain themes of empowerment, the autonomy given to children in these stories is compromised by themes of fear alleviation where children must resort to the comfort and protection of adults when a problem arises. It is also significant to note that while contemporary books are designed to be fear-alleviating, they must first produce the fears that they intend to alleviate. Stallcup's theory on why the use of fear persists in children's literature is that cultural representations of children as innocent and in need of protection continue to be perpetuated which in turn produce and heighten adults' fears, thus justifying efforts to govern them. First, Stallcup argues that adults have a need to protect and comfort children while also reassuring themselves that they are capable of providing this protection. Second, parents have a deep rooted fear of children's potential to be deviant and destructive. Third, parents have a need for children to become acceptably socialized adults. These account for the continuing use of fear in children's literature. Hunt (2001) makes a similar finding in his research on censorship in children's literature. He suggests that the fear and mistrust produced by cultural representations of childhood is just as strong as the desire to protect a supposed, remembered, or wished for innocence. For these reasons, Hunt contends that the history of children's literature is characterized by an exercise of power (Hunt, 2001, p. 256-7).

Governing Children through Fear and Governing Children through Censorship

As previously outlined, contemporary concepts of childhood are socially constructed. I have argued that the technique of the use of fear to govern children is also constructed in

that it is based on fears that adults' hold on the possibly subversive or destructive nature of children. These fears are based on cultural representations of children as in need of protection. It is reflective of a social need to socialize children into adults and have them abide by dominant norms and ideologies, and the adult need to comfort and protect children. Stallcup (2002) argues that depending on the time, the geographic area, and the culture of a given area, the factors that make up the use of fear as a governing tool in children's books shifts and alters (p. 152). Zipes (1981) makes a similar argument stating that contemporary adult cultural perspectives on children view them as fundamentally different from themselves. He argues that the fear of children for the reason that they are unlike adults is a newly constructed cultural idea as the boundary or dichotomy between child and adult was developed in the mid-nineteenth century. Zipes contends that by recognizing childhood as a constructed category, there is also an acknowledgement that this category is not stagnant, that it is socially and culturally produced, and that it has the potential to transition and change (p. 19).

For Zipes (1981) and Stallcup (2002), governing children through fear within children's books is a process that is based on social and cultural beliefs regarding children and childhood. Carefoote (2007) and Stearns (2006) make a similar argument regarding censorship. They argue that censorship occurs as a result of tensions in a society across social and cultural beliefs. When printed materials present themes, topics, or illustrations that run contrary to a community's norms, or certain members of a community object to materials, censorship arises. Carefoote (2007) argues that as a result of censorship being dependant on a community's norms, there are no explicit standards for censorship as it is

dependant on a number of factors such as: the censors involved in a challenge and how they go about their claim; the community, i.e. the geographic location, size, economy, national origin of community members; and political or religious movements within the community (p. 13).

In the following section I continue my analysis of the literature on the history of children's literature and focus on children's books and the twenty-first century. I draw closer links between governing through fear *in* and *of* children's books and the use of censorship as mechanisms for governing children through literature. I then extend the argument that censorship is a governing mechanism *in* and *of* children's literature by making the claim that censorship, similarly to governing children through fear, is dependant on cultural concerns of children and childhood (specifically that children should be protected through the books that they read, and that childhood should remain innocent). In other words, censorship is itself based on fear and is thus a means through which adults govern their own fear. As Stallcup (2002) has argued, governing children through fear-inducing and fear-alleviating books has cultural implications for adult-child relations and how society views childhood. Similarly, I argue that censorship is another facet of governing children as it is an expression of adult fear towards children based on their cultural representations. While there are many types of emotions that come into play with censorship such as anger, frustration, defensiveness, anxiety, restraint, and shock (Herzog, 1995, p. 145), I argue that censorship is an expression of adult fear towards children because it involves concern regarding the uncertain consequences of particular materials, issues, and topics on children. Therefore, censorship *in* and *of*

children's literature is a concern not necessarily about the materials in question, but rather an expression of fear by adults on the feared/dangerous impacts of those materials on children. In the following section, I also present censorship as an expression of a struggle about the loss of control that a parent feels towards materials that questions their values, culture, or traditions (Herzog, 1995, p. 144).

The Censorship of Contemporary Children's Literature

In *Trust Your Children: Voices against Censorship in Children's Literature*, West (1997) discusses censorship in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. He makes the argument that legal challenges and the banning of children's books has existed since the creation of the literary category of children's literature. He states that in many respects censorship *of* children's books (i.e. banning, restricted access) is more widespread today than in the past as a wider range of children's books are being challenged and campaigns against books are better organized. West also argues that the type of censorship that occurs within contemporary society is more visible to the general public (challenges are discussed publicly, challenges are brought to court), and the public is frequently more involved in challenges (p. vii). West is making the claim that the type of censorship that was most frequently seen in earlier centuries was censorship *in* books, i.e. through restrictions on taboo topics for children's books. This form of censorship was an invisible form of censorship where the public was generally unaware of the censorship that was taking place. During the 1960s, restrictions on taboo topics were lessened resulting in increased cases of censorship *of* books by community members or institutions such as schools rather than *in* books by authors, editors, or publicists. This does not

negate the fact that censorship *in* children's books still occurs. Authors mostly likely continue to be pressured to exclude certain topics when writing children's books. Censorship *in* children's books also occurs in contemporary literature when educators (teachers and principals) and librarians engage in self-censorship by crossing-out specific passages or words that they deem inappropriate (Jenkison, 1986). This form of censorship is discussed further in a later section.

While West (1997) argues that children's literature has always been subject to some form of censorship since the creation of the genre in the nineteenth century, he notes that prior to the 1970s the type of censorship that took place occurred while the author wrote, or by the editor. Authors from the 1940s and 1950s understood that there were certain taboos to be avoided when they wrote children's books such as swearing, references to sexuality, and controversial social problems. They accepted these restrictions, and in doing so authors of children's literature became their own censors (p. vii-viii). Donelson and Nilsen (1997) recount a similar history during this decade except they add that some taboo subjects such as drug use, divorce, and school drop-outs were introduced in children and young adult literature through subtle implication and as examples of bad behavior (p. 434). The avoidance of certain taboo topics continued as a trend into the 1960s, however this trend broke down at the end of the decade when children's authors, editors, and publishers began to ignore the unwritten guidelines on forbidden themes and topics that had restricted them in the past (West, 1997, p. viii; Donelson and Nilsen, 1997, p. 113). As a result, a new breed of children's books began to emerge that dealt specifically with controversial topics. Writers were encouraged by publishers to write

serious coming-of age stories geared towards teenagers moving from childhood to adulthood. These books have been classified by children's literature historians as *new realism* or *problem novels* for their focus on the every day issues of young adults. Many of these types of books were also written in response to the romanticized stories of previous decades that spoke little to the lives of children and young adults (ibid). Judy Blume, the most frequently censored author in the history of American children's literature, wrote about topics that included: menstruation in *Are You There God? It's Me Margaret*; masturbation in *Deenie*; divorce in *It's Not the End of the World*; drug abuse in *Letters to Judy*; and racism in *Iggie's House* (Barry, 1998).

West (1997) notes that when controversial children's books started to emerge they caused little initial controversy (p. viii). In Dick's (1982) history of contemporary censorship she argues that challenges to books began to occur in Canada in the early 1970s around the time trade books were added to school curriculum. Challenges *of* books would set the stage for the censorship challenges that were to occur later on when censorship through suppression took off (p. 7). Parents increasingly demanded that these types of books be banned from schools and public libraries. Conservative political and religious organizations launched campaigns against a number of books. West notes that the censorship trend accelerated into the early 1980s where most challenges involved concern with sexuality in books (p. ix). During the 1990s it was quite popular for conservative activists to censor children's books that dealt with non-traditional families. Critics targeted books that focused on gay families such as *Daddy's Roommate* and

Heather Has Two Mommies as well as books that present single-parent families in a positive light such as Meredith Tax's picture book *Families* (Ibid).

Other recent challenges have come from activists on the religious right that attack children's books that discuss magic, witches, or ghosts. J.K. Rowling's seven-part series depicts the story of the young wizard Harry Potter. When the books were first published they were enormously popular in the young adult literature community. Parents and teachers were fascinated by the series' ability to capture the imagination of children on an international level. Critics however characterize the book as satanic for containing occult themes, glorification of witchcraft, violence, and anti-family attitudes. Carefoote (2007) cites the cases of four cities in Canada that have censored the series by restricting them to library use under supervision. A fifth case in Whitby, Ontario requires students to have parents sign a consent form before allowing *The Philosopher's Stone* to be read in classrooms (p. 125). Despite religious critics, other religious groups have characterized Harry Potter as a Christ figure. Several Canadian Christian churches have used the book for theological reflecting as the stories deal with moral issues of good and evil. The American Library Association gave this series the title of most challenged book of the 21st century (Ibid).

Initiators of School Censorship and Rationales for Complaints

Initiators of contemporary school censorship are typically parents or interest groups such as political or religious organizations concerned with individual and/or family values, teachers, administrators, librarians, authors, and politicians. The rationale for their

complaint is based on the view that certain materials can corrupt children and adolescents, offend sensitive readers, or undermine values and beliefs (Reichman, 1993, p. 15). Reichman (1993) points out that censors involved in school challenges come from both the political right as well as the political left, anywhere from conservative Christian groups to those advocating left-wing minority rights (p. 14). Shariff and Manley-Casimir (1999) came up with similar findings and suggested that challenges occur when minority groups from all sides of the political spectrum sense that their beliefs are being threatened and coerced by society's norms, and when they feel forced to conform to the dominant ideology. They note that book challenges also occur when a society becomes increasingly diverse and multicultural as has occurred in Canada (p. 164). A similar conclusion was made by Stephens (2003) writing about the controversies surrounding the *Harry Potter Series* in The U.S. It was found that those who call for censorship of the series are frequently parents who are evangelical Christians that find the series objectionable because they live in a country where their values are at odds with contemporary society and the changing nature of children's literature. Their concerns and objections are therefore reflective of the fear of possible loss of their traditional values and culture (p. 60). The fear that founds this type of censorship also relates to the notion that reading shapes one's subjectivity. When censors are presented with materials that violate their worldview, censorship of these books becomes a technique through which they can exercise power so as to influence subjectivity formation in children.

The notion that censorship is based on adult fear has also been noted by Arons (1983). In his research, Arons interviews families on the subject of conflicts between parents and

schools that involve censorship. He found that parents expressed a significant amount of fear that their children were growing amidst a cultural collapse as well as dysfunctional values (p. viii). Arons describes the fear of cultural collapse expressed by some parents as a reflection of the alienation and confusion that they are experiencing as a result of the uncertainty about the values that underlies contemporary culture (p. 21, 37, 155).

Initiators of censorship are typically discussed in literature on censorship for the conservative political views that they hold. Ravitch (2003) argues that a focus on right-wing politics and initiators with regard to censorship excludes what she terms 'liberal censorship.' The aim for liberal censors is to remove materials that are deemed politically incorrect, for example, materials that are sexist, homophobic, racist, ageist, etc. (Ravitch, 2003; Hunt, 2001, p. 257). Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* is the most challenged book by censors on the political left for the racial slurs found in the book. *The Merchant of Venice* has also successfully been removed from curriculum as recently as 2000 (Ravitch, 2003, p. 80). Those opposing liberal censorship argue that although these materials are politically incorrect, they nevertheless are a part of our history. They argue that these books should be preserved as a reminder of our past (Carefoote, 2007, p. 22-24). Ravitch notes that censors on the political left in general target textbooks rather than trade books in their challenges. Most censorship has been of language now considered culturally insensitive. Ravitch notes that it is becoming more common to see instances of activists on the political left challenging books.

Jenkinson's (1986) study on challenges to books in Manitoba's public and school libraries showed that half of the complaints about books in schools came from within the institution, i.e. from principals, teachers, secretaries, clerks, and other employees who questioned materials and engaged in self-censorship (p. 20). Shariff and Manley-Casimir (1999) have noted that teachers engage in self-censorship because they are worried about job security, and consequently choose course materials that do not deviate from the norm to avoid reprimand (p. 173-4). Booth's (1992) research highlights the high frequency that librarians see instances of books self-censored by readers who have torn out pages or inked out passages. He notes that in some cases it is school officials and teachers that engage in the self-censorship (p. 10).

Pressure groups, special interests groups, or advocacy groups are also prominent subjects involved in school censorship cases. Dick (1982) cites one group, Renaissance International, a fundamentalist Christian organization from Canada that involves itself in many censorship cases through media campaigns such as writing letters to the editor. Another tactic that is sometimes use by this group is involvement with local PTA meetings at schools. The goal of this group is to apply restricted access or banning within schools and classrooms of books which they consider to be controversial (p. 40).

Topics and Issues Subject to Censorship

Whether the object of censorship is curriculum, textbooks, or library books, the topics and issues that face censorship are wide-ranging and include scary stories, fantasy, folktales, violence, the occult, witchcraft, taboo words, secular humanism, sexuality, and

creationism. Herzog's (1995) research on school censorship is significant because it is one of the few studies done on the subject that provides classifications and analysis for discussing censorship in schools (p. 137). Dick's (1982) research on school censorship includes nine categories and themes on the basis of which books have previously been censored. These include: immoral aspects, profane aspects, seditious aspects, heretical aspects, racist aspects, sexist aspects, labour-related aspects, and nationally sensitive issues (p. 8-34). Arons (1983) has also researched the reasons challenges to books in schools are made. He found the most prominent reasons to be: differences in religious and moral values, fundamentalist parental overprotection or contemporary liberal values, fear of change, words and meanings taken out of context, different understandings of the purpose of education, fear of psychological manipulation, politics, and authoritarianism and a desire to protect administrative jobs.

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I made the claim that under liberalism the notion of 'the family' was reshaped resulting in increased autonomy of children and women who previously held subordinate positions within the patriarchal family structure. The reshaping of the concept of the family resulted in the state acquiring greater opportunity to monitor the population. Children were positioned at the center of these shifts and governing practices. Under liberalism the concept of childhood was changed, generating a social need to protect children. This social imperative motivated liberal societies to produce new spaces as a means through which the subjectivity of children could be produced. Some spaces that were produced in order to regulate the subjectivity formation of

children include: laws (i.e. regarding child labour, the age of consent, housing conditions); health (e.g. hygiene inspections, presence of medical practitioners at birth); and education (i.e. through the establishment of schools). In addition to these spaces that are involved in the subjectivity formation of children, I add children's literature.

