CRITIQUING CANADIAN MULTICULTURAL DISCOURSE THROUGH THE ART OF
THE FILIPINO DIASPORA

Miguel Soriano

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Communication Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Masters of Arts (Media Studies) at Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

October 2024

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Miguel Soriano

Entitled: Critiquing Canadian Multicultural Discourse Through the Art of the Filipino
Diaspora

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Media Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect
to originality and quality.

 Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair

Dr. Monika Gagnon

_____Examiner

Dr. Charles Acland

_____ Examiner

Dr. Monika Gagnon

_____Supervisor

Dr. Alessandra Renzi

Approved by _____
Dr. Elizabeth Miller, Chair of Communication Studies

November 5th, 2024   _____
Dr. Pascale Sicotte, Dean, Arts and Science

ABSTRACT

Critiquing Canadian Multicultural Discourse Through the Art of the Filipino Diaspora

Miguel Soriano

Canada is touted to be a model of harmonious multiculturalism vis-a-vis other multicultural societies. However, implicit in Canadian multicultural policies are heteronormative and inequitable frameworks that shape the prevailing policies toward diasporic groups. Through discourse analysis and decolonial aesthetic observation, this study explores how Canadian multicultural discourse can be challenged through the art of Filipino-Canadian artists, and what the latter reveals about the experiences of Filipino immigrants in Canada. By performing a discourse analysis on the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the 2017 Canada Council for the Arts Equity policy, in combination with the examination of the work of Toronto-based Filipino-Canadian artist Azia Jonelle, this study will seek to answer the following question: how does the work of Filipino-Canadian diasporic artists challenge normative ideas of Canadian multiculturalism? In the end, this paper will identify the predominant issues of Canadian multiculturalism by examining the artist's particular representations vis-a-vis normative multicultural discourses found within the aforementioned policies, and thus determine how the particular experience of the Filipino-Canadian diasporic subject is disarticulated and rearticulated amidst Canada's multicultural landscape.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>LIST OF FIGURES</u>

Chapter 1: Conceptual Framework

1.1 Introduction

Canada is touted to be a model of harmonious multiculturalism vis-a-vis other multicultural societies (Diaz, 2016, p. 332). However, implicit in Canadian multicultural policies are heteronormative and inequitable frameworks that shape the prevailing policies toward ethnic minorities (Diaz, 2015, p. 15; Diaz, 2016, p. 332). These frameworks have the potential to perpetuate systemic inequalities by reinforcing established cultural values that lead to the marginalization of minority groups. The full expression and recognition of diverse cultural identities are potentially limited, resulting in multiculturalism being undermined by underlying structures that priortize certain identities and experiences over others. This thesis will explore how the art of Filipino Canadians challenges Canadian multiculturalism discourse and what the latter reveals about the experiences of Filipino immigrants in Canada. The main research questions of this thesis are: How do the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the Canada Council Equity Policy reflect normative discourses of Canadian multiculturalism? How is the work of Filipino-Canadian diasporic artists able to challenge these normative discourses? The objects that frame this analysis are the artwork *Mending ng Angkan* by Azia Jonelle, a Toronto-based queer-Filipino multidisciplinary artist, the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act, and the 2017 Canada Council for the Arts Equity Policy (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988; CCA, 2017; Azia Jonelle, 2022). The work of Jonelle is significant to this analysis as her diasporic Filipino identity allows for their artistic representations to depict an aesthetic that combines and interweaves notions of "homeland" and "hostland," and thus produces a representation that has the potential to critique normative notions of what a diasporic subject's relationship to their identity *should* be. This art analysis is situated within a critical discourse analysis conducted for the aforementioned policies. The Multiculturalism Act offers a broad viewpoint on Canada's expression of nationhood, while the Equity Policy presents a specific case study of a Canadian federal arts funder that Jonelle, as an artist, has experience with. By analyzing these objects, this thesis aims to explore how Jonelle's artwork, and potentially many from the Filipino diaspora, challenges the ideas articulated in these texts. Conversely, it also seeks to investigate how the statements in these texts either validate or highlight an alternative perspective on the themes depicted in Jonelle's work.

This project is reflective of the interconnectedness between my identity and the identity of the artist I analyze. As a queer Filipino-Canadian and a member of the Filipino diaspora in Canada, I aim to explore the underlying biases and colonial frameworks present in Canada's multicultural policies, which stem from Canada's colonial history and may influence contemporary articulations of its political systems. Through my work, I hope to reveal these structures, both in the artist funding bodies and equitable inclusion policies, like the Multicultural Act of 1988, that are directed toward ethnic minority groups in Canada.

1.2 Key Terms

My thesis revolves around two key terms, namely *Multiculturalism* and *Diaspora*. These terms are crucial in understanding the complex relationship between the Filipino-Canadian diaspora and Canadian society. *Multiculturalism* discourse establishes how a nation's cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity can affect its social and political cohesion (Garcea et al., 2008, p. 1). Canada's diversity results in opposing discourses that inform this field, with some theories suggesting that multiculturalism leads to the segregation of cultural

groups (Garcea 2008; Lloyd Wong 2008; Michele Labelle 2008). In contrast, others argue that it promotes diversity and distinguishes Canadian society from other equally diverse countries (Kymlicka, 2003, p. 1). The concept of *Diaspora* is also significant as the nuanced depictions of "homeland" and "hostland" by diasporic artists can unveil a particular reality that neither a "Canadian artist" nor a "Filipino artist" can capture. Through the analysis of the work *Mending ng Angkan* by Azia Jonelle, I demonstrate how the artwork illuminates the prevailing imaginaries of the Filipino diaspora in Canada and challenges the underlying colonial structures, such as the prioritization of French and English speakers over minority language groups, which may be embedded in Canadian multicultural policies.

1.3 The Potentialities of Art of the Filipino-Canadian Diaspora

This research seeks to understand some effects of Canadian multiculturalism discourse through a media-based examination of work by a member that exists within the group defined by "multiculturalism." By closely examining the portraiture produced by artists like Azia Jonelle, who are directly impacted by multicultural policies such as the 1988 Multiculturalism Act and the CCA Equity Policy, I demonstrate how Jonelle's work illustrates her navigation of the normative discourses of multiculturalism within these policies and their negotiation of a sense of 'belonging' in Canada.

The use of portraiture of Filipino-Canadian artists came to me when I developed my photo series to depict my experience as a queer Filipino-Canadian. As an emerging artist who is also negotiating similar slippages, I developed a photo series that serves as an image-based exploration of the Filipino diasporic experience in Canada. This photo series explores the nuances of my identity by generating a new aesthetic that is neither in Canada nor the Philippines but is thoroughly distinct from any of these representations. My aim with this photo series was to understand the relationship between self-imagery, the visual artifact, and notions of cultural and queer identity of the subject in question. This photo series portrays the queerness ingrained in the diasporic journey by juxtaposing traditional masculine Filipino attire with feminine styles of dress. I weave together elements of tradition, modernity, and queerness. I position myself to echo the masculine poses found in 19th-century studio portraits of Filipino labourers, while surrounded by traditional texts and furniture from their "homeland," the Philippines. Given this historical context, the photo series attempts to depict my identity, which transcends being merely a representation of either my "hostland" or "homeland," neither strictly modern nor traditional, but wholly unique and distinct from any other portrayal. As a queer Filipino who grew up in Canada while also being influenced by my Filipino heritage through my parents, expressing my queerness has been difficult due to the cultural incompatibilities that exist between these two identities. By showcasing objects representative of my ethnic identity with my queer self-presentation, these two portraits use traditional poses and garments to represent a new conception of my identity, where previously disparate elements are now harmonious.

My interpretation of queerness in my work goes beyond sexuality or challenging the gender binary. It encompasses a rejection of normativity as a whole. In this context, wearing a traditionally feminine garment on a masculine body isn't 'queer' because it plays with gender, but because it defies what society considers 'normal' behavior. The Barong is worn untraditionally without an undershirt, exposing my body, and is paired with a feminine skirt and heels. Still posed similarly to pre-colonial Filipino subjects, I blend multiple positionalities and rearticulate what modernity and tradition mean to the diasporic subject.

These two photos provide insight into the potential of diasporic art and portraiture to capture the affective experiences of self-identity, diaspora, and queerness. From these experiments, I started understanding how art, and specifically portraiture, can be used as a

window to understanding the nuances of identity and cultural experience that often lie hidden or beneath the surface in an artist's work. By integrating literature on diasporic subjectivity and multiculturalism with an analysis of Canadian multicultural policies, this thesis demonstrates how seemingly inconsequential artworks can challenge normative discourses of multiculturalism and reveal new ways to conceptualize diasporic subjectivity in Canada.

Figure 1: Fluid Bonds. Miguel Soriano, 2023. Inspired by pre-colonial photos of Filipino soldiers of the 19th century, shows the subject assuming a traditionally masculine posture with a straight back and no facial expression while gesturing away from the camera. This is juxtaposed with queer dress, such as the skirt and tight-fitting shirt, interweaving traditional Filipino masculinity with queerness.

Figure 2. Fluid Bonds. Miguel Soriano, 2023. I am posed in a performative masculine stance with neutral facial and body expressions. I am wearing a traditionally masculine Filipino garment, the "Barong Tagalog," used in matrimonial ceremonies and other formal events.

1.4 Chapter Summaries

Chapter 2 presents an examination of the literature relevant to this thesis, focusing on Diaspora Studies, Multiculturalism, and Decolonial Studies. The literature review is divided into two categories: Canadian multiculturalism discourses and Filipino-Canadian studies. It examines the intersection between Filipino Studies and Canadian multiculturalism by demonstrating how Filipino Canadians use art to highlight the contradictions in Canadian multicultural policies. This chapter also traces the historical context of multiculturalism in Canada by outlining its emergence before the enshrinement of multiculturalism in public policy, as well as how immigration policies began to reshape Canadian identity, marking a significant shift towards inclusive multiculturalism. Moreover, I outline the theoretical frameworks employed, including Chin and Reid's (2023) concept of 'belonging' and acknowledgment within multicultural discourses, Largo's (2017) decolonial diasporic

aesthetic, and Mecija's (2018) "queer" lens into Filipino-Canadian diasporic art. These frameworks provide the foundation to help determine how Filipino-Canadian art critiques and exposes issues in Canadian multicultural policy. Finally, this chapter outlines the methodology that this thesis follows, using Norman Fairclough's (2001) critical discourse analysis (CDA) to examine the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the 2017 Canada Council for the Arts Equity Policy.

Chapter 3 presents a critical discourse analysis of both the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 and the 2017 Equity Policy of the Canada Council for the Arts (CCA). It first provides a historical account and structural description of both policies and then moves toward a detailed analysis of the specific rhetorical mechanisms and contextual framing that the policies employ to assert the multicultural "Other's" place in both Canadian federal policy and niche governmental organizations like the Canada Council for the Arts. It provides a deep analysis of specific sections of each policy that pertain to multiculturalism and minority communities by following the critical discourse methodology of Fairclough (2001). I conclude that both policies allude to a view of multiculturalism rooted in Canada's historical bilingual and bicultural conception of its national identity, and thus subtly prioritize the primary language groups in Canada over multicultural minorities.

Chapter 4 contextualizes the findings from the previous discourse analysis chapter within the work of *Mending ng Angkan* by Azia Jonelle. It first provides an overview of how Azia Jonelle's background and identity are significant to this thesis and later describes the specific work used to critique the normative multicultural discourses found in each policy. After an examination of Jonelle's specific work, this chapter examines the concept of political 'belonging' for minority groups and demonstrates how the aforementioned policies construct their conception of 'belonging' that conflicts with Jonelle's diasporic Filipino-Canadian positionality. This chapter also demonstrates how the representations in Jonelle's work exhibit a "decolonial diasporic aesthetic" that not only illustrates her experience within the diaspora, but also works to deconstruct and disarticulate the normative discourses of multicultural 'belonging' by showcasing objects that hold a historically feminist and anti-colonial sensibility for Filipinos. Additionally, this chapter shows how a "queer" lens can push the analysis further by examining how diasporic art expands the limits of heteronormative and patriarchal frameworks entrenched in post-colonial societies like the Philippines and Canada. Considering the historical context of the Philippines and Canada, Jonelle's positionality, and the choice of representations in *Mending ng Angkan,* I determine that her work "queers" the boundaries of Western aesthetics and Canadian multicultural discourses.

Chapter 5 presents an overview of the significant findings of the critical discourse analysis and diasporic art analysis and contextualizes them within the relevant literature on Canadian multiculturalism and Diaspora Studies. It also outlines the limitations of the study, including the fundamental differences between the Multiculturalism Act and the Equity Policy, as well as the limited scope of using one artistic reference as a mode of critique. Finally, it presents new perspectives on how the work of emerging artists has the potential to critique institutionalized forms of identity-making through artists' affective representations and lived experiences that are expressed in the art.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The theoretical paradigms that influence my work include Diaspora Studies, Multiculturalism, and Decolonial Studies. Particularly, I am interested in the intersection between Filipino Studies and Canadian multiculturalism discourse, and how Filipino-Canadian scholars use art to expose notions of Canadian multiculturalism that contradict Canada's particular public representations within their policies. I examine various discourses on multiculturalism in Canada, where the incorporation of minority identities is recognized as a component of the Canadian multicultural identity. By exploring how diasporic subjectivities are depicted and contextualized within Canadian multiculturalism discourses, we can identify the space that diasporic Filipinos occupy within this multicultural framework. This literature review can be separated based on two distinct categories: Canadian multiculturalism discourses and Filipino-Canadian studies. A comprehensive discourse analysis of multiculturalism discourses may not always be directly relevant to Filipino-Canadian contexts, so I will concentrate my literature review on multiculturalism discourses that apply to diasporic art in Canada. Nevertheless, the answers to my research questions are contingent on the combined analysis of these two categories of literature, so I place my review of Filipino-Canadian literature in the context of literature on Canadian multiculturalism.

2.2 The Beginning of Multiculturalism in Canada

Since its beginning, Canada has grappled with a population challenge, driven by the need to develop its population to sustain a competitive economy and cultivate a sense of nationhood. Consequently, immigration has been indispensable for maintaining Canada's quality of life (Wilson, 1993, p. 652). Ninette Kelley and Michael Trebilcock (2010) argue that Canadian immigration policy arose from the need for territorial expansion and the reinforcement of national identity. Initially, immigrants were seen as a means to expand the Canadian workforce and, through their consumption, stimulate economic growth (p. 63). Immigrants were "viewed as a cheap source of labour rendered cheaper by the utilization of contract labour schemes" [...] (p. 13). The mid-19th century outlook on immigration policies in Canada, post-Confederation, was defined by the adoption of immigration policies as the "cornerstone" for the development of new nations (p. 13). The initial consideration of welcoming immigrants into Canada post-Confederation was based on their potential contribution to Canada's emerging economic sphere and the development of its national identity (p. 13). This goes beyond the cultural enrichment derived from ethnic diversity to encompass the economic value that cheap labour and increased population numbers can offer to a developing nation (p. 13). Thus, the Liberal and Conservative governments paid greater heed to economic interests than to non-material values, where economic expansion was the underlying objective of expanding immigration policy (p. 14). Alongside this expansion of immigration and the explosive promotion of immigrant workers was controversy surrounding growing crime statistics and the emergence of "urban ethnic ghettos," that law-enforcement officials identified and associated with the open-door immigration policies that characterized late 19th century Canada (p. 14). Thus, by the turn of the 20th century, the Canadian government argued for more restrictive policies to control the flow of immigration and heed the economic interests of the government at the time (p.14). Three restrictive regulations

specifically affected the volume of Asian immigration at that time: the [1]Chinese head taxes, the East Indians' continuous journey requirements, and the Japanese voluntary emigration quota (p. 15). These restrictions, commencing in 1906, signified a period during which Canada's immigration policy was guided by discriminatory principles, barring entry based on factors such as ethnicity, nationality, class, or occupation (Mahtani, 2015). At the same time, they revised the Immigration Act in 1906, intensifying immigration selectivity and complicating the admission process further (Kelley and Trebilcock, 2010, p. 14). It is important to note that Anglo-Canadian nationalists at the time predominantly preferred British immigrants over other groups, while French-Canadians were more apprehensive about disrupting the "linguistic and cultural balance" of the existing Confederation (p. 13). It is clear through the divergent perspectives of the Anglophone and Francophone communities that their views on immigrants are based on different grounds: the former desiring to maintain the predominantly white cultural makeup of Canada through the promotion of British immigration, and the latter aiming to preserve the cultural and linguistic distinctiveness of French-Canada. While various groups held differing ideological views on immigration, the restrictions on immigration policy disproportionately affected those outside of Canada's Anglo-Franco linguistic races, especially immigrants categorized as "Other." It was not until lobbying efforts began for the amendment of The Immigration Act in the 1970s that Canada's multicultural character was brought into the discussion, prompting a recharacterization of Canadian national identity to include the ethnic "Other" (Uberoi, 2016 p. 270). This historical context of Canada's view on new immigration at the onset of the development of Canadian national identity informs the various discourses that emerge later on surrounding Canadian multiculturalism.