I have discussed 'governing through fear' and 'governing through censorship' as two techniques within children's literature that are used so as to shape the subjectivity of children. Examples of these processes or techniques were given from the seventeenth century to today. The intention in laying out the history of children's literature from instructional manuals of the eighteenth century, to 'fear-inducing' books of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and then 'fear-alleviating' books of contemporary times is to present children's literature as shifting to coincide with changing cultural values about children. The objective was also to outline the social transformations occurring during these centuries that resulted in this change.

I have argued that the use of fear as a governing technique *in* children's books has been used as a method by which to socialize children. It has also been used as a technique to shape the subjectivity of children by reinforcing distinctions between adult-child relations (i.e. that children are in need of protection, that childhood is a state of innocence, and that adults can provide this protection). I also argue that while adults govern children through the use of fear within children's books, cultural representations of children produce the fears in adults that they have regarding childhood (i.e. fear of disobedience, inappropriate socialization).

I have argued that early and contemporary censorship governs children by protecting them from words and ideas that adult censors consider to be morally wrong as models for living or inappropriate for children. On either side of the political spectrum it is believed by censors that by limiting what children read they can change society to reflect their worldview (Ravitch, 2003, p. 79). It is also believed that by controlling what children read they can govern the subjectivity of children.

This literature review drew links between the use of fear and the use of censorship as techniques for governing children through literature. I compared the two by making the claim that they are both governing mechanisms because they rely on adult cultural perceptions of children and childhood. This section outlined the cultural assumptions involved in the use of fear and censorship in relation to children's literature, and how these cultural beliefs have shifted and transformed over the centuries. It was also argued that the use of censorship, similar to the use of fear, is an expression of adult fears of loss of control over contemporary values, and of needing to protect children from particular materials which threaten the transmission of their own worldview. I also drew links between the techniques of censorship and fear by making that claim that because censorship is based on fear, it is used as a means through which adults manage their own fears. In this way, fear and censorship are two governing techniques used as means of shaping the subjectivity of children.

In this chapter, I have argued that both practices of governing through censorship and fear are concerned with the subjectivity formation of children through children's books. This discussion is relevant for my analysis of the discourses surrounding the Chamberlain case in that it offers a framework for understanding some of the cultural assumptions behind censorship challenges. These arguments can be used to explain a number of the cultural beliefs and values that ground the emotion-based discourses of respondents speaking about this case. It can also offer insight into how fear is a significant aspect of censorship challenges, particularly for the Chamberlain case in its use within these emotion-based discourses.

The next chapter discusses the theoretical approaches I draw on in my analysis of the emotion-based discourses of the Chamberlain case. More specifically, I outline the approaches I apply to discuss how the use of narrative strategies and emotions in the discourses of respondents to the case can act as social and political devices to shape perceptions of the issues involved.

Chapter Three: Theoretical Approaches

The theoretical framework that forms my analysis is comprised of two approaches: the social constructionist perspective on emotions, and an analytics of the emotion effects of boundary talk.

My account of the first approach begins with a definition of 'emotion' based on Armon-Jones' (1985, 1988) social constructionist perspective. This definition makes the claim that emotions are formed based on the norms and values of a particular community and serve to reproduce them. Here I also borrow from de Courville Nicol's (forthcoming) work on the social and political effects of emotions. I argue that the emotions which are solicited through the discourses of editorialists, columnists, and the general public that speak about the Chamberlain case aim to shape audiences' perception of and response to the case.

Next, I consider how an analytics of the emotion effects of boundary talk offers insight into how respondents draw readers in emotionally through their discourse in order to shape their perception of and response to a debate through emotional means. I argue that through the use of rhetorical strategies, these emotion-based discourses evoke particular emotional responses and produce the truths of the case. From this approach I hope to gain an understanding of how the subjects that discuss the Chamberlain case use comparable rhetorical strategies as those examined by Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995) in their analysis of debates surrounding New Reproductive Technologies. By uncovering the rhetorical strategies used in these discourses, I will be able to argue similarly to

Bloomfield and Vurdubakis that the discourses produce emotional effects that reinforce particular perceptions or ways of framing the Chamberlain case and construct the case's moral truths.

The Social Construction of Emotions: Constructionist Perspectives

Since the mid-1970s, a new method for theorizing emotions has emerged that makes the claim that emotions are socially constructed. In contrast to traditional theories that view emotions as irrational or biological, this theory provides a unique perspective that considers emotions to be experienced as a result of social and cultural processes (Averill 1980, p. 305; Hochschild, 1983; Armon-Jones, 1985, p. 1; Lupton, 1998, p. 15). Armon-Jones' (1988) social constructionist perspective views emotions as derived from the learnable attitudes, norms, expectations, and judgments of the individuals that make up a community.[8] Being that emotions are comprised of attitudes that we gain knowledge of through learning, constructionists view emotions as culturally determined (Armon-Jones, 1988, p. 32; Lupton, 1998, p. 15). The emotions are taught by emotional ritual where a certain set of 'appropriate' behaviours are associated with a situation, and aligned to an emotion. These emotion rituals become part of an individual's repertoire of learnt emotions that are later performed in the appropriate situation to which the emotion was prescribed (Armon-Jones, 1985, p. 1). The performance of these emotion rituals

[8] Within her definition of constructionism, Armon-Jones makes a distinction between 'strong' and 'weak' constructionism. 'Strong' constructionists are defined as those who claim that emotions, including primary emotions are irreducible sociocultural products, and that no emotion is a natural state. 'Weak' constructionists are those who claim there are a limited range of natural emotion responses that are untouched as they exist prior to sociocultural influences (Armon-Jones, 1988, p. 37-38).

reinforces the beliefs and values embedded in its prescription, as well as the individuals' commitment to the value (p. 1, 20).

The Social and Cultural Functions and Effects of Emotions

While constructionists view emotions as socioculturally constituted, they also argue that emotions have a particular sociocultural function: to restrain undesirable attitudes and behaviour, and to sustain and endorse particular cultural values. From a sociofunctionalist perspective, Armon-Jones (1988) argues that learned emotions morally regulate the members of a society, and that without this type of environment and the moral rules found within it, some emotions would not be learnt or experienced by the individual (p. 33, 35). Without the observations and evaluations of another person, the individual will not gain the emotion concept. Emotions according to Armon-Jones, therefore only serve individuals as members of a community. They hold a significant function in maintaining social order through moral regulation of desirable and undesirable behavior (p. 37, 39).

De Courville Nicol (forthcoming) cautions against the reification that the social functionalist approaches may engender when failing to take agency and political struggle into consideration in the analysis of emotion effects. Inasmuch as they influence conduct, she views emotions as effects that are deployed in the maintenance or transformation of social order. In an embodied and interactive approach to emotions, she argues that the perception of an object or phenomenon is culturally constituted and is a condition of the emotional response it evokes. She suggests that emotions are generated by and aligned with the manner in which social change is represented in political struggle. For example,

when social change is associated with regression and disruption, fear and avoidance, rejection or condemnation are likely to occur. On the other hand, when social change is associated with progress or restoration, hope and openness, acceptance or promotion are likely to ensue (p.3). In short, de Courville Nicol argues that the positive and negative valence of emotions means that they can have the effect of promoting certain behaviours and thwarting others. Their arousal in rhetorical strategies is thus a means of exercising power.

Armon-Jones and de Courville Nicol's theories on the social construction and sociocultural functions and social and political effects of emotions are significant for my own research in that they can be used to question how the emotions evoked by the discourses of respondents are constructed. The constructionist approach can be used to understand how various emotions associated with the Chamberlain case (fear, hope) are produced and shaped in these discourses depending on how the issues involved in this case are framed, i.e. as progressive or restorative social change, or as regressive and disruptive social change. In particular, de Courville Nicol's theory of the political effects of emotions in the promotion of social order and social change can be used to argue that the discursively produced emotion effects of narratives on the Chamberlain case are an attempt on the part of respondents to rhetorically restrain attitudes viewed as undesirable about the case while endorsing others.

The second approach that I take in this analysis, the analytics of the emotion effects of boundary talk, speaks more directly to the ways in which emotions not only frame issues

but also draw in audiences through their use in discourse and shape perception of the debate. Bloomfield and Vurdubakis's approach offers insight into the strategies and techniques that are used to shape audience perception through emotional means.

Boundaries of Fear and Hope

The second part of my theoretical framework is based on Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' (1995) discursive analytical approach to the rhetorics of fear and hope. The authors argue that the rhetorics of 'fear' and 'hope' are narrative strategies that allow for phenomena to be presented as either 'hopeful' or 'fearsome'. They advance their argument through an examination of the discourses surrounding New Reproductive Technologies (NRTs).

Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' approach was borrowed from Mulkay's (1993) analysis of the persuasive strategies used in the UK House of Commons during the passage of the Human Embryology and Fertilization Bill. Mulkay identified two opposing rhetorics within the debate: one a 'rhetoric of hope' which focused on the benefits that would be gained as a result of this research; and the other a 'rhetoric of fear' which focused on the moral and ethical problems associated with this type of research. Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995) make the argument based on other work done by Mulkay, as well as their own use of the approach in their article, that his analysis of opposing rhetorics can be extended to a number of different discursive contexts. In this section I argue that this approach can be extended to the emotion-based discourses of journalists, columnists, and the general public (as expressed in letters to the editor) that discuss the Chamberlain case.

To begin, I outline Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' adaptation of Mulkay's approach to the analysis of the 'rhetoric of fear' and the 'rhetoric of hope'.

Mulkay's analysis of the debate over research on embryos focused its efforts on analysing the narrative strategies and cultural presuppositions that allowed for certain technological developments to be represented as 'hopeful' and others as 'fearsome'. One of the discursive tools or resources that Mulkay found was used in the rhetoric of fear is language that emphasizes the violation of cultural and moral boundaries. Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995) contend that both the rhetoric of fear and hope obtain power from the concept of boundaries as a means to uphold culture categories and moral values. They define this strategy as 'boundary talk'. The use of boundary talk in debates provides narrative strategies for either side where cultural categories and moral values can be threatened or reassured (p. 535). The authors claim that the ability of the rhetorics of fear and hope to evoke either the absence or presence of the transgression of existing classifications within the social and moral order is similar to Douglas' (2000) theory of purification and contamination. This theory suggests that through the discursive resources of language and imagery, subjects can strengthen their discourse position by using contrasts or language dichotomies to generate either fear or hope e.g. absence or presence of transgression; sacred and profane; normal versus abnormal; and purity and pollution (p. 535).

Bloomfield and Vurdubakis claim that because NRTs represent dramatic changes in categories within our moral order, that this debate has enormous potential for the use of

boundary talk. The authors argue that boundary talk is fundamental to the debate surrounding NRTs because the rhetorics of 'fear' and 'hope' create emotion effects. For instance, framing embryo research in terms of advancing humanity will inspire hope, whereas emphasizing the unknown consequences of new technology will generate anxiety (p. 533-4).

The Fear Effect

To explain how the emotion effect of fear is discursively produced, Bloomfield and Vurdubakis first make a comparison between film makers within the horror genre and people against embryo research. They argue that in both instances they rely on identical semantic structures when they describe the scientific violation of human life (p. 536). Those who oppose NRTs may make use of images and symbols within popular culture that represent boundary transgression, such as monsters transgressing the human/inhuman boundary (Ibid). The authors contend that recent discourses on NRTs portray the technology in futuristic and extreme boundary breaking ways, such as men that carry foetuses, or human embryos implanted into surrogate animals, womb-leasing, genetic engineering, etc. (p. 536-7).

In addition to the examination of how subjects use the rhetoric of fear semantically and through cultural imagery, the authors also explore how subjects use the rhetoric of fear to associate NRTs with atrocities of the past (e.g. Nazism) or to make terrifying revelations for the future. Bloomfield and Vurdubakis maintain that when subjects make these types of associations, they generate fear. One particular object of fear with which this rhetoric

associates NRTs is consumer-led eugenics, or unconstrained choice (p. 537-8). The hope for genetic repair under the rhetoric of fear is construed as a desire for purification or an eradication of unwanted traits in order to be restored to the normal, resonating with the crimes of WWII. By comparing NRTs with Nazism, the rhetoric of fear places those agreeing with the technology in violation of the collective self-identity of Western democracies' postwar period which opposed Nazism (Ibid).

The Boundaries of Hope

In their approach to the rhetoric of hope within emotion-based discourse, Bloomfield and Vurdubakis explore how subjects that support NRTs frame their discourse in a therapeutic vocabulary of genetic repair (p. 538). They use this form of semantics in order to reinforce the idea that NRTs have a positive impact. Within the rhetoric of hope, the goal of genetic repair is to achieve natural wholeness (such as in the case of genetic disease). Bloomfield and Vurdubakis contend that even though a vocabulary of genetic repair is based upon transgressive images of the natural order or of abnormality, it also deploys a corrective and restorative vocabulary that provides hope for normality regained (Ibid).

The focus of the rhetoric of hope for Bloomfield and Vurdubakis is to point out the desire for purification through the eradication of genetic diseases or defects. In this argument, fear is initially produced through representation of that which is damaged or diseased, but is also shown to be potentially overcome through NRTs (p. 540). The rhetoric of hope

produces the potential of new treatments and may also present the issue as one of choice between the lesser of two evils, i.e. repair over abnormality (p. 543).

In sum, in their analysis of the use of rhetorics of fear and hope, the authors argue that these discourses are framed using contrasting symbols, imagery, semantics, and vocabularies to achieve power through the production of emotional effects. I argue that Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' approach to discourse and rhetoric, which deconstructs the language used in media stories in the debate that surrounds NRTs, can be extended to other controversial debates that represent the possibility of disturbance in existing classifications that form the social/moral order. The discourse in editorials, columns, and letters to the editor responding to the Chamberlain case is an example of a debate where I argue Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' approach can be extended.

For example, one theme articulated within the emotion-based discourse surrounding the Chamberlain case is that of equality rights. This theme is articulated through a rhetoric of hope for a future where intolerance and discrimination towards same-sex parent families will be diminished. It is argued that negative representations of same-sex parent families can be 'repaired' or 'purified' socially and culturally through positive representations of same-sex families. In the context of the Chamberlain case, the discourses of editorialists and the general public make the argument that these positive representations should be integrated within school curriculum.

In contrast, another theme present within the emotion-based discourse in the print media regarding the Chamberlain case is that of the violation or contamination of family values. Within this theme, same-sex parents are represented in editorials and columns as abnormal and as transgressing traditional family structures. It is argued that presenting same-sex parenting within school curriculum violates the moral rights of parents who view these types of family structures as a threat to existing or preferred familial and moral norms.