2.3 Critiques of Canadian Multiculturalism

Several discourses on Canadian multiculturalism contrast the overarching notion of Canada being exemplary of "harmonious relations among people of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds" and how a country "ought" to be (Brosseau and Dewing, 2009 p. 14). Laurence Brosseau and Michael Dewing (2009) offer a distinction between three interpretations of multiculturalism: ideological, sociological, or political (p. 1). Descriptively, multiculturalism refers to the cultural makeup of Canadian society-- an aspect of its demography (p. 1). Politically, multiculturalism refers to the "management of diversity through formal initiatives in the federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal domains" (p. 1). In other words, it refers to how the multicultural population of Canada is organized and referenced within official legislation. Ideologically, which is most relevant to this thesis, multiculturalism encompasses various sets of beliefs that construct a view of whether its existence is beneficial or detrimental for the state, and how its existence can be managed within the varied political discourses of the nation. Numerous critiques contend that multiculturalism policy does not address the root issue of discrimination within countries containing various ethnic groups and origins (Garcea 2008; Lloyd Wong 2008; Michele Labelle 2008). Rather than fostering fair exchange and integration of cultural groups, multiculturalism instead leads to social fragmentation due to the underlying issues in multicultural expressions within the existing policies and the processes that disseminate education within Canada (Garcea 2008; Lloyd Wong 2008; Michele Labelle 2008). Lloyd Wong (2008) determines that there are two important conceptual distinctions in the existing literature regarding multiculturalism: first, fragmented pluralism and interactive pluralism;

---

[1] The 'Chinese Head Taxes' refers to a tax that restricted immigration of Chinese labour workers between 1885 to 1923 in Canada. It was the first legislation that sought to exclude immigrants based on their ethnic background (Chan, 2016).

and second, an immutable core approach and a dynamic nucleus approach (p. 14). Fragmented pluralism involves separation and segregation of members of various groups, while interactive pluralism entails interaction between members of different groups (p. 25). This implies that within a given country, cultural groups can interact in two distinct ways, which may depend on the prevailing policy processes at a given time: one in which cultural groups coexist separately and distinctly, and another where they coexist while engaging in ongoing dialogue with each other. In the latter case, the "immutable core" refers to a situation in which different cultural groups are subsumed within common values, language, and culture of the "core" of a country, and the "dynamic nucleus" refers to where there is the continuous development of social norms that befit the numerous and distinct cultural groups existing at a time (p. 28). Wong (2008) asserts two key points: firstly, to prevent social fragmentation in a multicultural nation, there needs to be a shift towards interactive pluralism based on the dynamic nucleus approach (p. 28). This entails ongoing dialogue, scrutiny, and reevaluation among diverse cultural groups regarding the essence of Canada's national identity, rather than conformity to an overarching cultural identity that forces various groups to assimilate (p. 28). Furthermore, this approach can only become a reality if governments are committed to enhancing social cohesion through leadership roles and modifying their multicultural policies towards such an end. Wong (2008) determines that Canada's current form of multiculturalism does not include discussion among cultural groups and that the government does not intervene enough to avoid social fragmentation.

In line with Wong's (2008) findings regarding the importance of government intervention and recognition of dynamic plurality to prevent social fragmentation within Canada's multiculturalism framework, Michelin Labelle (2008) arrives at a parallel conclusion. She focuses on three critiques of the Canadian multicultural model by contrasting it with the Quebec interculturalism[2] model of diversity. The initial argument, known as "fragmentation theory," discusses Canada's achievement of a multicultural state rather than a multinational one, leading to a highly divided state with conflicting claims of multiculturalism (p. 37). The second argument addresses how Canadian multicultural policy creates tensions with Quebec's intercultural approach, undermining the status of the Quebec nation and hindering the establishment of a pluralist territorially-based Quebec citizenship (p. 37). The third argument highlights discussions focusing on the normative foundations of multiculturalism rather than its policies, emphasizing the examination of multiculturalism's merits concerning various normative dimensions such as identity politics, social cohesion, and social justice (p. 37). She concludes that asserting the convergence of federal and Quebec diversity management policies would result in the interculturalism model evolving in contrast to Canadian multiculturalism. This is because their convergence overlooks contradictions regarding divergent official languages, approaches to integration, and the interpretation of citizenship (p. 38). Similarly, Chedly Belkhodja (2008) delves into another critique of Canadian multiculturalism by analyzing Anglophones and Francophones in Quebec (p. 80). He contends that critiques of multiculturalism have evolved beyond the initial concerns about its impact on Quebec's linguistic-nationalist values. Instead, they now encompass issues related to the development of a Quebecois cultural identity, social integration and cohesion, and the formation of a "cosmopolitan Quebecois community (p. 91)."

Anna Kirova's (2008) multicultural critique focuses on the multicultural education theory, where she determines that issues within multicultural education have led to the opposite result that the Canadian Multiculturalism Act strived for (p. 102). Garcea (2008)

---

[2] 'Quebec Interculturalism' is a model that was developed in Quebec in response to the federal government's move towards Canadian multiculturalism as a way to integrate new immigrants in Canada (Proulx-Chenard, 2021). It is defined by the idea that equality between cultures in Quebec "required francisation and secularization of the public domain" (Proulx-Chenard, 2021).

notes that the "current multicultural education practices in Canada are based on ethno-racial distinctions," and thus have not eliminated racism nor the unequal treatment of the minority (p. 4). Based on this argument, Kirova (2008) notes that the structure of multiculturalism in Canada, and multicultural education theory, make it difficult for multicultural education to attend to a "multiplicity of identities, fluidity of culture, negotiations of power in the cultural space, and the new politics of difference [...]" (p. 101). Thus, she contends that provincial educational structures must prioritize a deeper examination of identity shifts, cultural distinctions, and cultural identities to address the existing challenges within Canadian multiculturalism discourse. In a similar critique of multicultural education, Phyllis Dalley and Michael Begley (2008) analyze French-Canadian educational literature spanning from 1995 to 2005 (p. 126-137). They discover that critiques of multiculturalism favor the Quebecois interculturalism model, which offers a more inclusive approach and is adept at managing cultural differences because it facilitates the negotiation and development of a shared culture (p. 132). While they acknowledge that Quebecois intercultural education fosters social cohesion among diverse cultures, it overlooks the issue of equal opportunities and access to language knowledge (p. 132). Following this overview of the literature on Canadian multiculturalism, the following section brings in various scholars that contextualize multiculturalism within the work of Filipino-Canadian diasporic artists.

2.4 Multiculturalism Through the Lens of the Filipino-Canadian Diaspora

Art and artists can provide another perspective on the analysis of multiculturalism discourses. The representations within the artwork of the diaspora are not always explicit in their critique of the themes and motifs they choose to represent. The following people are examples of Filipino-Canadian scholars whose work examines the intersection of multiculturalism and Filipino diasporic art to reconceptualize and rearticulate the aesthetics of various Filipino artists, uncovering their obscured meanings in the context of multiculturalism discourse.