Through an analysis similar to that of Bloomfield and Vurdubakis, I intend to examine the modes of conceptualization that make the rhetorical strategies of fear and hope suitable vehicles for moral concerns in the Chamberlain case. As well, I will examine the cultural meanings regarding equality rights, parental rights and family values that allow for rhetorics to drive these discourses. Same-sex parents represent a change in current categories within our moral order as expressions of filiation which threaten traditional cultural categories. For this reason I argue that this debate has potential for the use of 'boundary talk' similar to the debate on NRTs.

Chapter Four: Methodology

> Studies of governmentality... are studies of a particular 'stratum' of knowing and acting. Of the emergence of particular 'regimes of truth' concerning the conduct of conduct, ways of speaking the truth, persons authorized to speak truths, ways of enacting truth and the costs of so doing. Of the invention and assemblage of particular apparatuses and devices for exercising power and intervening upon particular problems. They are concerned, that is to say, with the conditions of possibility and intelligibility for certain ways of seeking to act upon the conduct of others, or oneself, to achieve certain ends (Rose, 1999, p. 19).

In this chapter I extend my discussion of social constructionism from the previous chapter to draw on the application of this theory in discourse analysis. Taking a governmentality approach, I outline key methodological concepts for my analysis which include neoliberalism, discourse, truth and knowledge, power, subjectivity, and techniques of the self, and discuss their relevancy to this type of analysis. Through a discourse analysis I generate conclusions on the emotion-based discourses of columns, editorials, and letters to the editor regarding the Chamberlain case. Specifically, I look at how rhetorical strategies in these emotion-based discourses are used as vehicles for the moral concerns of the subjects writing in response to the case, how some populations are stigmatized through the normalizing discourse of these columns and editorials, and how the definitions of equality rights, parental rights/family values are constructed through emotional means by the subjects writing these discourses.

Social Constructionism and Truth

In the previous chapter, I pointed out that social constructionism's primary interest lies with the analysis of the social and cultural aspects of a particular phenomenon. It was

argued that emotions are derived from learnable attitudes, norms and expectations from the members of communities. I also argued that in terms of methodology, social constructionists do not take their subject of analysis as natural, or for granted. Rather, they question how a phenomenon has been constructed and how it shifts. I argue that similar arguments can be made in applying social constructionist theory to other aspects of my analysis, specifically in my discussion of the notions of truth and knowledge.

Relying on Armon-Jone's (1985, 1988) definition of social constructionism, I argue truth and knowledge are socially constructed in that they are historically specific, and derived from beliefs, values, and norms. In this way they can be considered to be socioculturally constructed rather than natural in that they are founded on the systems of belief and moral values from which they are derived. Truth and knowledge are not natural but rather socioculturally and historically based. They are in a constant state of flux where the meanings behind them shift. Under constructionism, it can also be argued that truth and knowledge perform a number of social functions. They endorse and sustain cultural systems of beliefs and values. As a result, truth and knowledge can regulate certain behaviours or attitudes through discourse by endorsement or disapproval. Truth and knowledge can therefore be viewed as having a moral role that contributes to the preservation of the moral rules of a society.

In the context of my own work, this approach to truth and knowledge is particularly useful for a discourse analysis of respondents to the Chamberlain case through columns, editorials, and letters to the editor. It can be applied to explore how truths and

knowledges are produced, reproduced and reconstituted through these subjects writing about the case in their emotion-based discourses. This approach can then be used in order to discuss how these truths generate subjectivities within discourse.

Governmentality and Neoliberalism

Associated with a strong constructionist position on knowledge and truths are 'governmentality' theorists who draw on Michel Foucault. These scholars use a governmentality approach to examine various strategies through which populations' and individuals' are monitored and managed in keeping with liberal and neoliberal goals including populations and individuals well being, productivity, and wealth. With a Foucauldian approach, governing is about steering conduct rather than about simply controlling it. A governmentality approach therefore seeks to investigate a dimension of history that was transformed by rationalized and calculated schemes, programmes, techniques, and devices that seek to shape the conduct of a population in order to achieve a certain ends (Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999).

Governmentality theorists make a distinction between government and domination in order to distinguish the goal of governance as interested in the individual's actions and behaviours, and the goal of domination as interested in the removal of the individual's abilities to act. Under domination an individual's ability for action is either crushed or ignored, whereas to govern is to not only recognize our capacity for action but to adjust oneself to it as well. This is why Rose labels governance as "to act upon actions," (1999, p. 4). For Rose, to govern entails understanding what mobilizes those being governed,

and to act upon those forces by instrumentalizing them and shaping those actions, processes, and outcomes in desired directions. Governing humans thus does not involve crushing their capacity to act, but rather acknowledging it and using it for certain objectives.[9] Rose labels the investigation of governmental rationalities as an examination of the techniques and practices for the "conduct of conduct." This is a key point in governmentality research and analysis as it allows for the possibility to consider how individuals are active participants in governing processes rather than governed exclusively through repression (Ibid).

Governmentality theorists contend that strategies of governance consists of multiple tools and techniques. They can involve either direct or indirect strategies to regulate populations, but also less direct strategies that rely on individuals within the population to voluntarily conform to the interests and needs of the state. Lupton (1999) outlines that these strategies can take diverse and multi-centered forms, and can emerge from the state but also other agencies and institutions such as the mass media. Under modern rule, the state depends on a complex set of relations between state and non-state authorities, upon networks of power, and upon activities of authorities who do not form part of the formal or informal state apparatus (Rose, 1999, p.15). Governance, according to Rose, is "what points out the nature, problems, means, actions, manners, techniques and objects by which actors place themselves under the control, guidance, sway, and mastery of others, or to seek to place other actors, organizations, entities or events under their own sway,"

[9] As an example, Rose (1999) cites the churches of early modern Europe where authorities understood the responsibility of political rule as necessitating institutional action upon the details of the conduct of the individuals and populations who were their subjects, individually and collectively, so as to guarantee the better good of society, i.e. to maintain order, security, health, happiness, and prosperity (p.6).

(p.16). Foucault (1988) contends that the rationality behind intervening into the behavior of individuals is to mobilize citizens to govern themselves morally. He terms this form of self-governance, techniques of the self. Central to governmentality is that the governing strategy is targeted at autonomous, self-regulating citizens, who are viewed as active rather than passive contributors of governance. Relying on Foucault's definition of techniques of the self, a governmentality approach makes the claim that individuals police themselves through these techniques and strategies so as to exercise power upon each other in order to pursue their own best interests. I return to the discussion of techniques of the self in the next section on subjectivity.

Rose (1999) notes that governmentality theorists are interested in examining the techniques and strategies of governance that mobilize populations to govern themselves, as well as understanding the activity of governing as inextricably bound up with thought, truth, knowledge, and expertise. Through governance, thought is both made possible and also constrained. Examining governance therefore becomes an examination of the conditions under which certain truths become possible. A major concern for governmentality theorists therefore is the investigation of the formation and transformation of truths (p.8).

Subjectivity

In the previous section, I explained that a governmentality approach contends that under liberalism and neoliberalism individuals engage in techniques and strategies of policing one another where they are active participants in governance. Governance is enacted

through various techniques or strategies of governing the self. In this section I argue that discourses are one way through which governance is exercised, specifically by the truths and knowledges that they generate and the subjectivities that these truths advance.

Under a governmentality approach, discourses are defined as that which can be said and thought, when it can be said, by whom, and with what authority in order to have the status of truth. A discourse can also be understood as a body of knowledge that gives meaning to reality via words and images. Hall (1997) defines the Foucauldian perspective on discourse as the production of knowledge through language. He goes on to state that discourse is that which defines and produces the objects of our knowledge. Discourse governs the way in which a topic can meaningfully be talked about and reasoned about. It is through discourse that we understand the social and cultural aspects of the world that we live in. Being that discourse governs our knowledge and meaning of the world, it also influences how these ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others. Discourses can therefore be used as a governing strategy to delimit, set the boundaries, and make possible what can be said and what can be done about a particular phenomenon (Lupton, 1999, p.15). Linked to the concept of discourses is the term rhetoric. I define this concept loosely as techniques or strategies within discourse that attempt to influence audiences. Being that a governmentality approach falls under the position of poststructuralism, the focus is on identifying the discourses that participate in the construction of notions of realities, meanings, and understandings rather than defining and identifying structures (Lupton, 1999, p. 26).

Central to a governmentality understanding of discourses is the notion of power-knowledge. The term is used in Foucault's writing to indicate that power and knowledge are inseparable in that knowledge is always a form of power in its ability to shape meaning. Power is also implicated in knowledge by producing the circumstances under which knowledge is applied (Hall, 1997, p. 48; Foucault, 2003, p. 98). According to Foucault, since knowledge is linked to power in discourse it assumes the authority of 'truth' while it holds the power to make itself true. This authority of truth is obtained in discourse by prescribing certain ways of talking about the topic while excluding others. This in turn governs what is 'sayable' or 'thinkable' about a phenomenon. [10] In directing how we talk about a phenomenon, knowledge also governs the subjects involved through their personification within discourse. The intention then in examining power-knowledge processes in discourse under a governmentality approach is to explore the ways in which discourses produce subjectivities that only exist meaningfully within the discourses about them (Hall, 1997, p.45). Thus, an intrinsic aspect of a Foucauldian examination into the processes of power-knowledge within discourses is an inquiry into the subject and subjectivity.

The concept of subjectivity in Foucault's work (2003) is concerned with examining different modes by which our culture makes human beings into subjects. His work deals with three modes of objectification that transform human beings into subjects (p. 126). The first mode is objectification through the sciences. Science conceptualizes the subject in a number of different ways depending on the discipline. Throughout history, certain

[10] In order to signify that truth and knowledge are not neutral, the discourses of respondents that I analyzed are referred to as 'truth claims'. This denotes that at work in these discourses are power-knowledge processes that affect what is being said, how it is being said, and by whom.

scientific universals regarding human social life were held privileged, i.e. as social fact, and through this privileged status certain scientific classifications have acted to specify social norms. This form of objectification is generally interested with the shifting ways in which the body and social institutions have related (or have been understood) in order to enter into political relations (Foucault, 1984, p. 10). For example, within the discipline of psychology, subjects are framed as having a psyche and this association impacts how people are governed through this discipline (e.g., they may be given psychopharmaceutical medications) and how they govern their selves as a result of this discipline intervening on their lives (e.g. they govern their selves as a subject with a psyche). The second mode of objectification of the subject is called dividing practices. This form of objectification is defined by Foucault (1984) as "a process of division either within himself or from others" (p. 8). In this process of objectification and categorisation, individuals are given social and personal identities. Dividing practices are modes of manipulation that either align or exclude on the basis of identity. For example the subject becomes objectified when they are divided into contrasting dichotomies or categories, e.g. the sick and the healthy; the criminal and the law-abiding. The third mode of objectification that Foucault relies on is self-subjectification when individuals engage in turning themselves into a subject through self-formation (Foucault, 1984, p. 11). Rose (1998) defines subjectification as "processes and practices by means of which human beings come to relate to themselves and others as subjects of a certain type" (p. 25). This process involves self-understanding as well as self-formation where the individual come to know and perceive their self in a particular way. Foucault notes that mediating this

subjectification is an external authority figure that informs one's self-understanding (p. 11). These three modes of objectification are discussed further in my analysis chapters.

The concept of subjectivity that is developed in my analysis emphasizes power-knowledge relations as well as the assumption that subjectivities are multiple and constructed. For the purpose of my analysis, I looked at how various knowledges and truths generated a number of subjectivities in the discourses of subjects commenting on the Chamberlain case. Foucault's three modes of objectification are used to demonstrate how these subjectivities and knowledges are constituted. Chapters five and six discuss in detail these modes of objectification and how they apply to the formation of various subjectivities within the discourses of the Chamberlain case.

At issue in my discourse analysis is why, at a given time, out of all the potential things that could have been said about the Chamberlain case why certain ideas were articulated or recognized as truth. Complimenting this inquiry into the truth claims produced is the question of how these discourses operated in the construction of various subjectivities.

Emotion-Based Discourses

In previous chapters I refer to the discourses of respondents to the Chamberlain case as 'emotion-based'. I have defined the concept of discourse within governmentality theory as a body of knowledge that makes possible through strategies of governance what can be said and done about a particular phenomenon. 'Emotion-based' discourses are distinct in that they discursively produce emotion effects through discourse. In the context of my

analysis the emotion-based discourses surrounding the Chamberlain case produce emotion effects that draw audiences in to shape perception of the debate, and which rhetorically restrain attitudes viewed as undesirable while promoting others.

Frame Analysis: A Definition and Brief Overview

In this section I discuss how applying a frame analysis alongside a governmentality approach to discourse analysis offers additional insight in the Chamberlain case. This type of analysis looks at how journalists actively participate in the selection of certain aspects of a story in order to frame it in a particular way. This is relevant for my analysis in order to understand how respondents create the meaning of the issues involved in the case. This analysis also offers insight into how the use of techniques such as moral vocabulary and emotionally charged words are used in discourse in order to frame a story in a desired way. The following section discusses this approach and how it will be applied in my analysis.

Recent research conducted on the mass media has seen an increase of work that centers on the concept of "framing". This analytical framework is defined by Entman (1993) as comprised of a paradigm that shows how frames become embedded within news text, and how framing influences thinking (p. 51). In Entman (2004), he extends this definition of frame analysis to describe it as a method that shows how news reporting actively involves "selecting, and highlighting some facets of events or issues, and making connections among them so as to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation, and/or solution" (p. 5). Entman argues that the framing of an issue influences an audience's thinking by

repeating terms, such as 'good' and 'evil', in order to structure an issue and unite an audience behind an interpretation of the event while excluding other understandings. By conveying an emotionally compelling frame through a moral vocabulary of good versus evil, audience approval can be achieved (p. 1). Entman's theory on frame analysis identifies four basic functions of frames in covering political issues, events, and actors: 1) defining effects or conditions as problematic; 2) identifying causes; 3) conveying a moral judgment; and 4) endorsing remedies or improvements. He argues that frames perform at least two of these four functions when reporting (p. 5).

Entman outlines that the analysis of frames is carried out by identifying words and images from the rest of the report that either stimulate support or opposition to the sides of the political conflict being discussed. He argues that the capacity of these words and images can be measured through their 'cultural resonance' and magnitude. Those that apply culturally resonant terms have the most potential to influence an audience. Cultural resonance is defined by Entman as cultural schemas that evoke strong emotional responses and have a higher probability of influencing audiences than other images or words. These words tend to be noticeable within a frame, memorable, and emotionally charged (p.6, 170). By magnitude Entman suggests that the prominence and repetition of words and images affects a public consensus or shared thoughts and feelings about a subject.

A frame approach is relevant to my analysis because it shows how respondents in the discourses of the Chamberlain case actively select and highlight certain aspects of the

case in order to create their own meaning of the issues involved. A frame analysis is also used to explain how respondents use different techniques and strategies to impact how the audience understands the discourse (e.g. through the use of moral vocabulary or emotionally charged words, use of contrasting cultural symbols/imagery).

Themes

There are two main themes generated by respondents in their discourse that I discuss. The first theme is equality for same-sex parent families. This theme centers on the promotion by editorialists, columnists, and the general public of the values of tolerance, diversity, and non-discrimination in their discourses. Their main concern is the defence of equality rights and the need for positive representations of same-sex parents in public education curriculum. Under this theme three subjectivities are created. The first is the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject'. This subjectivity is constituted through truth claims that presume individuals within society should act in accordance with the cultural values of equality. It also expects citizens to promote and advocate these values. The second subjectivity that is produced within these discourses is that of 'the unethical subject'. This subjectivity is upheld through semantic and language strategies, claims to violation of moral/cultural boundaries, and historical-comparative narrative strategies. The final subjectivity under this theme is that of 'the individual as advocate'. This subjectivity is maintained within the discourse through respondents speaking about their activism, and by respondents directing others to take action on the issue of equality rights for same-sex parents.

The second theme that I examine is parental rights and best interests of children. Under this theme respondents made truth claims regarding the impact of sensitive issues on children where they questioned the age appropriateness of materials on same-sex parents for kindergarten and grade one students. Journalists/commentators also made claims that defended traditional family values, i.e. that children should not be forced to learn about families that contradicted their moral beliefs. There are three subjectivities that I discuss under this theme: 'the innocent child' and 'the immoral parents' and 'supporter of parental rights and best interests of children.' These subjectivities are maintained in the discourse through cultural assumptions about childhood (e.g. age appropriateness of certain materials, that children are vulnerable and innocent), and parenthood (same-sex parents as violating cultural/moral boundaries). The following section discusses the practical components that were used in order to gather the discourses that were analysed.

Practical Components

The methodological approach of data collection for this analysis relies on the use of the database Canadian Newsstand on ProQuest. This database contains over 170 Canadian newspapers, and is updated daily. Through the database's search engine, researchers have access to full text articles, columns, and editorials. For these reasons this database was ideal in offering a comprehensive, wide-ranging research on columns and editorials discussing the Chamberlain case. My search was conducted by searching through the database for the timeframe of 1997-2003[11] using key words. The key words used were the titles of the books.[12] Initially all news formats were selected (news reports, editorials,

[11] The Chamberlain case's history ranges from April 1997 to June 2003.
[12] *Asha's Mums; Belinda's Bouquet;* and *One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dad, Blue Dad*

columns, and letters to the editor). This yielded one hundred and forty-five pieces from ten newspaper sources. After reading through the articles, thirty-three editorials, column articles, and letters to the editor were pulled from: The Edmonton Journal, The Gazette, The National Post, The Globe and Mail, The Ottawa Citizen, The Vancouver Sun, The Province, The Calgary Herald, The Toronto Star, and The Windsor Star. Of the thirty-three columns, editorials, and letters to the editor, four were excluded because they were not relevant for the analysis. The main reason these discourses were excluded was because they were too descriptive of the Chamberlain case and lacked strong opinions on the case.

This sample of twenty-nine articles allowed me to examine discourse in the newsprint media about this censorship case, as articulated by the general public, editorialists, and columnists. It was not meant to be a representative sample of all discourses on the case. The intention of this thesis was not to provide varying perspectives on this debate in Canada, but rather to show how a sample of various accounts drew readers in emotionally so as to shape their perception of this debate through emotional means. The editorials, columns, and letters are not exhaustive of the discourses on this case. However these articles allow me to draw attention to a number of patterns and dynamics that the influence of emotions have on shaping the meaning of this case.

Chapter Five: Subjectivities and Truths Surrounding Equality Rights for Same-Sex Parents

The theme of equality rights for same-sex parents is a reoccurring topic within the emotion-based discourse surrounding the Chamberlain case. This theme centers on the discursive promotion by editorialists, columnists, and the general public of values of tolerance, diversity, and non-discrimination. Within this theme, respondents produce 'truth claims' regarding the meaning of the case. This chapter discusses the ways that these claims are socioculturally constituted, i.e. historically specific, and based on the norms, values, and beliefs from the particular society in which they were generated. Coupled with this argument is a discussion surrounding the power-knowledge processes within these 'truth claims'. I argue that the knowledge that these discourses impart is a form of power in its ability to shape the meaning of the case. The discourse act as a form of power by producing the circumstances in which knowledge and truth about the case is applied. These discourses are notable for the 'truth claims' that they produce as well as the emotion effects that they generate.

Relying on Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' (1995) analytics of the emotion effects of boundary talk, and de Courville Nicol's (forthcoming) approach to emotions as effects, I argue that (through the use of emotions) the discourses of respondents are produced and shaped in order to achieve particular emotion effects. Various techniques and strategies are used to shape audience perception of the case through emotional means. In directing how this case is talked about in the truth claims that are produced, these discourses also govern the subjects involved through their representation in the text. My analysis is therefore

particularly interested in drawing out some of the subjectivities that are produced and maintained within the discourses surrounding the Chamberlain case. This chapter demonstrates how these subjectivities are constituted in these discourses by relying on Foucault's three modes of objectification: scientific objectification, dividing practices, and self-objectification. Examining the subjectivities and the claims to truths associated with these identities is significant for a Foucauldian discourse analysis because it allows for a better understanding of how a subject is incited to engage in self-governing and remain committed to this process. A governmentality analysis also takes into account the dual process of governing where the individual takes on self-governance while also engaging in the governing of others.

Scientific Objectification

The first mode of objectification I address under the theme of equality rights for same-sex parents is scientific objectification. Scientific objectification is defined by Foucault (2003) as the conceptualization of a subject through the sciences. This occurs when scientific universals on human social life are privileged, and then act as specific social norms. An analysis of the scientific objectification of the subject explores the ways in which the body and social institutions have related in order to enter into political relations. More specifically, of interest in the analysis of this mode of objectification is how a particular scientific discipline frames its subjects which affects how people are governed through this discipline, and how they consequently govern them selves due to this discipline intervening in their lives (Foucault, 1978).

In this chapter I argue that the discourses of respondents to the Chamberlain case promote a subjectivity through the science of law where individuals are expected to advocate societal and cultural values of equality rights, tolerance and diversity within their community. I define this subjectivity as the 'ethical subject'. The identity of the ethical subject holds the expectation that citizens are invested in maintaining equality rights values and that they are willing to govern themselves as well as one another so as to uphold these standards of equality. I argue on the basis of Foucault's theory that individuals within these discourses are objectified as subjects by the scientific classification of certain behaviours and social norms as privileged (i.e. the maintenance of equality rights) within social life. Before discussing the constitution of the 'ethical subject' within the discourse surrounding the Chamberlain case, I discuss how liberalism and neoliberalism advance this subjectivity through the scientific discipline of law.

The 'Ethical Subject': Governing through Norms/ Freedom

The 'ethical subject', as a citizen invested in the promotion of equality, is one which was advanced through liberalism and law. Under liberalism the function of law as a coercive technique/instrument of sovereignty was displaced and seen rather as a liberal technology of government for disciplinary and governmental apparatuses. The transformation of law under liberalism altered its role into one where it was a regulatory, normalizing mechanism concerned with government processes (Dean, 1999, p. 118-9). As an example of this form of approach to law, Dean cites Foucault's (1979) *History of Sexuality.* In this work, Foucault makes the argument that with the development of bio-power in the eighteenth century, (e.g. intervention that governs populations in various aspects of life from health,

habitation, and urban environment) increased importance was attributed to a notion of law where its function was invested in norms. For example, under liberalism, judicial institutions became incorporated into programs of governance (e.g. medical, administrative, etc.) where the function of the institutions was primarily regulatory of norms and normalizing powers. Foucault (1978) described this period as a phase of 'juridical regression' where, despite the abundance of constitutions, codes, and legislative activity, the meaning of law as an apparatus of government centered on domination and oppression shifted towards the new notion and function of law as normalizing and regulatory. Foucault argues that through this phase of juridical regression, law is increasingly invested with norms, and gradually becomes more like a norm.

As an example of a law that functions by the way of normalizing practices, Dean (1999) uses traffic laws where the law coercively enforces constraints but also establishes a set of norms by which road users regulate their conduct. Thus while this type of law still participates in a judicial system where it is an instrument of the sovereign, its function is to establish and uphold norms so as to regulate conduct (p. 120). Law, rather than being a mechanism for governing through dominance, becomes a technique through which individuals can govern themselves through internalized norms.

In this chapter I argue that citizens are governed through the norms of equality rights. This form of governing instructs the population with a certain set of freedoms that they are encouraged to take up. Citizens are expected to promote these freedoms within communities and ensure than that these rights are being upheld, otherwise the population

will be subject to increased surveillance and control. This notion of freedom is relevant to the discourses of journalists/commentators that discuss the Chamberlain case as it contextualizes how the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' which is found in these discourses of respondents is advanced. I previously discussed scientific objectification of the subject occurs when a scientific discipline frames its subjects in a particular way so as to engage in political relations with them in terms of governing the body (Foucault, 1978). I argue that the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' is an example of subjectification through scientific objectification in that under a governmentality approach through the concept of bio-power, the population is considered a 'social/state body', i.e., a living entity composed of vital processes. Through the scientific discipline of law, the population is framed as citizens with particular freedoms. This consequently affects how people are governed through law, as well as how they govern themselves as a result of this discipline intervening into their lives. This argument is further exemplified through Rose's (1999) theory on governing through freedom.

Rose (1999) contends that when western liberal governments granted increased freedom to individuals through liberalism in the mid-nineteenth century, a series of attempts to shape and manage conduct were also undertaken, e.g. census taking, public polls, etc (p.65). Thus citizens were being publicly regulated by codes of civility, reason and orderliness. These interventions occurred both publicly as well as privately in that citizens were being civilized by being equipped with languages and techniques for self-government (p.69). These interventions were necessary in order to have citizens recognize that they must act upon themselves as both free and responsible, as having liberty but also as a member of a

society, in order for a liberal government to be maintained. This political rationality holds that in order to govern better, the state must govern less. In order to optimize various facets of society, individuals must be governed through the entrepreneurship of autonomous actors-individuals and families, firms and corporation. Once they have become responsibilized and entrepreneurialized, they would govern themselves (p. 139).

The neoliberal concept of freedom therefore requires citizens to take on techniques of self-governance that include responsibilization and entrepreneurship.[13] It also anticipates that through self-government, citizens will extend their governing towards each other by problematizing conduct, values, or cultures of anyone/anything that goes against this concept of freedom. Foucault's research on the histories of conduct over the nineteenth century revealed the existence of techniques which functioned as injunctions on moral government. These techniques were exemplified in architecture, and in guidance to parents. They were further embodied in language, knowledge, in the creation of space and repertories of conduct within them. These techniques of the self are practices of subjectification which are linked to government and knowledge (p.43).

Rose (1999) and Dean (1999) agree on the historical relationship that law has with norms; however Rose frames his theory within a context of governing through freedom and liberty rather than governing through laws and norms. Rose's theory on governing through

[13] 'Responsibilisation' is defined by Rose (1999) as individuals recognizing that they have rights but also that they are members of a community that defines and delimits those rights. Individuals therefore must take part in governing in order for this form of government to function. 'Entrepreneurship' entails a perspective of the human actor as no longer the nineteenth century economic subject but an entrepreneur of his or her self. That is, individuals are considered to be subjects who are active in making choices in order to fulfill their interests (p. 142).

freedom is particularly significant for understanding the relationship between how the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' is further developed and expanded through neoliberalism. I argue that the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' is advanced through the neoliberal notion that in order to have a society based on freedom, equality, and human rights, citizens must endure governance in order to maintain that freedom.

My intention in looking at the discourses surrounding the Chamberlain case is therefore to identify the ways in which individuals writing these discourses give identity to certain subjectivities and address the practices that govern them. It is also to explore the subjectivities that these respondents have taken up within these practices and from which they have come to govern themselves as well as others. I argue, based on Dean's (1999) and Rose's (1999) concepts of governing through norms and governing through freedom, that the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' is advanced under liberalism and neoliberalism. Equality rights being a fundamental aspect of freedom as outlined in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, citizens are expected to take up the behavior that abides by these values; to govern the self as well as one another through these values.

Within the discourses surrounding the Chamberlain case, the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' is being discussed, reproduced and advanced by respondents. This is done by respondents who speak of our society as one in which citizens should promote tolerance and diversity towards children of same-sex parents. This subjectivity is also asserted in the discourse by respondents endorsing that we continue to create an atmosphere of acceptance, and that schools have a responsibility to teach these standards (Surrey School

Board Perverts the Law, p. C8, Westwood, p.A15; Surrey Trustees Get Lesson About Books, p. 22). These discourses contend that the books involved in the Chamberlain case are excellent tools in lessons of tolerance for teachers to address the reality of same-sex parent families (Common Sense, p. A10).

Two truth claims are being advanced in the discursive construction of the 'ethical subject': that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is the highest of moral standards within our society, and that as a society we have a duty to make improvements to our tarnished history of discrimination and intolerance. Borrowing from Entman's (2004) framing analysis and Foucault's notion of power-knowledge, I argue that the respondents to the Chamberlain case generate the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject' by deliberately selecting and highlighting aspects of the case in order to frame its meaning through a particular lens. By framing the case through the perspective that it is a matter of discrimination against equality rights, respondents are taking a political position in this debate. The claims that these respondents make are 'truth claims' in that the truth and knowledge that they promote is not neutral but rather involves power-knowledge processes that effect what is being said, how it is being said, and by whom. I then turn to Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' (1995) and de Courville Nicol's work on emotion effects to address how discourses that articulate a message of hope serve as rhetorical strategies in political debate and act as an exercise of power within these discourses.