Robert Diaz (2016) examines how queer diasporic migrants deal with Canadian multiculturalism policy and its colonial underpinnings to reassert the position of the queer diasporic Filipino subject within Filipino-Canadian migration research (Diaz, 2016 p. 327). To do so, he focuses on the contemporary art exhibit of Julius Manapul, the *Cabinet of Queeriosities,* featured in the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) in Toronto. Diaz (2016) refers to Bonnie McElhinny's critique of the Filipino exhibit, where she contends that the refusal to display Filipino-made artifacts without mention of American colonialism[3] demonstrates how Canadian multiculturalism both "traffics in political correctness and masks its orientalist rhetoric" (p. 331). This implies that the exhibit transforms the reality of racial abjection and imperialism against Filipino people into "palatable" narratives about "universality amid difference" (p. 331). The issue with the particular structure of the Philippine exhibit is that in the process of choosing what artifacts to display to recover anthropological signifiers of "otherness," it simultaneously ignores the historical violence that frequently accompanies the creation of these artifacts (p. 331). As a result, the exhibition becomes a reminder of how colonial abjection can still manifest itself in present-day Canada (p. 311). Diaz (2016) asserts that ROM curators purposely occluded the Filipino body in the exhibit "to remove the pleasure that a docile body from another colonial regime [as] [it] might elicit [within] this settler colonial one (Canada)" (p. 331) He implies that the Filipino body arouses and exposes

---

[3] 3 The period of American Colonialism in the Philippines began after the Spanish American War of 1898, and continued until 1902. It resulted in the death of over 200,000 Filipino combatants and civilians (Office of the Historian).

the relationship between imperialism and the systematic practices of racialization that underline how migrants in Canada have been subordinated and Indigenous communities displaced on settler colonial land (p. 332). This perspective will be useful when examining how the diasporic Filipino body works to contradict Canada's touted reputation as a model of harmonious multiculturalism (p. 332).

The article "Reimagining Filipina Visibility through 'Black Mirror'" by Marissa Largo (2017) examines the work of artist Marigold Santos, a Filipino-Canadian artist in Calgary, Alberta. Largo (2017) contends that the Filipina subject is associated with colonial and nationalist logic that subsumes her under normative notions of "tradition, the nuclear family, and heterosexuality" (p. 100) However, through an artist's reinterpretation of these cultural aesthetics, such as the folklore tale about the "Asuang," they can instead be used to critique the colonial discourses surrounding the Filipino subject. As a result, Largo can discern a particular type of representation that neither represents Santos' Filipina heritage nor her Canadian citizenship but surpasses and disrupts such a binary. She contends that "multiculturalism requires fixed categories such as 'racial minorities' [...] which position people of colour on the periphery of national belonging" (p. 105). Considering this, the representations seen in Santos' art can embody such contested national 'belonging,' which speaks to the larger ability of the decolonial diasporic aesthetic to envision a positionality that extends beyond "essentialist and nationalist definitions of racial and gendered minority" (p. 105).

2.5 Theoretical Framework

This thesis' theoretical framework is informed by Diaspora Studies and Multiculturalism Studies. To analyze the normative discourses of Canadian multiculturalism within policy, I utilize the theoretical framework of Chin and Reid (2003) in their article "Discourses of Multicultural Acknowledgement in Canada: Liberal and Conservative, General and Specific" (Chin and Reid, 2023). They present a theory of 'belonging' and acknowledgment within contemporary discourses of multiculturalism, specifically derived through a broad discourse analysis of the Harper Conservative (2004-2015) and Trudeau Liberal (2015-2019) governments (Chin and Reid, 2023 p. 257). Chin and Reid (2023) distinguish between two forms of acknowledgment: general and specific (p. 263). The former refers to the acknowledgment of an entire community without mentioning a specific sub-community or group; the latter refers to acknowledgment directed to an entire community but specifically recognizes certain sub-communities to encourage them to identify with Canadian nationhood (p. 269). This theoretical framework of 'belonging' in multicultural societies helps conceptualize how majority and minority identities are constructed by each policy and thus determine how they position ethnic minorities as 'belonging' to Canada's political community.

In terms of the analysis of diasporic art, I will build on Marissa Largo's (2017) concept of the *Decolonial[4] Diasporic Aesthetic* (Largo, 2017 p. 99). She posits this concept to demonstrate how Filipino-Canadian art both disarticulates notions of "the diaspora" in Canada, while also demonstrating how the concept of "diaspora" is rearticulated through the artistic representations of these Filipino-Canadian artists (p. 99). In a similar sense, Casey

---

[4] The "decolonial" aspect of this aesthetic is defined by how it is able to deconstruct forms of Western aesthetics that are influenced by historical forms of colonialism and neo-colonialsm, thus resulting in a representation that is neither representative of a diasporic subject's hostland or homeland, but uniquely its own (Largo, 2018 p. 14).

Mecija (2018) looks at her band *Ohbijou*, and at the advantages and burdens of the band's visible diversity in the context of Canada. She analyzes her lyrical themes that are rooted in the diasporic experience and contrasts them with her personal experience as a diasporic musician within the multicultural musical landscape of Canada. Similar to how decolonial diasporic aesthetics rearticulate particular colonial histories to interrogate colonial practices, Mecija (2018) challenges normative frameworks of typical Canadian music by placing her band's work against the reactions and assessments by the Canadian media and non-diasporic fans (Mecija, 2018 p. 130). Particular to Mecija's theoretical paradigm is the employment of a *queer* analysis of diasporic art, in which "queer" follows the definition of an "aesthetic experience pushing out associations with 'ordinary' encounters" (p. 119). In a similar sense, my project will employ a *queer* analysis of diasporic art, not in terms of the sexuality of the artists in question, but how their particular representations "make strange" typical Western aesthetic forms and entangles the subjectivities of the diasporic subject within the context of Canada (Largo, 2017 p. 107). Together, these two theoretical lenses will allow me to determine how Filipino-Canadian diasporic art may offer an alternative lens to how belonging in Canadian multiculturalism policy is conceived and navigated by members of a specific minority group in Canada.

2.6 CDA Methodology

I intend to use critical discourse analysis to examine the following policies: the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the Canada Council for the Arts 2017 Equity Policy (CA, 1988; CCA, 2017). The former policy body provides a legislative framework for Canada's expansion of focus on protecting its multicultural heritage, reduction of minority discrimination, and the implementation of programs to enhance multicultural representation in Canada (CA, 1988). The Canada Council's Equity Policy highlights the organization's dedication to promoting equity in the arts and presents an orientational framework that defines their strategic initiatives to ensure equity in their daily operations (CA, 1988; CCA, 2017). Here, I will use the framework of Norman Fairclough (2001) as it combines the analysis of language, discourse practice, and discursive events as socio-cultural practice. Considering the sociopolitical and historical context of both policies will allow me to demonstrate how public policy manifests itself in the context of contemporary articulations of diasporic and multicultural identity seen through the examination of Azia Jonelle's work. While Jonelle's work does not directly engage with Canadian policy, her implicit critiques of Canadian multiculturalism engage and expose frictions within Canadian policy. Fairclough's analysis framework consists of four steps: structural analysis and the order of discourse; interactional analysis; interdiscursive analysis; and linguistic and semiotic analysis (Fairclough, 2001, p. 241). The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 and the Canada Council for the Arts Equity Policy differ in their origins, historical significance, and scope of application. I begin by establishing the historical context of both the 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the CCA's 2017 Equity Policy to determine what influenced their development, how these policies evolved, and how they fit into a broader interactional process. Then, I will start analyzing the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 to establish a macro-level perspective on how Canadian multiculturalism is articulated through federal policy. Following this, I will delve into a micro-level analysis of the 2017 CCA Equity Policy. I will then determine how each policy represents facts related to multiculturalism, their construction of *minority* and *majority* identities, and their descriptive values outlined in each text, to delineate the various social spheres that each text relates to. I will then analyze how the text is organized and how their specific clauses interact, interweave, and combine, to uncover the "fabric of meaning" in terms of their choice of words and phrases (Gaudet and

Robert, 2019, p. 26). Finally, I cross-analyze the data from each respective policy and contextualize it within the work *Mending Ng Angkan* by Azia Jonelle, determine how their focus on multicultural analysis illuminates normative discourses of multiculturalism in new ways, and establish how Canadian multiculturalism exemplifies a complex symbolic politics of minority 'belonging' and acknowledgment in each policy.