Throughout the discourses, respondents that take up or align themselves with the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject' contend that the religious views of some members of

society should not trump the values of the rest of the community which they argue is founded on equality. There is an insistence by these subjects that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is the highest form of morality within our society and that schools have a responsibility to impart these beliefs to children (The Court Deciding on Curriculum, p.A6). These discourses of rights insists that our Charter values are the principal of equality—they insist on the idea that we are all deserving of equal respect and dignity, regardless of our race, religion, sexual orientation, and so forth. Power-knowledge processes are evident in these claims in that respondents are shaping the meaning of this case by privileging equality rights over religious rights in their discourses in that they position them over and above religious rights (Westwood, p.A15; Kindergarten Court, p. B6). In this way, it can be argued that these discourses exercise the status or an authority of truth by framing the case through the perspective of discrimination and equality rights, thus governing how this case is talked about.

The second truth that is asserted in these discourses under the theme of equality rights for same-sex parents is the idea that we are currently living within a society that has a tarnished history of discrimination, and that this history ought to be repaired or remedied (Lakritz, p. A23). This theme is articulated through a rhetoric of hope for a future where minority groups (i.e. same-sex parents) will no longer be negatively represented. It is argued that these negative representations can be culturally 'repaired' or 'purified' through positive representations of same-sex families. In the context of the Chamberlain case, the discourses of editorialists and the general public make the argument that these positive representations should be integrated within school curriculum in order to correct a damaged history of

discrimination (Clapp, 2002, p. A15; Young, 2001, p. B6). Relying on Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' (1995) analytics of the emotion effects of boundary talk, I argue that the rhetoric of hope that is found in these particular discourses is used as a strategy to intentionally generate emotion effects that highlight the positive impacts of these books within school curriculum. De Courville Nicol's (forthcoming) work on emotion effects can be used to further argue that discourses that articulate a message of hopefulness for equality rights for same-sex parent families discursively produce emotion effects within their narratives so as to discourage attitudes and behaviours that are perceived to be undesirable, e.g. discrimination against same-sex parent families or negative representations of same-sex parent families, while they serve to endorse others, e.g. the promotion of a culture of non-discrimination within Canada, and positive representations of same-sex parent families. In sum, by framing the Chamberlain case as progressive social change that promotes more positive representation of same-sex parent families within elementary school curriculum rather than regressive and disruptive to social change, e.g. violation of traditional notions of family or religious values, these respondents are exercising power through discourse.

I have argued that these truth claims involve power-knowledge processes that direct what is being said about the Chamberlain case, how it is being said, and by whom. I have also discussed how these truth claims function as an exercise of power by respondents in their discourses. Borrowing from Armon-Jones (1985, 1988), it is also significant to note some of the social constructionist aspects of these truth claims, i.e. that they are historically specific, and are grounded on beliefs, values, and norms of a particular society. The truth

claims that advance the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject' are historically specific in that they attempt to endorse and sustain a cultural system of beliefs and values regarding discrimination and equality rights which is particular to Canada. During the time the Chamberlain case was unfolding within the court system, debate regarding same-sex marriage was in full effect with Canadian courts. While the final decision on the Chamberlain case was being made, same-sex marriage was legalized in two provinces (Ontario and British Columbia).[14] Prior to the same-sex marriage debate, Canada enshrined the Charter of Rights and Freedoms within our constitution in 1982 where the equality rights of gays and lesbians were guaranteed through legislation. Thus, within the last few decades and coinciding with the Chamberlain case, there were a number of legal changes affecting the societal and cultural perceptions, beliefs and values towards same-sex couples.

As was argued at the beginning of this chapter, within liberal societies, through the scientific discipline of law, the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject' was generated by the population being constructed as citizens with particular freedoms. With the creation of this subjectivity, changes were made in how people were governed through law, as well as how citizens governed themselves by the discipline shaping/informing lives. Foucault (1979) argues that with the development of intervention programs to govern aspects of the population in the eighteenth century, law became increasingly interested in norms where its function became invested in their regulation. I have argued that within neoliberalism, the freedoms attributed to citizens under the scientific discipline of law and the subjectivity of

[14] Canadians for Equal Marriage. Equal Marriage Backgrounder. Retrieved April 28, 2009. From http://www.equal-marriage.ca/resource.php?id=500.

'the ethical subject' expected individuals to advocate societal and cultural values of equality rights, tolerance and diversity within their community. This subjectivity also anticipates that through self-governance citizens will be willing to govern themselves as well as one another so as to uphold these standards of equality.

The discourses of the Chamberlain case illustrate the ways in which individuals are objectified as subjects by the scientific classification of certain behaviours and social norms as privileged (i.e. the maintenance of equality rights) within social life. Considering that this case occurred during a time where a number of legal changes affecting the cultural representations of same-sex parent families were being made, it is not surprising to see a set of discourses such as those found in the columns, letters to the editor, and editorials related to the Chamberlain case as they represent attempts at endorsing and sustaining a particular cultural system of beliefs and values regarding equality rights.

Dividing practices

The second mode through which subjects are objectified in these discourses is by dividing practices. This is where subjects are placed into classifications that divide and separate the individual from those outside the category. Dividing practices can be social as well as spatial: they are social in that people in a particular grouping who exhibit difference could be subjected to certain means of objectification; and they are spatial when people are physically separated from the social grouping for being different. Through social objectification individuals are given social and personal identity (Madigan, 1992, p. 266).

In the context of the discourse surrounding the Chamberlain case, individuals position themselves or they are placed in support or in contrast with the promotion of equality rights, tolerance, and diversity. This subjectivity is produced and maintained by two techniques or strategies found in the text: through semantic and language strategies; and through the use of historical-comparative narrative strategies.

Governing through Freedom: 'The Ethical Subject' versus 'the Unethical Subject'

As I have already outlined, the discourses by newspaper columnists, editorialists, and the general public writing letters to the editor create the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject'. This identity is further promoted and advanced through the exercise of dividing practices where the subjectivity of the 'the unethical subject' is defined by juxtaposing the identity with 'the ethical subject'. This act constitutes a dividing practice in that those who fit within the category of the 'ethical subject' are portrayed as responsible and desirable citizens, whereas those who are placed within the category of the 'unethical subject' are portrayed as prejudiced, discriminatory, as well as dangerous and harmful to the foundation of a society and culture based on non-discrimination.

Semantic and Language Strategies

The first strategy that is used as a dividing practice is semantic and language techniques where vocabulary is exercised to portray those that promoted the inclusion of the books in classroom curriculum as maintaining equality rights, whereas those who supported the ban were described as violating cultural values of tolerance, and diversity. Using Bloomfield and Vurdubakis' (1995) approach of the analytics of the emotion effects of boundary talk, de Courville Nicol's (forthcoming) approach to emotion as effects, and Entman's (2004)

framing analysis, I outline how the semantic and language strategies applied by respondents is an exercise of power within their discourse which governs the meaning of this case, i.e. what is 'sayable' or 'thinkable' about the case. I also argue that these strategies are an exercise of power in that they promote and sustain the subjectivities and dichotomies of the ethical and unethical subjects.

Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995) contend that when semantic and language strategies are applied in discourse, the author can frame a story in a particular direction using contrasting symbols, imagery, semantics, and vocabularies. Power is achieved in discourse when subjects create and direct how the meaning of a story is articulated, which impacts the emotional responses it generates in an audience. In the context of the articles, columns, and letters that I analysed, persuasive strategies are used to label parents opposing the inclusion of the three books as "prejudiced," "homophobic" and "book-banners," (K. Ramsey, 2002, p. A15; Young, 2001, p. B6; Our Schools Need Books, 2000, p. A22). By labelling individuals in this way they are represented in these discourses as an affront to our culture and are objectified as 'the unethical subject.' I argue, borrowing from Entman's (2004) framing analysis, that the use of morally charged terms such as "prejudiced" and "homophobic" represents an attempt on the part of these respondents to direct or frame the discourse in a desired direction.

Some of the discourses question and challenge the parenting ability of those who oppose their children being taught about same-sex parents families. One commentator argues in her letter to the editor that banning these books is just a way for homophobic parents to

avoid having to deal with the reality of diverse family types. She charges parents that support the ban with flawed and lazy parenting (K. Ramsey, 2002, p. A15). Her statement insinuates that any moral parent would want their children to learn about tolerance in the classroom. By characterizing the Chamberlain case as a matter of equality rights for same-sex parent families, Ramsey positions those in disagreement as amoral and abnormal in their ethical thinking by acting contrary to a society that functions on equality rights. Another commentator, Lawrence, expresses distrust of simply leaving the topic of same-sex parents up to parents. Lawrence cautions that prejudice is taught within the home, and that as a society based on justice and equality, we have a duty and responsibility to protect children from fanatic "zealots...and their ilk," (Lawrence, 1997, p. A11). These examples clearly show how respondents that take on the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject' use moralizing discourses that impose judgments on the rightness and wrongness of the conduct or values of others.

Violation of Ethical and Cultural Boundaries

Another dividing practice that occurs with this discourse by supporters of these books is language and narrative techniques that frame individuals that oppose the books as fearful of homosexuals and in violation of the ethics of a society based on equality. Five of the twenty-nine columns, editorials, and letters to the editor make the claim that supporters of the ban justify the exclusion of the books due to their fear towards homosexuals and same-sex parent families (Our School Need Books, 2000, p. A22; Barratt, 2002, p. A19; K. Ramsey, 2002, p. A15; Shortt, 2000, p. A22; Twigg, 1997, p. A34). One letter makes the claim that parents are afraid that their children will form their own opinion when they are

presented with the reality of same-sex families (K. Ramsey, 2002, A15). Other editorials, columns, and letters attribute support for the book banning with fear associated with religious beliefs (Twigg, 1997, p. A34; Our Kids Need Books, 2000, p. A22). Three responses also make this association but include warnings about the consequences of this type of fear (K. Ramsey, 2002, p. A15; Barratt, 2002, p. A19; Shortt, 2000, p. A22).

The strategy of framing their letters and columns through a lens that attempts to expose or reveal the fears (supposed or real) of their opposition, gives those contesting the ban significant discursive power in undermining the claims of their opponents. When oppositionists frame the discourse of supporters of the ban as a fear this weakens the claims of supporters of their equality right to religious freedom and their rights as parents to choose what their children learn. One letter in particular (Shortt, 2002) functions as a means to destabilize and de-legitimize supporters of the ban by stating that the school board should "sort out their uneasiness towards protecting gay and lesbian students." This statement is a rejection and invalidation of parental concerns about the books, and claims that any fear parents hold is something they should simply overcome. This letter is also notable in that it recognizes and acknowledges the fear that some parents experience as a result of living in a society that is moving too far too fast while also insisting that our ethics, law, and culture are falling behind changes in family structures.

By framing individuals who oppose the books as fearful of homosexuals these discourses also place these subjects in a position of violation of the ethics of a society based on equality. In doing so, these discourses evoke presence of boundary transgression of what is

considered to be 'ethical behavior' within a culture founded on equality rights. In this way, it can be argued based on Douglas' (2000) theory of purification and contamination that these discourses discursively use language to strengthen their position.

Historical-Comparative Narrative Strategies

In addition to semantic and language strategies that are used in these discourses, the respondents use the rhetoric of fear to associate and compare the Chamberlain case with atrocities of the past. Through a discourse of 'repair' and a rhetoric of 'fear' that relies on comparative-historical narrative strategies, respondents frame and position the Chamberlain case alongside instances of human rights violations.

According to Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995), an author will make these forms of links and connections in order to produce specific types of emotions in an audience, such as fear. This strategy is applied in the discourses that discussed the Chamberlain case by supporters of the inclusion of the books framing their rhetoric in the columns and letters that they wrote through a perspective of a battle against discrimination. Various letters written by the general public (Young, 2001, p. B6; Lawrence, 1997, p. A11) argue that the purpose of the educational system is to fight discrimination, foster tolerance, compassion, and understanding. Their letters frame the Chamberlain case as a context where banning the three books is described as a homophobic practice. This then allows the commentators, journalists, and authors to group the case with other forms of discrimination or "outrages" such as racism, and sexism.

In Lawrence's (1997) letter to the editor, the author relies on cases of historical discrimination to advance his argument. The letter begins with the author expressing outrage that society allows discrimination to occur, and that this prejudice is being justified on the basis of religious beliefs. He cautions, "History shows what discrimination, particularly when supported by religious dogma, can do." His statement is followed by references to cases where Lawrence argues religious belief rationalized and sustained practices of discrimination. He cites a number of examples of this which include: the execution of six million people in Nazis Germany; slavery and segregation of African-Americans in America; and apartheid in Africa. Lawrence places the Chamberlain case alongside these examples and states that book banning goes hand-in-hand with book burning. The emotion-effects that these connections generate are of fear of being discriminatory towards homosexuals. Connecting the Chamberlain case to the reality of horrific episodes located in the recent past labels those transgressing this boundary as homophobic or having violated equality rights. Being that equality rights are a fundamental foundation upon which Canadian culture is grounded, transgression of this cultural boundary distinguishes supporters of the ban as the 'other' against which it defines itself.

In another letter, Shortt (2000) uses a similar rhetorical strategy as Lawrence to induce fear in the audience. Shortt begins his letter by framing the Chamberlain case as an instance of homophobia. Using cultural imagery and symbolism, he goes on to describe homophobia as a type of weapon that is used to inflict injury on the self-esteem of its victims. In his description of homophobia, he classifies it as just as powerful and harmful as more tangible

weapons of violence. To illustrate his point, he cites an example where a boy in Surrey, B.C. recently committed suicide after incessant taunting from fellow students. Shortt goes on the state that while gay and lesbian students are waiting for school boards to "sort out their uneasiness" about these books, they are forced to endure a level of homophobia that is "crushing their spirits."

Shortt's intention in framing the Chamberlain case as a situation of homophobia and then citing an example of the severe brutality that homophobia can generate is to supply a warning to readers about the consequences of allowing homophobia to continue in the future. The fear that Shortt generates in this letter also offers the possibility of hope that homophobic atrocities of the past can be repaired through positive representations of same-sex parents in classroom curriculum, and a curriculum that teaches children to "love and respect one another regardless of difference."

Through the use of dividing practices power is exercised by creating boundaries as a means to sustain cultural categories and moral values. As has been demonstrated in my description of the use of semantic/language strategies, and historical comparative strategies, boundary talk and language dichotomies in these discourses are being used to either threaten or sustain cultural and moral values. This is done through language dichotomies of absence or presence of transgression; normal versus abnormal; and purity and pollution. In this section, I argued that the arousal of fear in these discourses has the effect of exercising power through the production of emotional effects by associating the Chamberlain case with historical atrocities of the past. Power is exercised by oppositionists

of the ban by portraying supporters as amoral and abnormal parents. It is also obtained by associating the Chamberlain case with horrific cases of discrimination. Lastly, narrative strategies are also used to portray supporters of the ban as polluting the ethical foundation of a society based on equality rights. A rhetoric of hope is deployed to argue that this contamination of our ethics could be repaired or purified by teaching tolerance in classroom curriculum.

Self-objectification

Governing through Freedom: The Individual as 'Equality Rights Advocate'

The third subjectivity that is created in this discourse is self-objectification where the respondents writing in response to the Chamberlain case take on/adopt the identity produced by scientific objectification -that of the 'ethical subject'- and by associating themselves with the position of 'the individual as equality rights advocate'. Foucault (1984) defines this self-objectification as a process that involves individuals participating in the transformation of their selves into a subject. This mode of objectification is unique to the two other modes of objectification in that it involves techniques of self-governance where the individual actively participates in their objectification and subjection. Under the theme of equality rights for same-sex parents, there are two types of respondents: active and passive supporters. Passive or constrained supporters are subjects who through the process of dividing practices, are categorized into a subjectivity as was the case for 'the unethical subject.' Foucault considered these modes of objectification techniques of domination in that the subject plays a passive role in their objectification. Self-subjectification in contrast to scientific objectification and dividing practices looks at the

processes of self-formation in which the person is active. Foucault defines this mode of objectification as a variety of operations that people exercise "on their own bodies, on their own souls, on their own thoughts, and on their own conduct" (Foucault, 1984, p.11).

In the context of the discourses that I looked at, active supporters are defined both as subjects who took on the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' by tying oneself to this identity to write about this topic, and those who took up the subjectivity of 'the individual as equality rights advocate' where subjects speak of their activism and direct readers to engage in similar forms of activism. This is to say that all respondents by writing columns, editorials, and letters to the editor are engaging in subjectification by associating themselves with the subjectivity of the 'ethical subject' by promoting equality rights in their discourses and talking about society as founded on the values of non-discrimination and diversity. Returning to Rose's (1999) definition of responsibilization and entrepreneurship, I argue that the act of writing these editorials, columns, and letters to the editor is a technique of self in that it is a form of responsibilization and entrepreneurship where individuals recognize themselves as citizens with equality rights as members of a community that defines and sets the boundaries for those rights, and are taking part in maintaining them in order to uphold their own interests. These articles are an expression of entrepreneurship in that individuals are actively making a choice to uphold these cultural values in their discourses.

Some subjects in these discourses not only engage in subjectification by aligning themselves with the identity of 'the ethical subject' but also through associating themselves

with the subjectivity of 'the individual as equality rights advocate.' The subjectivity of 'the individual as equal rights advocate' is maintained within the text in two ways: by subjects speaking of their activism and by subjects directing readers to engage in similar forms of activism. This subjectivity is sustained within these discourses by respondents giving personal accounts of ways that they promote tolerance and diversity. In one column, a respondent writes about her activism as an equality rights advocate for same-sex parents. She describes her support for the books involved in the Chamberlain case by stating that she purchased the books and read them to a group of elementary school children. Giardini describes her account of the difficulties she encountered when attempting to locate and purchase these books in community bookstores. Her column outlines her activist struggle when she discovered that many of the books were out of print or simply impossible to find. Giardini goes on to describe her experience with a bookstore manager that advised her that one book she requested was poorly written and "not any good." The columnist then took one of the books to a group of children and shared it with them, after which they discussed the issues that were brought up (Giardini, 2000, p. B1). Giardini's story is that of a community activist, persistent in obtaining these books despite obstacles, and her experience of getting a group of children together to create a positive space where she could read them a story about same-sex parents.

In other examples of community members taking on the subjectivity of 'the ethical subject', two columns quote teachers that discuss the ways that they take on the subjectivity of activist as part of their role as an educator. The first statement is from James Chamberlain, the teacher who initiated this legal case. He contends, "My job as a teacher

is to validate every child in my classroom. My responsibility is to make them feel safe; to make sure every child feels it is his classroom as much as anyone else's." In this statement, it is apparent that Chamberlain views his role as a teacher as synonymous with activist. The column goes on to outline Chamberlain's open involvement with GALE-BC, the provincial association of Gay and Lesbian Educators. The column also states that he was a member of the delegation that met with B.C.'s minister of education to ask for a clear-cut procedure for getting "alternative lifestyle books" approved as classroom resource material. Chamberlain's statements and actions show that he is taking on the subjectivity of equality rights advocate, (Valpy, 1997, p. A23).

The subjectivity of "equality rights advocate" is also sustained by respondents directing the audience to engage in the promotion of equality. Some community members and columnists made explicit statements as to how this culture of homophobia and intolerance can be mended. In one letter to the editor, a community member advises readers that, as a society, we can act to repair this discrimination by reading and buying theses books. The letter also suggests that as a concerned community, we should speak out against these prejudiced behaviours by engaging in letter writing campaigns to the Surrey School Board to express our disapproval of their decisions and actions (Clapp, 2002, p. A15). Shortt's letter to the editor recommends that for the betterment of the community, Surrey parents should read these books and notes that "they might even learn something," (Shortt, 2000, p. A22).

Again in these discourses there is a reliance on the rhetoric of fear and hope to draw readers/audiences in emotionally so as to shape their perception and how they respond to this case. This is done by aligning activism with hopefulness against a culture of discrimination. The use of these strategies can be interpreted as a method through which respondents make attempts at altering attitudes and emotions towards same-sex parent families by relying on cultural norms, e.g. the violation of equality rights (Armon-Jones, 1988). These discourses also illustrate how producing a discourse of truth that presents the role of teachers and the identity of activists as coinciding with one another is an exercise of power in that it transforms the meaning of these subjectivities. As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, the association of teachers with activism to produce the emotion effect of hopefulness or progressive social change is not only a construct but one which is challenged in these discourses.

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I argued that the discourses of editorialists, columnists, and the general public (in letters to the editor) responding to the Chamberlain case create subjectivities through their truth claims about equality rights for same-sex parents. The first subjectivity that was discussed is that of 'the ethical subject'. This subjectivity is constituted through claims that citizens within society should act in accordance with cultural values of equality, tolerance and diversity. This subjectivity formation is tied to liberal and neoliberal societies through scientific objectification. The second subjectivity that is produced within these discourses is that of 'the unethical subject' which is positioned (through dividing practices) in contrast to 'the ethical subject'. This subjectivity is upheld through semantic

and language strategies, claims to violation of moral and cultural boundaries, and historical-comparative narrative strategies. The third subjectivity observed is generated through self-objectification, that of the 'ethical subject' and 'the individual as equality rights advocate'. I argued that the subjectivity of the ethical subject is maintained by all the respondents whose discourses fall under the theme of equality rights for same-sex parents. The act of writing columns, editorials, and letters to the editor on the subject is considered a form of subjectification through the practices of responsibilization and entrepreneurship. This type of subjectivity is also represented in these discourses by respondents that identified as equality rights advocates who spoke about their activism, and by these respondents directing others to take action on the issue of equality rights for same-sex parents.

Throughout the discourses that fall under the theme of equality rights for same-sex parent families, I have shown how the hopes and fears of respondents shape the truths that they generate in speaking about the Chamberlain case as well as the subjectivities that are produced alongside these truth claims. Returning to the original argument that was made in chapter three on governing through censorship and governing through fear, it can be argued that the intention in the discourses of respondents is not only to take on and read on to other respondents' truth claims and subjectivities. Underlying the concerns of respondents is the subjectivity formation of children.

As was argued previously, subjectivity is generated through children's books. Thus the respondents that promote equality rights for same-sex parent families have interests in

governing what children should and should not read. For those who take up the subjectivity of the individual as equality rights advocate this is seen in their desire to have children learn about same-sex parent families in curriculum, and in associating this type of social change with progress and the emotion of hopefulness in their discourses. Coinciding with this rhetoric of hope is a rhetoric of fear that if children do not learn about same-sex parent families in school, that discrimination will continue to be perpetuated.

The following chapter continues with the discourse analysis of respondents writing under the theme of parental rights and best interests of children. Similarly to this chapter, it goes through the three modes of objectification through which subjectivities are generated. It then ties together how these discourses are also interested in the subjectivity formation of children through children's books.

Chapter Six: Subjectivities and Truths Surrounding Parental Rights and the Best Interests of Children

> "Tolerance is always age appropriate." -Chief Justice Beverly McLachlin, *Chamberlain, 2002.*

As discussed in the previous chapter, a theme frequently brought up in the letters, editorials, and columns of my analysis is the issue of positive representations of same-sex parent families as expressed in the three books in question. Another reoccurring theme that many journalists and commentators discuss are concerns with regard to parental rights and the best interests of children. Within this theme respondents discuss concerns regarding the impact of sensitive issues on children, and make claims that defend traditional family values, e.g. that children should not be forced to learn about families that are contrary to their moral beliefs. Respondents question whether books discussing same-sex parent families were age appropriate for kindergarten and grade one students, and bring up uncertainty about exposing children to controversial topics at young ages.

Similarly to the previous chapter, I identify the subjectivities that are being articulated within these discourses under the themes of parental rights and the best interests of children and discuss how these subjectivities are maintained through claims about the meaning of the Chamberlain case. These truth claims produce and uphold these subjectivities because they serve as a technique of governing the self as well as governing others through the text. As in the previous chapter, I use Foucault's modes of objectification (scientific objectification, dividing practices, and self-objectification) to discuss how these subjectivities are constituted in these discourses.

This chapter begins by examining two coinciding subjectivities under these themes: 'the innocent child' and 'the immoral parents'. There are a number of cultural assumptions that ground the truth claims of these subjectivities. One cultural assumption that supports the subjectivity of 'the innocent child' is that children are vulnerable, and that the Surrey school board has a duty to shield young minds from sensitive issues such as same-sex parents. Alongside this claim are statements that parents are correct in assuming that their children need to retain their innocence more than they need to learn about same-sex parent families. Supporters of the ban also rely on the technique of dividing practices to portray same-sex parents as violating the boundary of traditional family types. These claims constitute the subjectivity of 'the immoral parents'. I also look at statements that hold the opinion that the books preach or indoctrinate children with politically correct social agendas. Again, this truth claim centers on the assumption that children are innocent, and that they are in need of protection from propaganda and the political agenda of interest groups. The final subjectivity that is examined is 'supporter of parental rights and best interests of children' which falls under the category of self-subjectification. In this section I look at the ways in which individuals demonstrate the techniques of responsibilization and entrepreneurship in their self-governance by writing about this topic in editorials, columns, and letters to the editor.

Scientific Objectification

'The Innocent Child': Governing through Censorship/Governing through Fear

The first mode of objectification I address under the theme of parental rights and best interests of children is scientific objectification. In the discourses of respondents to the

Chamberlain case, the subjectivity of 'the innocent child' is produced. As was discussed in the literature review, this subjectivity is based on cultural assumptions that the fragile nature of children should be protected from certain materials when it contains sensitive/controversial subject matter due to the uncertain consequences it could have on them. This cultural belief is maintained through discourses that make claims to the age appropriateness of the material, and claims to the best interests of the child.

I argued in my analysis of the history of children's literature that the perspective that children should be protected from certain materials is a cultural construct that developed in the nineteenth century when perceptions of childhood began to shift towards the view that children and adults were distinct. The shifting concept of 'the child' resulted in the creation of children's literature as a literary category and specific books written for children so as to protect and preserve the purity and innocence of childhood (Stallcup 2002). The creation of children's literature also occurred during the same time the social imperative to protect and monitor children necessitated new spaces and techniques for their subjectivity formation (de Courville Nicol). The salient point here is not simply to expose claims to the innocence of children as a cultural construct but to question whether there are other underlying concerns at the foundation of claims towards the fragile nature of children or the best interests of children; mainly that parents are concerned that children learning about same-sex parent families will confuse them, or that these books will offer moral values that diverge from their beliefs. As was argued within the literature review, censorship can also be interpreted as a governing practice that is an expression of fear in adults regarding the impact of books on children.

Appropriateness/Best Interests of Children

Concern about the age appropriateness of these books is a claim that is frequently used by editorialists, columnists, and the general public discussing the Chamberlain case in newspaper articles (Moore, 2001, p. B7; Giardini, 2000, B1; Kingston, 2002, p. SP1; Age Limits, 2002, p. OS08; Lakritz, 2004, p. A23; Hunter, 1999, p. A19; Ramsey, 2002, p. A15). The main issues in these claims are that the three books discuss a topic too sensitive for kindergarten and grade one students (Hunter, 1999, p. A19), that it is unnecessary and not a pressing need for children to learn about same-sex parent families at such a young age (Lakritz, 2004, p. A23; Age Limits, 2002, p. OS08), that parents might not want them learning about this material at a young age (Age Limits, 2002, p. OS08), and that their children are not mature enough to be exposed to this information (Ibid).

One columnist, Giardini, from the *National Post* decided to put the question of the age appropriateness of this subject to the test by going out and purchasing *Heather Has Two Mommies,* a book similar in subject matter to those banned in the Chamberlain case that deals with same-sex parent families. Giardini then reads the book to a group of five children between the ages of 5-11. In her column, she outlines how the responses that she received from the children provided her with the conclusion that they were a lot less bothered by the notion of same-sex parents than many adults. She argues that the reaction that she got from the children did not appear to cause moral confusion, or immature responses about the topic. Giardini highlights that when she asked the children

what it would be like to have two mothers, the children's responses showed little indication of serious confusion. One child thought that it would be "cool" whereas another child was somewhat concerned how a child with two mothers would address them individually if they were both mom/mum/mother etc. Giardini's column articulates a discourse where her attitude is that most children are rather care-free about the stories that they read, and that they are generally more interested in colourful pictures and the silly antics of the characters in books than the types of families involved in the story. This point was also reiterated in the judgment of the B.C. Court of Appeal in the Chamberlain case which states:

> The irony of all this was that the battle was ostensibly over the means of conveying the value of loving and caring family relationships, whatever their form. It is hard to resist the thought that K-1 children may have better appreciation of that value than any of the contending adults. Alternative family arrangements must now be a fact of life for virtually every child in public schools in Surrey, either as a result of personal circumstances of friends and classmates well known to them. K-1 children for the most part are too young to form critical normative judgments. They simply accept the variety around them as fact and welcome all the love and care they receive (*Chamberlain,* 2000, par. 58).