Chapter 3: Understanding Multiculturalism through Critical Discourse Analysis

3.1 The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988

In this chapter, I conduct a critical discourse analysis of the Multiculturalism Act by first outlining the historical conditions that led to its emergence. I then conduct a deep analysis of its provisions and linguistic mechanisms to reveal how the frame and stratify majority and minority identities within the Act. I determine that while it asserts the historical place and contribution of ethnic minorities in Canada, the Canadian Multiculturalism Act nevertheless does not allow for ethnic minorities to take precedence over the "founding groups," based on how they frame language and the value of the racialized "Other." Additionally, the act fails to both acknowledge the systemic barriers to inclusion faced by ethnic minorities and does it explicitly outline implementation strategies that would allow for its provisions to enter public discourse. Therefore, I determine that the act remains a symbolic example of Canadian multiculturalism that is invariably tied to its bilingual and bicultural history.

The report of the 1963-1969 Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was the first instance in Canadian history where multicultural identity was discussed, and the potential enshrinement of multicultural policy was considered (*The Canadian Encyclopedia*, 2019). The report emerged as a reaction to the escalating discontent among French Canadians in Quebec who demanded safeguards for their language and culture and opportunities for full participation in political and economic decision-making (*The Canadian Encyclopedia,* 2019). Initially, the Royal Commission was asked to investigate the racial and ethnic diversity of Canadians, specifically the ethnic makeup of English and French communities in Quebec and the rest of Canada (*The Canadian Encyclopedia,* 2019). Upon its initial announcement, the objective was to compile a set of recommendations aimed at repairing the inter-societal relationships between Canada's two founding communities (*The Canadian Encyclopedia,* 2019). The proposed ideas showed support more for bilingual policies, rather than biculturalism (*The Canadian Encyclopedia,* 2019). Consequently, the Royal Commission shaped Pierre Elliot Trudeau's choice to embrace a policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework (French and English), which later materialized into the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988. While the term "Bi and Bi" suggests an interconnection between bilingualism and biculturalism, Trudeau's government viewed language and culture as largely separable. Consequently, the policy of multiculturalism was articulated within a bilingual, rather than a bicultural framework (Wood and Gilbert, 2005, p. 681). The inclusion of other ethnic groups in this discussion only emerged to complement the existing financial support of English and French language cultural activities, by pledging assistance from the "other ethnic group" (p. 681). Pierre Elliot Trudeau's foremost focus was the animosity between Quebec and the rest of Canada; concerns regarding other ethnic groups were considered secondary and were only addressed when the need for financial backing for such endeavors arose (p. 682). This suggests that multiculturalism was never an independent goal or vision. Referencing the early immigration policies of mid-19th century Canada, which prioritized the economic contributions of new immigrants, alongside similarly discriminatory

policies such as the Chinese Head Tax[5] of 1885, multiculturalism emerged as a political requisite complement to a national bilingual policy aimed at acknowledging Francophones and Quebec (Kelley and Treiblock, 2010, p. 15; Wood and Gilbert, 2005, p. 681). Understanding the emergence of the discussion of multiculturalism policy in Canada is important in framing the various discourses that emerge later on. In particular, the recognition of multicultural ethnic groups predated political discourse, and their later consideration during the Bi and Bi Commission initially did not encompass other ethnic groups, nor was it their primary objective (Garcea 2008). Upon critical examination of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988, it will become apparent that the secondary and often overlooked attention given to the "Other" in Canada's multicultural policy history manifests itself in the debates surrounding its effectiveness in promoting social cohesion for ethnic minorities in Canada.

The Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 was the first instance in which ethnic groups other than English and French were considered an integral part of Canada and enshrined into law (Uberoi, 2016, p. 268). The significance of this enshrinement is articulated by Varun Uberoi (2016), in his article "Legislating Multiculturalism and Nationhood: The 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act" (Uberoi, 2016). He asserts that the creation of this act holds significance on three fronts: firstly, it reshaped multiculturalism policy by prompting federal institutions to mirror Canada's diversity within their staff and to actively promote diversity; secondly, it heightened policy oversight by mandating federal governments to annually report to Parliament on the operational aspects of the policy; and thirdly, it explicitly supports a multicultural policy that fosters fresh perspectives on the identity and nationhood of Canada, embracing diverse ethnic groups beyond the French and English (p. 268). These areas of significance indicate that the act not only aimed to safeguard and incorporate various ethnic groups into federal policy but also sought to guarantee that the internal framework of the federal government embraced diversity. As a result, it contributed to reshaping Canada's identity and articulation of nationhood to encompass ethnic minorities through internal restructuring and reform. After having established the historical emergence of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, we can move towards a deeper analysis of the cultural references, discursive statements, and linguistic and rhetorical mechanisms used throughout the text.

3.1.1 Structure of the Multiculturalism Act

The structure of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act can be divided into three main parts: definitions that clarify key terms and their application within the act, the policy itself, and mandates for implementing the policy within both federal and provincial institutions. This discourse analysis focuses primarily on the second and third categories. I will begin with an in-depth examination of the second category, which describes the specific provisions of the Multiculturalism Act. The second category is divided into two main sections: "Multiculturalism Policy" and "Federal Institutions." The "Multiculturalism Policy" section outlines specific policies related to multiculturalism in Canada, while the "Federal Institutions" section details policies applicable to all federal institutions, including the federal government and all its institutions as declared by the act. My analysis starts with the first sub-category, "Multiculturalism Policy of Canada." This analysis will be divided into three parts. First, I will conduct a textual analysis of the linguistic and grammatical mechanisms used to convey the specific policies of the Canadian government's execution of the Multiculturalism Act. Second, I will examine how multiculturalism and ethnic groups are referred to within the text. Third, I will explore how the combination of these rhetorical

---

[5] See footnote 1.

13

mechanisms, along with the discursive statements made, establish truths concerning Canada's view of its multicultural identity throughout the policy.

3.1.2 Section 1: Analysis of the Multiculturalism Act

The verbs that are deployed to declare the Canadian government's role in promoting these policies of multiculturalism are active. In this section, verbs such as "recognize," "promote," "encourage," "preserve," "enhance," and "foster" are consistently used at the beginning of each provision. These active verbs, initiating each line of policy, signify the actions to be undertaken by the Government of Canada, the subject, in advancing the multiculturalism policy, the object. For instance, "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada to recognize and promote [...]" (p. 3). This demonstrates how the Canadian government is expected to act concerning a particular directive, as seen in 3.1.a, where they are mandated to recognize and promote "the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance, and share their cultural heritage" (p. 3). The active use of "recognize" and "promote" in conjunction with one another establishes a truth about each statement being made. To request someone to "recognize" implies the existence of something that is "obscured." In this context, it refers to the obscurity of Canada's multiculturalism, which necessitates acknowledgment. Moreover, the use of "promote" in these statements implies an active effort to endorse and recognize Canada's multicultural reality within a policy framework. Analyzing the active verbs in this policy section reveals the Canadian government's acknowledgment of multiculturalism as a previously concealed aspect of its identity. Thus, the government must recognize this obscurity and actively promote its understanding within policy contexts. Canada's multicultural nature is substantiated through various discursive statements that emphasize the country's diverse makeup and reveal the government's perception of its national identity and character. This section refers to Canada's multicultural character in four instances: 3.1a, 3.1b, 3.1f, and 3.1h.

> 3.1a: [...] recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the *cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society* [...] (p. 3).
> 3.1b: [...] recognize and promote the understanding that *multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity* [...] (p. 3).
> 3.1f: [...] encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic, and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of *Canada's multicultural character* [...] (p. 3).
> 3.1h: [...] foster the recognition and appreciation of the *diverse cultures of Canadian society* [...] (p. 4).