For the same reason that the columnist gives as well as the B.C Court of Appeal, many other respondents feel that banning the three books in the Chamberlain case on the basis that the ban protects the best interests of children was unjustified. A number of columns and letters to the editor point out that none of the books discuss homosexual sex, nor do they promote, or advocate homosexuality and thus they argue that there was very little in these books that children need protection from (Ramsey, 2002, p. A15; Surrey's Book Ban, 1997, p. A10; Barratt, 2002, p. A19; Common Sense, 1998, p. A10; Kingston, 2002,

p. SP1). In fact, other commentators and journalists note that when it comes to the interests of children, that it may be best for kids to learn about diverse families so as to sensitize them to the reality that these families exist, that not all families are the exact same, and that a child shouldn't be discriminated against because their parents do not fit more traditional families (Barratt, 2002, p. A19; Schmidt, p. A8). These contrasting claims show that there is conflict within these discourses as to how to define the best interests of children. Those in support of these books claim that it is within the best interests of children to learn about diverse family types, whereas parents objecting to the books define and frame their claims under a rhetoric that it is in a child's best interests to learn values that are consistent and coincide with values similar to those of their parents.

On both sides of the political spectrum (those who support and those who oppose the books) there is agreement upon the cultural assumption that sex and sexuality were topics that 5-6 year old children were not old enough to learn about. The point of contention between the different sides of this political debate is whether books on families with same-sex parents spoke too closely to issues dealing with sex and sexuality to be considered appropriate.

If claims for the best interests of children are viewed within the context of governing through censorship, these statements can be understood as a rhetorical or narrative strategy where, under the appearance of protecting the best interests of children, adults and parents are in fact concerned with upholding their own best interests and their own beliefs. Asserting the best interests of children thus may be an expression of fear by

adults and parents regarding loss of control over what their children are learning because it runs contrary to their beliefs. As was noted in my literature review, other inquires into censorship in children's books have noted that the emotion of fear is a significant factor in the intentions of censors (Herzog, 1995; Stephens, 2003). I argue that this fear is exacerbated in the context of these discourses with the parental and adult fear that if children are exposed to materials on same-sex parent families, that they will form their own judgments on these family types. This point is elaborated in the next section.

Children Formulating Their Own Judgements on Same-Sex Parent Families

Parental concerns about these books were not only based on cultural fear of loss of control over what their children are learning but also based on the cultural assumption that if children learn about beliefs that differed from their own that they would either be confused, or that it would result in children forming their own judgments about same-sex parent families. One columnist in the articles analysed is certain that these books would cause issues amongst children and states, "...I can envision 5 and 6 year-olds being seriously morally confused by *Asha's Moms* [sic] and *One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dads, Blue Dads*," (Moore, 2001, p. B7). Moore's statement is significant in that it suggests that children are capable of recognizing, comprehending, and making judgments about homosexuality as well as various types of family structures. Moore's column, which is entitled, "Assault on Religious Convictions", makes the claim that these stories are unacceptable in that they offend the religious convictions of parents choosing to teach their children about traditional family structures. What Moore does not address in his column is his assumption that children can make these types of distinctions between

different family types, and recognize that they are different from their own notions of family structures.

Columnist Anne Kingston makes the claim in her article that not only is it unrealistic to assume that children can make judgements about same-sex parent families, she argues that children listening to or reading these stories would have far fewer questions and concerns about families with two mothers, than the parents objecting to the books. She writes:

> Children, with all their wonder still intact, are remarkably non-judgmental and accepting of imagery put before them. They don't question whether Arthur, the central character in a series of popular children's books, is a bear or a mouse or an aardvark, a dilemma I grapple with every time I read the books to my nieces and nephew... Indeed, children resent parents and adults mucking up their entertainment... (Kingston, 2002, p. SP1).

In this debate there are two conflicting perspectives being put forth. For some, there is no threat in children's books discussing the issue of same-sex parent families because it is believed that kids are unable to discriminate and only have a first degree reading of the books. For other respondents, it is argued that there is a threat by children learning about same-sex parent families as it is believed that kids' values will be violated being that they are able to make distinctions between family types. The discursive strategy that is being used in Kingston's (2002, p.SP1) article as well as others such as Giardini (2000, B1) and Twigg (1997, p. A34) is to negate the threat that those who oppose these books believe exists by dismissing it as an invalid concern. This is being done either because these respondents who support these books are simply unaware that at issue in this censorship

debate is subjectivity formation of children through children's books or it is done to strategically downplay the subjectivity formation of children that occurs through books so as not to bring attention to the political interests that they have in promoting issues of same-sex parent families in elementary school curriculum.

As was indicated earlier, claims that assert the best interests of children may actually be an expression of fear by adults regarding what their children are reading. In the context of governing through censorship and fear, disapproval of these books can be interpreted as an attempt at adult fear alleviation through censorship in children's books of family types that go against their cultural beliefs or of social change they considered regressive rather than progressive.

In my analysis of the scholarly work on the history of children's literature, some authors researching the issue of censorship of children's books have noted that the motive behind restricting and banning books is not primarily the impact of controversial/sensitive subjects on the minds of young children. Rather, censorship is frequently based on the fact that the books in question cover materials that are at odds with those censoring the materials. It can be argued that what is at play in the debate surrounding the Chamberlain case is subjectivity formation of children based on fear. Stephens (2003) notes that in the case of censors with conservative religious values, they are living within a country whose contemporary ethics are becoming gradually more at odds with their own. She argues that children's literature is shifting in a way that causes fear within parents of the loss of their traditional values and culture. I argue that censorship can thus be interpreted as a

form of fear alleviation in adults where control can be regained. In Arons' (1983) work on censorship, he interviewed families on the issue of conflict between parents and schools regarding censorship challenges. He found that many of his interviewees were fearful that their children were living in a time of "cultural collapse" and dysfunctional values (p. viii). Arons describes the fear of cultural collapse expressed by some parents as a reflection of the alienation and confusion that they are experiencing as a result of the uncertainty about values that underlie contemporary culture (p. 21, 37, 155).

This fear has led some parents to choose to send their children to private schools or to home school their children rather than have them in public schools. Many columns, editorials, and letters to the editor considered this to be a viable option for parents who have these concerns (Fun, 2003, p. A17; Lamey, 2002, p. A16; Moore, 2001, p. B7; School Choice, 2002, p. A10). One column written by Lamey outlines that the concerns of parents have become such a prevalent issue in the United States that it has resulted in an enormous rise in home schooling from 50,000 home learners in 1985 to between 1.5 million and 1.9 million today. Lamey states that home schooling rates are increasing annually by 15-20%. She labels this phenomenon a "conservative Christian counterculture" against the inclusion and diversity education occurring in public schools (Lamey, 2002, p. A16). Shariff (2006) suggests similarly to this columnist that as a result of the secularization of the public school system in Canada, a form of "religious restlessness" is developing where parents and students are more likely to assert their rights to religious expression. For these stakeholders this expression can take the form of

clothing, symbols, and moral values and beliefs that they argue cannot be separated from their educational experiences at school (p. 478).

Dividing Practices

The second mode of objectification that is found within these discourses under the theme of parental rights and best interests of children is the characterization of same-sex parents as violating moral and cultural boundaries. As was discussed and demonstrated in chapter five, this mode of objectification is where subjects are placed into classifications that divide and separate the individual from those outside the category. The truth claims that this subjectivity generates involves distinctions between moral and immoral, normal and abnormal.

Governing through Censorship/ Fear: Same-Sex Parents as Boundary Violation- 'The Immoral Parents'

Within the discourses of commentators responding to the Chamberlain case in columns, letters to the editor, and editorial, some respondents considered the inclusion of materials on same-sex parents in classroom curriculum as adding to an ever increasing age of dysfunctional values, and cultural confusion where conventional family values are being questioned, and redefined. Their reaction to this shift in perceptions of family structures is to characterize same-sex parents as violating moral and cultural boundaries.

Supporters of the ban achieved the effect of moral violation by arguing that same-sex parent families transgressed 'normal' family structures.

Through a rhetoric of fear, supporters of the ban used language and narrative strategies to emphasize the violation of cultural and moral boundaries of those encouraging curriculum that recognizes same-sex parent families. In these discourses, it is argued that the books involved in the Chamberlain case have the potential of bringing existing conceptual and social categories of families into confusion. These family types are described as "sinful" and "morally disordered" (Moore, 2001, p. B7). The use of moral vocabulary in these discourses is a technique through which those who support the ban advanced the subjectivity of 'the immoral parents.'

As was shown in the previous chapter, supporters of the books, i.e., those who take up the identity of the 'ethical subject', rather than addressing their oppositions claim that same-sex parenting is a violation of traditional family structures, and framed the Chamberlain case through a discourse of violation of equality rights. By framing their discourse on how the banning of these books is a form of discrimination that contaminated values of equality, supporters of these books created their own dividing practice.

Governing through Fear/ Censorship: Characterization of the Books as Political Brainwashing/ Ideological Propaganda- 'The Militant Subject'

One of the main narrative strategies used by the journalists and commentators expressing strong opposition to the books involved in the Chamberlain case is to label and portray the books as harmful and as 'misinformation'. By classifying the books in this way, these discourses advanced the subjectivity of the child as innocent by claiming that children should be protected from these books because of their dangerous nature. These discourses also frame those in support of the books as a militant interest group.

The journalists and commentators that express strong opposition to the books involved in the Chamberlain case frame their discourse describing the books and their supporters as proselytizing an agenda of political correctness (Giese, 2002, p. A31). Other commentators describe the three books as "political brainwashing", "ideological propaganda," and "propaganda tools" (Lakritz, 2004, p. A23; Moore, 2001, p. B7). By framing the books as means by which equality rights advocates can convert or indoctrinate children to certain political ideology, the books are undermined and de-legitimized as 'appropriate' learning resources. These labels also frame the books as biased materials and associate them with a particular political cause, e.g. violation of traditional family structures. In addition, this discourse maintains the subjectivity of the child as innocent in that it suggests children should not be subjected to controversial materials in curriculum as they will fall victim to political indoctrination. Borrowing from Entman (2004) and Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995) it can be argued that respondents in these discourses use a moral vocabulary that is emotionally charged to characterize advocates of same-sex parent rights as militant. This is done through the use of words that connote an illegitimate use of power on the part of activists interested in integrating these books into curriculum.

Association of the books within the Chamberlain case to a political cause generates other concerns by those opposing the inclusion of the books into curriculum; the fear that if one interest group is allowed to have their agenda promoted in the classroom, other groups will insist on the same rights. One letter to the editor asks, "What other group will demand their lifestyles or beliefs be taught in schools?," (Fun, 2003, p. A17). The

comment generates a vision of complete boundary breakdown where the possibility that any group could come into a classroom and indoctrinate children with what ever agenda they want to promote. The image suggests complete loss by parents of control over what their children are learning and suggests that schools and teachers have unrestricted decision-making power in what materials are taught. Bloomfield and Vurdubakis (1995) refer to this rhetoric of fear as one which evokes the impression of unconstrained choice.

Finally, advocates of these books are portrayed, and at times directly classified as fanatics, militants, and extremists (Hunter, 1999, p. A19; Valpy, 1997, p. A23). In one letter to the editor (Age Limits, 2002, p. OS08), the author questions the action of Chamberlain and asks why he was so persistent in forcing children to be exposed to information about homosexuality. The commentator goes on to suggest that Chamberlain should put his own personal agenda aside rather than compromise the best interests of the children involved, his students. This author's comment frames Chamberlain and other teachers interested in promoting equality rights within the classroom and in curriculum as irresponsible for placing their interests over and above those of children.

Self-Objectification

'Supporter of Parental Rights and Best Interests of Children'

The third type of subjectivity that is generated in this discourse is self-objectification where the respondents writing in response to the Chamberlain case take on/adopt the identity of 'supporter of parental rights and best interests of children'. As was discussed

earlier, this self-subjectivity involves action on the part of the individual in the transformation of the self into this subject.

In the case of respondents whose articles fell under the theme of parental rights and best interests of children, this identity is developed by associating oneself with the behavior of acting to protect children from perceived violations through writing about this issue. In their discourses, respondents identify with this subjectivity by making claims to the appropriateness of books for children, and making claims as to what is in the best interests of children. Under Rose's (1999) definition of responsibilization and entrepreneurship, writing these articles can be considered a technique of the self in that these individuals recognize and acknowledge cultural representations of children; these representations in turn generate within the individual a number of fears which then motivates their action of subjectivity formation of children through books in order to uphold their interest in alleviating these fears.

Concluding Remarks

In looking at the discourses that fall under the theme of parental rights and best interests of children, I have illustrated how the hopes and fears of respondents shape the truths that they generate in speaking about the Chamberlain case and the subjectivities that are produced together with these truth claims. In the case of the subjectivity of 'the innocent child' this subjectivity is generated through claims that relied on the cultural assumption children are vulnerable, and need protection from sensitive/controversial topics in books. I outlined the concerns of respondents about the age-appropriateness of the three books

involved in the Chamberlain case, and the issue of the best interests of children. In this chapter, I also outline the subjectivity of 'the immoral parents' and 'the militant subject' which are generated through dividing practices. The subjectivity of 'the immoral parents' is produced in these discourses through the use of moral vocabulary that characterized same-sex parent families as sinful or abnormal. Supporters of the ban also obtained power within the discourse by using narrative and semantic strategies to present same-sex parent families as transgressing from traditional family structures. The subjectivity of 'the militant subject' is produced through rhetorical strategies that use emotionally charged words and a rhetoric of fear to connote illegitimate use of power by those supporting the use of these books in curriculum. This is done by respondents framing supporters of the books as militant activists interested in indoctrinating children with an agenda of political correctness. These claims also advance the subjectivity of children as innocent. These commentators feel that the books were equivalent to propaganda and that they were being used to indoctrinate children to a particular political agenda. I argued that these concerns are also an expression of fear by parents of unconstrained choice by teachers in the classroom. Lastly, I make the claim that the subjectivity of 'supporter of parental rights and best interests of children' is generated in these discourses through the act of individuals taking up/identifying with this subjectivity by writing these articles. I argue that this is a technique of the self in that it requires practices of self-governance, i.e. responsibilization and entrepreneurship.