These statements assert two truths: first, that Canadian society is culturally and racially diverse, and second, that Canada is not only presently diverse, but its multicultural makeup has existed historically. Consequently, by acknowledging Canada's multicultural character in this manner, these provisions establish multiculturalism as an intrinsic element of Canadian identity and nationhood, advocating for its recognition not only through the formulation of this policy but also as something that existed before its development. Regarding the subject of these statements, namely the Government of Canada, it affirms that the government acknowledges these truths about Canada's multiculturalism, both within the context of this policy and concerning Canada's heritage. Another aspect of this policy section to note is its direct reference to the multicultural "Other" or ethnic groups in the act. The reference to how this policy refers to the multicultural "Other" occurs in eight instances throughout this section: 3.1a, 3.1c. 3.1d, 3.1e, 3.1g, 3.1h, and 3.1i. In each of these statements, the policy attempts to be inclusive of members of all origins and ethnic groups by stating "all members

of Canadian society," "communities whose members share a common origin" and "individuals and communities of different origins" (p. 3). Notably, these examples do not separate the historically dominant British and French populations but include all members of different origins and communities by employing inclusive language. This approach balances the status of French, English, and other ethnic groups by grouping them in these provisions. However, a passage in section 3.1i regarding Canada's official languages conflicts with the idea of equalizing all ethnic groups within the act.

> 3.1i: [...] preserve and enhance *the use of language other than English and French*, while *strengthening the status and use of official languages of Canada* [...] (p. 4)

This statement establishes Canada's status hierarchy of its national languages vis-a-vis other minority languages. Firstly, it differentiates between "English and French" and "other languages," and secondly, it emphasizes the priority of French and English by stating that their status and use must not only be maintained but also "strengthened." Thus, it affirms the pillars of Canada's nationhood as defined by its primary language groups: the English and the French. This distinction alludes to the historical context from which this act emerged, rooted in the bilingual and bicultural perceptions of Canada that depict Canadians are culturally English or French (Ubero, 2016, p. 270). We can also analyze how the act refers to the ethnic Other and determine their perceived value from these statements. For example, in section 3.1b, the act states:

> 3.1b: [...] recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an *invaluable resource* in the shaping of Canada's future (p. 3).

This provision suggests that in promoting Canadian multiculturalism concerning the ethnic "Other," they are recognized as a valuable asset for Canada's future advancement. Consequently, Canada's future hinges not only on the enrichment of cultural dimensions but also on economic considerations. Thus, it can be inferred that the act also acknowledges the economic significance of other ethnic groups in contributing to Canada's development. Inevitably, a country's acknowledgment and integration of other ethnic groups cannot rely solely on the goodwill of that country; it also is dependent upon how these groups have historically contributed to the Canadian economy and its evolution. We can grasp the historical context of this policy position by exploring how immigrants were viewed before the enactment of the strict Immigration Act of 1910, especially during the period from 1896 to 1910 (Timlin, 1950). Beginning in 1896, there was minimal control over who entered Canada, and those who did were categorized into three groups: the diseased, the criminal or vicious, and those likely to become public charges (p. 517). Given this, it appears that multiculturalism was never a priority in Canada's domestic or immigration policies. Governments actively opposed diversity through the implementation of immigration-limiting measures such as the "Chinese head tax, anti-Asian riots, the turning away of Jews and Blacks at the border, the internment of Ukrainians during the First World War, the internment of Japanese, Italians, and Germans during the second world war, [...] and the devastation of Indigenous people and cultures" (Wood and Gilbert, 2005, p. 684). The enactment of the Immigration Act of 1910 encapsulated these stringent measures, marking a significant broadening of authority within the legal framework overseeing immigration (Timilin, 1950, p. 523). Nevertheless, immigration has remained crucial to maintaining Canada's quality of life, despite the initial marginalization of these groups from mainstream Canadian society (Berichewsky, 1994; Wilson, 1993, p. 652). This underscores the significance of the specific mention of the economic contribution of the ethnic "Other" as "an invaluable resource in shaping Canada's future," reflecting historical anti-immigrant rhetoric which is articulated in the government's perception of immigrants as a valuable economic asset for Canada's progress (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988, p. 3). As we progress into the policy

implementation section of the Multiculturalism Act, a clearer depiction emerges of Canada's perception of the role and value assigned to minority ethnic groups. This is evident through the contrasting ways the policy addresses subjects within minority communities compared to the historical treatment of immigrants before the policy was enacted.

3.1.3 Section 2: Analysis of the Implementation Framework

This section of the legislation, titled "Implementation of the Multiculturalism Policy in Canada," pertains to the responsibilities of Canadian governmental bodies to enact the policy in daily operations and across different tiers of administration, spanning from federal to provincial levels (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988, p. 4-5). Although this section diverges from the preceding one by discussing the particular manner in which the policies detailed earlier are to be executed across Canada's governmental institutions, certain aspects of the analysis remain consistent with those of the previous section. For instance, we can observe a similar pattern of active verbs such as "encourage," "promote," "assist," and "enhance" used to describe the government's actions outlined in each provision (p. 5). Additionally, this section reinforces truths about Canada's multicultural composition, akin to the preceding section, by acknowledging Canada's "multicultural reality" (p. 5). There is also a parallel reference to the ethnic "Other," as seen in the previous one, where ethnic groups beyond English and French are represented using inclusive language such as "all origins and their communities," "all languages," and "diverse communities" (p. 5). Therefore, I direct my analysis towards the elements of this section that are different from the previous. Specifically, I focus on the portrayal of the value of the ethnic "Other" concerning the evolution of Canada's multicultural identity, the acknowledgment of discriminatory barriers these groups encounter, and the government's role in dismantling them. Through examining these themes within this section of the act, one observation emerges: the government's conception of multiculturalism favors individuals capable of making high-level contributions to Canadian society, overshadowing its commitment to overcoming discrimination against these groups. There are two instances in which there is mention of the government's role in promoting multiculturalism for means related to the development of Canada's economy and the intellectual level of immigrants:

5.1b: undertake and assist *research relating to Canadian multiculturalism and foster scholarship* in the field (p. 5).

5.1d: encourage and assist the *business community, labour organizations, voluntary and other private organizations, as well as public institutions,* in ensuring full participation in Canadian society, including the *social and economic aspects* [...] (p. 5).

These provisions reflect how Canada evaluates the significance of other ethnic groups based on their economic and societal contributions. In 5.1b, the stipulation for federal institutions to support the advancement of multiculturalism implies the government's dedication to embedding Canada's multicultural reality within scholarly pursuits. This commitment suggests that Canada's multicultural identity could potentially gain recognition at a global academic level. However, this provision fails to delineate which groups are tasked with conducting this research, particularly in terms of fostering the inclusion of ethnic minorities in contributing to this field. Although advancing scholarly endeavours related to Canadian multiculturalism entrenches Canada's multicultural identity at a global academic scale, the initial aim of the Multicultural Act lies in acknowledging and integrating other ethnic groups into official state policies, making this aspect somewhat off-target. However, 5.1d tackles this issue by advocating for the federal government's involvement in multicultural groups to facilitate their integration into Canadian society. It explicitly mentions "participation in Canadian society," highlighting the significance of including individuals from all

backgrounds and their respective communities (p. 5). In doing so, the act underscores the importance of integrating the multicultural "Other" into social and economic institutions, thereby addressing the issue observed in the previously mentioned provision. Nevertheless, the emphasis remains on institutions capable of making distinct contributions to Canada's economy, such as labour unions and the business sector (p. 5). While these measures acknowledge cultural diversity through sanctioned government channels such as ethnic and immigrant organizations, heritage language initiatives, and cultural celebrations, they neglect to tackle issues of political representation and influence (Cheran, 2006, p. 5). By emphasizing the cultural dimensions of the ethnic "Other" within such legislation, it inadvertently marginalizes these groups, preventing them from being recognized for their significant political, economic, and social contributions to society (Bun, 2004; Chandy 1995, p. 426; Fleras and Elliot, 2002, p. 238). As per Allahar (1998), this form of multicultural accommodation poses a challenge as it fails to reform conventional structures and systems of dominance (p. 341). Instead, it fosters parallel structures that are incapable of competing with the power dynamics historically established between Canada's primary ethnic groups (p. 341). The failure to address the intersectional factors and varied circumstances that other ethnic groups encounter in attempting to integrate into Canadian society on economic, cultural, and social fronts, is underscored by the act's singular mention of addressing the discrimination these groups endure. In 5.1g, it is stated that the Minister is to:

> 5.1g: Assist ethno-cultural minority communities to conduct activities with a view to overcoming any *discriminatory barrier and, in particular, discrimination based on race or national or ethnic origin* (p. 5).

This provision remains somewhat ambiguous, as it pertains to the implementation of the act's provisions by the government rather than being explicitly outlined within the mandates of the act itself. Although the government's inclination to combat discrimination against other ethnic groups is implied through its support and encouragement for social activities and assistance for groups in preserving multiculturalism in Canada, it confines ethnic groups to a status of acknowledgment within political institutions rather than active participation. As noted by Karim (2008), the Multiculturalism Act may be viewed as symbolic, lacking enforcement mechanisms akin to those found in official language legislation (p. 443). While the implementation provisions imply that promoting multiculturalism in Canada includes assistance for external organizations by and for other ethnic groups, which suggests that the multicultural project of Canada aims not for assimilation but for the promotion of diversity and difference, the lack of acknowledgment for the systemic barriers to inclusion in the state potentially undermines the substance of the policy. Kymlicka (2010) contends that for minority groups to engage with mainstream state institutions, they must assimilate into the dominant societal culture (p. 49). Consequently, despite provisions within the act that prioritize the participation of ethnic groups at different societal levels, there remains a presumption of separation between the ethnic "Other" and Canada's presumed primary ethnic groups, namely the British and French.

3.1.4 Conclusion

Concerning my discourse analysis of the Multiculturalism Act, I first established the conditions that led to the emergence of the act and its significance in the context of Canadian multicultural identity. Then, I conducted an in-depth analysis of its linguistic and rhetorical mechanisms which assert truths about how Canada conceives its multicultural identity and how its historical foundation influences and guides the statements within the Act. Through this analysis, I determine that the prior bilingual and bicultural conception of Canada, pre-Act, nevertheless influences its framing of minority and majority identities shaped by Canada's previous linguistic paradigm. There are two key assertions that the Act makes about

Canadian multiculturalism: first, the Act's use of direct and active verbs implies that the Act actively promotes multiculturalism, recognizing that multiculturalism was once a contentious and obscured facet of Canadian identity that needed to be "acknowledged"; and second, that multiculturalism was always an inherent aspect of Canadian identity and heritage. However, upon closer inspection, the subtle distinction between the "founding ethnic groups" and the ethnic "Other" demonstrates a prioritization of the former groups' languages over the latter. Moreover, I determined that the Act attributes value to other ethnic groups based on their economic and cultural contribution to Canada's national identity. While the act calls for the inclusion of other ethnic groups in its federal and provincial institutions, it remains ambiguous, focusing more on acknowledging their place in Canadian society, rather than their active participation. It also fails to make an explicit mention of the systemic and intersectional barriers that ethnic groups may face in their attempt to participate within these institutions, further exemplifying the symbolic nature of this policy. Therefore, the Multiculturalism Act, while considered a foundational policy that established the fundamental place ethnic minorities have in Canadian society, nevertheless is influenced by the bilingual framework that previously defined Canada. After establishing the differences in minority and majority identity acknowledgment in an all-encompassing federal policy of multiculturalism, we can look at micro-level multicultural policy to establish whether the normative discourses in the former are reflected in the policy of micro-governmental organizations like the Canada Council for the Arts.

3.2 The Canada Council for the Arts 2017 Equity Policy

3.2.1 Introduction

In this section, I conduct a critical discourse analysis on the most recent 2017 Equity Policy of the Canada Council for the Arts. I begin with establishing the historical context of the Canada Council and the factors that initiated the dialogue for the inclusion of ethnic minorities within the organization. Then, I analyze each relevant section of the policy to highlight both the truths that the Equity policy establishes about their view of equity within the organization and their overall sentiments concerning their view on multiculturalism. Additionally, I examine how the Multiculturalism Act potentially influences the Equity Policy's rhetorical framing and the implication this has for the organization and public discourse as a whole. I determine that the Canada Council's minority acknowledgment emerged similarly to the Multiculturalism Act, during a time when minority inclusion was a point of discussion, leading to their inclusion within both federal policy and micro-governmental organizations like the Canada Council for the Arts (Fatona, 2011, p. 88). Additionally, its statements reflect the systemic inequalities minority groups face in their inclusion, echoing Will Kymlika's (1989) view of multiculturalism within Liberal Theory, in that minority groups should be afforded more benefits to retain and protect all cultures (p. 187). Nevertheless, the tangible examples of the Canada Council's commitment to these principles exclude those who both lack citizenship and are not considered under the "Official Language Minority Community" (OLMC) umbrella. Consequently, the policy nevertheless reflects the multiculturalism ideal that prioritizes the founding languages over those of minority groups.

3.2.2 Historiography of the Canada Council for the Arts (CCA)

The Canada Council for the Arts (CCA) serves as the regulatory authority for arts grants and funding in Canada. Operating as a federal crown corporation, the Canada Council is answerable to the Canadian government under the supervision of the Minister of Canadian

Heritage and is overseen by an eleven-member board. The inception of the Canada Council can be traced back to January 8th, 1957, when Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent publicly announced his intention to establish the council, leading to the proposal of a bill in Parliament three months later (Fatona, 2011, p. 88). Fatona (2011) highlights that following its initial establishment, there were discussions regarding divisions concerning geographical or regional representation and the Canada Council's capacity to authentically represent the nation (p. 89). This highlights "the fact that the issue of racial representation underlined concerns of nation-building and cultural development," especially since the Canada Council was established after the creation of the Multiculturalism Act of 1988 (p 88). However, the outset of funding decisions by the Canada Council prioritized support for Western European disciplines in the arts, including "theatre, music, ballet, painting, sculpture, and literature" (p. 88). The definition of art, and consequently the determination of deserving funding recipients, was specified in the initial Canada Council Act of 1957, shaping the decision-making process accordingly (p. 93). Fatona (2011) also notes that by the mid-1980s, Canada saw a wave of advocacy groups and activities that were driven by First Nation artists and artists of colour across Canada, to form coalitions for recognition within governmental cultural and art institutions. They highlight that questions regarding "what it meant to be 'Canadian'," as well as considerations about "who and what defined artistic merit" and "who was being privileged as creators of Canadian culture," were central concerns within this movement (M. Nourbese Philip, 1992; Fung and Gagnon, 2002; Gagnon and McFarlene, 2003). Thus, Canada had a newfound necessity to strive towards a commitment to cultural diversity in the arts, that directly followed the Bi and Bi Commission in 1969 (p. 95). This historical account illustrates the interconnection between the overarching pressure exerted by ethnic groups on the Canadian government for their recognition, inclusion, and participation in all aspects of Canadian society— the arts and the CCA being just one part of this movement. Similar to how grievances from the ethnic "Other" stemmed from Canada's prior acknowledgment of a strictly bicultural (English and French) society, it was the lingering effects of Canada Council funding decisions rooted in European art traditions that prompted First Nation and immigrant artists to express their concerns (Fatona, 2011, p. 96). During the 1990s, a racial equity consultant initiated an institutional shift by implementing strategies and policies related to cultural diversity, particularly concerning Indigenous art (Robertson, 2006, p. 53). This marked the first instance in which both race and acknowledgment of systemic inequalities were recognized within this Canadian arts governing body, leading to the subsequent development and inclusion of equity principles in the following years (p. 53).

3.2.3 Structure of the 2017 Canada Council Equity Policy

The Canada Council Equity Policy consists of three main sections that delineate their stance on equity in their day-to-day operations. First, they outline the foundational principles upon which their equity values hinge, articulating precise definitions crucial to these principles (CCA, 2017, p. 4-9). Second, they establish the legislative framework supporting their principles by referencing various Canadian policies aimed at reaffirming Canada's stance on diversity, spanning immigration to multicultural identity (p. 9). Following this contextual groundwork, they delineate the equity principles the organization upholds, along with a description of the tools, practices, and programs in place to operationalize these principles within the agency's funding decisions (p. 11-16). Given the density of this policy, I structure my analysis by examining its three primary segments: the foundational definitions, the legislative context underpinning the policy, and the equity principles and tools utilized to enact these values.