Similarly to the argument that was made in the previous chapter, I question whether the calls for censorship of these books on the basis of claims to children's best interests were

strategies in governing children that were based on fear or a sense of loss of control by parents and community members over beliefs and morals children are being taught in an increasingly changing and diversifying society. In the same way that I questioned the intentions of respondents writing about equality rights for same-sex parent families, I argue that the objective in the discourses of respondents writing in support of parental rights and the best interests of children is the subjectivity formation of children through children's books. For those who take up this subjectivity this is seen in their desire to not have children learn about same-sex parent families in curriculum, and in associating this type of social change with transgression of moral boundaries and the emotion of fear in their discourses.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

In this thesis I explored how respondents actively create this case's meaning through the emotion-based discourses that they generate in their responses to *Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36.* I argued that the discourses that columnists, editorialists, and the general public make are claims to truth regarding the meaning of the case. These truth claims are wide-ranging in the issues that they dealt with from concerns of equality rights for same-sex parents, parental rights on the education of their children, to concerns about the best interest of children and the impact of sensitive materials on them. I also argued that linked to these claims to truth are subjectivities that they generate. These claims to truth and subjectivities are associated with subjectivity formation in autonomy-based liberal and neoliberal political societies that require individuals to maintain and uphold a number of interests of individual responsibility and self-government. In this thesis it was argued that subjectivities are shaped within the respondents' discourses through the practice of techniques of governing the self and others.

In my analysis of the columns, editorials, and letters to the editor that discuss the Chamberlain case, I argued that the hopes and fears of respondents that form their truth claims in their discourses are based on the social imperative of subjectivity formation of children in liberal and neoliberal societies. Respondents that promote equality rights for same-sex parents produce truth claims using a rhetoric of hope and fear to frame their interests in maintaining and upholding equality rights. Hope is used to express the possibility of a culture that continues to advance values of non-discrimination and tolerance, whereas fear is used to describe the risk of a society where discrimination

continues to be perpetuated. The responsibilization and entrepreneurship that these subjects engage in by taking up this subjectivity is demonstrated in their columns, editorials, and letter which shows their willingness to govern themselves and others based on these values. It also illustrates the interests that these subjects have in the subjectivity formation of children by governing what books children should or should not read. Respondents who took up the identity of promoting parental rights and best interests of children use similar rhetorical and narrative strategies for maintaining their interests. Fear is being used in these discourses to describe advocates of the books as militant, and same-sex parent families as a transgressing of the boundary of family structures. I argue that their interests in promoting parental rights and the best interests of children within curriculum are reflective of their fear of children based on their cultural representations, and the intention on the part of respondents at subjectivity formation of children through children's books.

References

(1997, Apr. 28). Surrey's book ban. The Vancouver Sun, p. A10.

(1998, Dec. 18). Surrey trustees get lesson about books. The Vancouver Sun, p. A22.

(1998, Dec. 20). Common sense must govern book choices. Edmonton Journal, p. A10

(2002, Sept. 23). Our schools need books, not legal bills. The Vancouver Sun., p. A22.

(2002, June 15). Age limits. Calgary Herald, p. OS08.

(2002, June 15). School choice; giving parents final say. The Windsor Star, p. A10.

(2002, Dec. 20). The court deciding on curriculum. The Windsor Star, p. A6.

(2002, Dec. 21). Kindergarten court: Parents, not judges should say if gay books belong in the classroom. The Ottawa Citizen, p. B6.

(2003, June 14). Surrey school board perverts the law's intent. The Vancouver Sun, p. C8.

Adams, Gillian. (1986). The first children's literature? The case for Sumer. Children's Literature 14, 1-30.

Aries, P. (1962). Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life. New York: Knopf; Random House.

Armon-Jones, C. (1985). Prescription, explication and the social construction of emotion. Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 15(1), 1-22.

---. (1988). The thesis of constructionism. In R. Harré (Ed.), The social construction of emotions. (pp. 32-56). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Arons, S. (1983). Compelling belief: The culture of American schooling. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Averill, J. R. (1980). A constructivist view of emotion. In R. Plutchik, & H. Kellerman (Eds.), Emotion: Theory, research, and experience. Volume one: Theories of emotions. (pp. 305-339). San Diego: Academic Press Inc.

Barratt, A. (2002, Apr. 14). Learning about diversity: Banned books depict families as they are. The Montreal Gazette, p. A19.

Barry, E. (1998). Judy Blume for president: Meet the woman who invented American adolescence. Retrieved Oct. 23, 2008, from http://www.bostonphoenix.com/archive/features/98/05/21/JUDY_BLUME.html

Bell, V. (1993). Governing childhood: Neo-liberalism and the law. Economy and Society, 22(3), 390-405.

Bloomfield, B. P., & Vurdubakis, T. (1995). Disrupted boundaries: New reproductive technologies and the language of anxiety and expectation. Social Studies of Science, 25(3), 533-551.

Blume, J. (1970). Are you there god? It's me Margaret. Scarsdale, N. Y.: Bradbury.

---. (1970). Iggie's House. Scarsdale, N.Y.: Bradbury Press.

---. (1972). It's not the end of the world. Scarsdale, N.Y.: Bradbury Press.

---. (1973). Deenie. Scarsdale, N.Y: Bradbury Press.

Blume, J., & Kids Fund. (1986). Letters to Judy: What your kids wish they could tell you. New York: Putnam.

Booth, D. (1992). Censorship goes to school. Markham, Ontario: Pembroke Publishers Limited.

British Columbia Library Association (BCLA) Intellectual Freedom Committee. Censorship in British Columbia: A history 1990-1999. Retrieved May 31, 2008, from http://www.bclibrary.ca/bcla/ifc/censorshipbc/1990.html

---. Censorship in British Columbia: A history 2000-. Retrieved May 31 2008, from http://www.bclibrary.ca/bcla/ifc/censorshipbc/2000.html

Bunyan, J. (1898). The pilgrim's progress. New York: Century Co.

Canadians for Equal Marriage. Equal Marriage Backgrounder. Retrieved April 28, 2009. From http://www.equal-marriage.ca/resource.php?id=500.

Carefoote, P. J. (2007). Forbidden fruit: Banned, censored, and challenged books from Dante to Harry Potter. Toronto: Lester Mason & Begg.

Carter, J. H. (2004). Exemplary programs, projects, policies, and classroom practices: Surrey, British Columbia: Book ban in the courts. Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education, 1(4), 81-85.

Clapp, C. (2002, June 25). Book ban is just discrimination. The Ottawa Citizen, p. A15.

Collins, D. (2006). Culture, religion and curriculum: Lessons from the 'three books' controversy in Surrey, BC. Canadian Geographer, 50(3), 342-357.

De Courville, Nicol, Valérie. (2006). Pour une sociologie culturelle foucaldienne...de la peur. Sociologie et Sociétés 38(2), 133-150.

---. (2004). Le soupçon gothique: l'intériorisation de la peur en Occident. Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval.

---. (forthcoming). "Analysing emotional selves", Chapter from unpublished manuscript tentatively titled Reading self-help: On the popularization of emotional stress and anxiety. April 16, 2009.

Dean, M. (1999). Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society. London: SAGE.

Dick, J. (1982). Not in our schools?!!!: School censorship in Canada: A discussion guide. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association.

Donelson, K. L., & Nilsen, A. P. (1997). A brief history of adolescent literature. Literature for today's young adults. (5th edition ed.,) New York: Longman.

Donzelot, J. (1979). The policing the families. New York: Random House.

Douglas, M. (2000). Secular defilement. Purity and danger: An analysis of the concepts of pollution and taboo (pp. 30-41). New York: Routledge.

Elwin, R., Paulse, M., & Lee, D. (1990). Asha's mums. Toronto: Women's Press.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51-58.

---. (2004). Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Farrow, D. (2002, Dec. 27). To approve or not to approve. National Post, p. A21.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish. London: Allen Lane.

---. (1978). The history of sexuality (1st American -- ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

---. (1982). The subject and power. In H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow. Michael Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.(pp. 208-226). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

---. (1984). Introduction and The body of the condemned. In Paul Rabinow. The Foucault Reader. (pp. 170-178). New York: Pantheon Books.

---. (1988). Technologies of the self. In Martin L. H., Gutman H. and Hutton P. H. (Eds.), Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault. (pp. 16-49). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

---. (1994). Entretien avec Michel Foucault. Dits et écrits, tome 4, 1980-1999. Paris, Gallimard. p. 41-95.

---. (2003). Structuralism and poststructuralism. In P. Rabinow, & N. Rose (Eds.), The essential Foucault: Selections from the essential works of Foucault 1954-1984. (pp. 80-101). New York: The New Press.

Fun, A., & Fun, M. (2003, June 16). Private school the answer. The Province, p. A17.

Giardini, A. (2000, Nov. 2). Enough with the 'special' mommies. National Post, p. B1.

Giese, R. (2002, May 9). Don't ban books, improve teaching. Toronto Star, p. A31.

Gorey, E. (1962). Gashlycrumb tinies. New York: Peter Weed Books.

Hall, S. (Ed.) (1997). Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices. London: Sage.

Herzog, M. J. R. (1995). School censorship experiences of teachers in southern Appalachia. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 8(2), 137-48.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hunt, P. (Ed.). (1990). Children's literature: The development of criticism. London: Routledge.

---. (1991). Criticism, theory, and children's literature. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

---. (1997). Censorship and children's literature in Britain now, or, the return of Abigail. Children's Literature in Education, 28(2), 95-103.

---. (2001). Children's literature. Oxford, UK; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.

Hunter, I. (1999, May 13). Nanny knows best. National Post, p. A19.

Jackson, Stevi and Sue Scott. (2000). Risk anxiety and the social construction of childhood. In Risk and sociocultural theory: New directions and perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Jenkinson, D. R. (1986). The censorship iceberg: The results of a survey of challenges in school and public libraries. School libraries in Canada, 19-30.

Kincaid, J. R. (1992). Child-loving: The erotic child and Victorian culture. New York: Routledge.

Kingston, A. (2002, June 29). Two dads, two mums, too much fuss. National Post, p. SP1.

Lakritz, N. (2004, Mar. 4). Give kids well-told stories. Calgary Herald, p. A23.

Lamey, A. (2002, June 18). Public schools must remain neutral. National Post, p. A16.

Lawrence, D. F. (1997, April 28). Should young minds be open or closed? The Vancouver Sun, p. A11.

Lupton, D. (1998). The emotional self: A sociocultural exploration. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

---. (1999). Risk. London; New York: Routledge.

MacLeod, A. S. (1975). A moral tale: Children's fiction and American culture, 1820-1860. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books.

---. (1994). American childhood: Essays on children's literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Madigan, S. P. (1992). The application of Michel Foucault's philosophy in the problem externalizing discourse of Michael white. Journal of Family Therapy, 14, 265-279.

Moore, C. W. (2001, Aug. 18). Assault on religious convictions. The Gazette, p.B7.

Mulkay, M. (1993). Rhetorics of hope and fear in the great embryo debate. Social Studies of Science, 23, 721-42.

Newman, L., & Souza, D. (1989). Heather has two mommies. Boston, Mass.: Alyson Wonderland.

Newman, L., & Willhoite, M. (1991). Belinda's bouquet. Boston, Mass.: Alyson Wonderland.

Ramsey, K. (2002, June 23). Book ban reveals parents' homophobia. The Ottawa Citizen, pp. A15.

Ramsey, P. (1999, Feb. 19). Education ministry shelves evaluations of some novels. The Vancouver Sun, p. A11.

Ravitch, D. (2003). The language police: How pressure groups restrict what students learn. (1st ed.). New York: Knopf.

Reichman, H. (1993). Censorship and selection: Issues and answers for schools. (Rev. ed.). Chicago Arlington, Va.: American Library Association; American Association of School Administrators.

Rose, N. (1998). Inventing our selves: Psychology, power and personhood. New York: Cambridge.

---. (1999). Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rowling, J. K. (1997). Harry potter and the philosopher's stone. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Schmidt, S. (2002, Dec. 21). Parents, teachers remain divided. National Post, p. A8.

Shariff, S. (2006). Balancing competing rights: A stakeholder model for democratic schools. Canadian Journal of Education, 29(2), p. 476-496.

Shariff, S., & Manley-Casimir, M. (1999). Censorship in schools. In A. C. Hutchinson, & K. Petersen (Eds.), Interpreting censorship in Canada (pp. 157-181). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Shortt, D. (2002, Sept. 23). Homophobia crushes students' spirits. The Vancouver Sun, pp. A22.

Stallcup, J. E. (2002). Power, fear, and children's picture books. Children's Literature, 30, 125-158.

Stearns, P. N., & Haggerty, T. (1991). The role of fear: Transitions in American emotional standards for children, 1850-1950. The American Historical Review, 96(1 Feb.), 63-94.

Stearns, P. N. (2006). American fear: The causes and consequences of high anxiety. New York: Routledge.

Stephens, R. (2003). Harry and hierarchy: Book banning as a reaction to the subversion of authority. In E. D. Epstein, & G. L. Anatol (Eds.), Reading harry potter: Critical essays (pp. 51-65). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Storr, C. (1970). Fear and evil in children's books. Children's Literature in Education, 1(1 March), 22-40.

Tatar, M. (1987). The hard facts of the Grimms' fairy tales. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Tax, M. (1996). Families. Mexico: The Feminist Press at CUNY.

Theoret, D. (2002, June 17). Silent majority wants gay books banned in schools. The Ottawa Citizen, p. A13.

Twain, M. (1962). The adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Toronto: Macmillan.

Twigg, A. (1997, May 2). Surrey trustees exercising democracy. The Province, p. A34.

Valentine, J., & Sarecky, M. (1994). One dad, two dads, brown dad, blue dads. Boston, Mass.: Alyson Wonderland.

Valpy, M. (1997, Sept. 11). Gay books in the classroom. The Globe and Mail, p. A23.

West, M. I. (1997). Trust your children: Voices against censorship in children's literature. (2nd ed.). New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Westwood, J. (1998, Dec. 23). Keep religion out of class. The Vancouver Sun, p. A15.

Willhoite, M. (1990). Daddy's roommate. (1st ed.) Boston, Mass.: Alyson Wonderland.

Young, K. (2001, Aug. 25). Gay materials in schools foster tolerance. The Montreal Gazette, p. B6.

Zipes, J. D. (1981). Second thoughts on socialization through literature for children. Lion and the Unicorn, 5, 19-32.

---. (2001). Sticks and stones: The troublesome success of children's literature from Slovenly Peter to Harry Potter. New York; London: Routledge.

List of Cases

Chamberlain et al v. Surrey School District #36 1999 BCCA 516

Chamberlain v. Surrey School District #36 2000 BCCA 519

Chamberlain v. Surrey School District No. 36, [2002] 4 S.C.R. 710, 2002 SCC 86

Russow and Kathryn Lambert v. Attorney General of British Columbia (1989, 35 B.C.L.R 29 (S.C.)

Zylberberg. Sudbury Board of Education (Director) (1988) 55 O.R. (2d) 149.