This section of the policy lays out the key terms that shape its equity principles and the Canada Council's interpretation of these terms. By presenting these definitions before delving into the principles and implementation plan, the policy aims to provide clarity regarding its stance and operational framework. There are seven words they define in this section: equity; cultural equity; equity-seeking groups; diversity (cultural diversity and culturally diverse); linguistic diversity; deaf and disability; Indigenous (CCA, 2017, p. 4-9). As this thesis centers on multiculturalism, I will focus on the definitions that are related to the cultural dimensions of equity. I opt to exclude the analysis of "Deaf and Disability" as it falls beyond the scope of my thesis. To organize this analysis further, I divide this section into three parts: the equity definitions that the Canada Council follows; the legislative context that frames these principles; and the equity principles and tools and practices used to implement them.

3.2.4.1 Examining The Canada Council's Definitions of Equity

This section begins with illustrating the interconnection and interdependence between the two terms "equity" and "diversity." They state that while equity "promotes diversity," such promotion is contingent upon whether principles of equity are implemented (p. 4). However, they also note that the two terms are distinct, in that "equity is a principle and process whereas diversity reflects a reality or desirable state" (p. 4). These statements exhibit the Canada Council's commitment to expand upon often conflated principles to delineate their nuanced roles within the broader framework of the policy.

In their definition of "equity," the Canada Council makes an explicit statement distinguishing between "equity" and "equality. They state that "[equity] [...] recognizes that while all people have the right to be treated equally, not all experience equal access to the same resources, opportunities, or benefits" (p. 4). By distinguishing between these two terms, they highlight the importance of considering intersectional factors, like resource access and opportunities, to ensure true equal opportunity for individuals. This is demonstrated further by defining what the parallel term, "equality," presumes, by stating: [formal equality] assumes that all people have comparable opportunities and access to resources" (p. 5). In doing so, they make a direct reference to the systemic inequalities that "marginalized" groups face, and thus the delineation of these contrasting terms demonstrates their awareness and acknowledgment of power relations and discriminatory practices that can affect the treatment of individuals.

This can be seen further by looking at how they define 'cultural equity' as a "concept which affirms that the traditions, aesthetics, and expressions of all cultures have equal value" (p. 5). It is important to note that in this section, there is a specific delineation of "cultural equity" that pertains to ethnic groups in Canada beyond the English and French. The concept of cultural equity extends beyond basic equity by not only addressing factors like income or status but also acknowledging the "historical and current power imbalances between cultural groups" (p. 5). The importance of establishing the concept of "cultural equity" in this policy can be seen by looking at a parallel situation in which artist funding was narrowed based on discriminatory principles that framed the art world of the past. Heidelberg (2019) states that in the 1970s, the decision for types of art that received agency funding was dependent on "access to excellence," where 'excellence' meant 'high culture' as defined by white, legacy arts institutions operating within the "'Great Tradition' of Western European esthetic" (p. 30). This historical elitism in the arts meant that there was a necessity to define and acknowledge the contributions of the ethnic "other" in the arts to have them included in the funding decisions by the agencies that defined this industry. As a result, the concept of "cultural

equity" came to define the principle of resource distribution based on the diversity of cultural representation (Belfiore et al, 2023, p. 163). Thus, true diversity cannot exist without the equitable distribution of resources. The Canada Council's delineation of cultural equity in their definition section illustrates that their statement on the interconnectedness and interdependence of "diversity" and "equity" echoes the historical notion that diversity is contingent upon the consideration of systemic factors exclusion and power relations. They employ words like "conquest," "colonialism," "cultural domination," and "systemic exclusion," to refer to this historical reality. Therefore, we can state that the development of this policy is rooted in the acknowledgment of the history of exclusion of other ethnic groups that framed the world of the past (Belifore, 2023, p. 161). They also make a point to discern the scope of equity by defining "equity-seeking groups," that is, "communities that face significant challenges in participating fully in society" (p. 5). They use terminology like "systemically excluded" and "marginalized," stating that these groups face disadvantages based on discrimination surrounding ethnicity, culture, nationality, and language (p. 5). Explicitly mentioning systemically marginalized groups in Canada and the Canada Council's efforts to address this discrimination underscores the importance of incorporating ethnic groups who may not be fully assimilated within the French and English linguistic paradigm that originally shaped Canada's multicultural identity.

3.2.4.2 Examining The Canada Council's Definitions of Diversity

This section distinguishes between two terms related to diversity: cultural diversity and culturally diverse (Canada Council, 2017, p. 6-7). The former is defined as:

> [...] the presence, expressions, and participation of many different individual communities co-existing in the shared culture of a society, and the explicit recognition that the contribution and participation of all peoples, particularly marginalized people, have the potential of equal value and benefit to the society at large (p. 6).

This definition explicitly references how different individuals and communities "co-[exist] in the shared culture of society" (p. 6). In this context, co-existence refers to one or more cultures existing alongside each other, rather than becoming a cultural monolith. This raises the question: do various ethnic groups assimilate into a unified Canadian culture, or do they integrate into Canada while preserving their distinct cultural identities? John C. Harles (1997) states that due to the indeterminate nation of Canada, assimilation into its culture is unlikely (p. 174). Since assimilation implies adherence to established cultural norms, "the ambiguity of Canadianness suggests that conceptually there is little for immigrants to assimilate into, and no certain focus for their political identity" (p. 147). Instead of assimilation into the cultural norms of Canada, Harles notes that political integration into Canada relies on citizenship as a way to identify with their host country [Canada] (p. 720). In this section of the policy, the inclusion of such language, which forms the foundation for subsequent equity principles, implies an understanding by the Canada Council that Canada is defined and enriched by diverse yet distinct cultures (p. 6). This notion is reinforced by subsequent statements, stating that "it is equally important to embrace not only the existence and participation of diverse cultures within the whole society but to recognize and value the distinct and diverse cultural expressions preserved" (p. 6). By specifying the value of cultural interdependence, the Canada Council underscores the significance it places, as a public arts funder, on acknowledging the worth of independent cultural diversity. Additionally, the Council's reference to "marginalized peoples" and use of the term "culturally diverse" to identify racialized groups further emphasizes their commitment to inclusivity and recognition of cultural diversity. The use of this language about cultural minorities provides insight into their perspective on the matter of representation of the ethnic "Other" in other facets of society.

This section also defines "Linguistic Diversity," referring to the "variety of languages communicated, be they in written, oral, or signed forms" (p. 7). The policy acknowledges the historical influences that determine the widely used languages in Canada, stating that linguistic diversity is shaped by:

> [..] history of preservation and everyday use; linguistic rights enshrined in the Constitution and the Official Languages Act; the resources and efforts to preserve and sustain Indigenous languages; diversification of languages spoken in the home and business as a result of immigration, education or international exchange; and the prevalence of people communicating in sign languages (p. 7).

This passage highlights the linguistic references in Canadian policies by acknowledging languages spoken by ethnic groups beyond the "two founding languages," English and French (p. 6). However, a subsection of this definition refers to "Official Language Minority Communities (OLMCs)," defined as "groups of people whose maternal or chosen language is not the majority language in their province. In other words, "Anglophones in Quebec and Francophones outside of Quebec" (p. 7-8). OLMCs do not encompass all language minority communities but only refer to being a minority French or English speaker based on the majority language spoken in a certain province. The Canada Council defines OLMC individuals, groups, and arts organizations in the context of their granting programs as:

> [...] those who self-identify as belonging to one of these groups and have a primary residence[6] in a province or region in which they are an official language minority at the time of application (p. 8).

In the context of grant eligibility, this statement asserts two points: first, languages spoken by other ethnic groups that are neither French nor English are not encompassed within the Official Languages Act's definition of Official Language Minority Communities (OLMCs); and second, eligibility for Canadian art funding requires a primary residence in Canada, implying the necessity for official state legitimation and documentation. Concerning the second point, since the Canada Council is a federal crown corporation, it is reasonable that grant eligibility requires official residency and state recognition to be considered. However, if we consider how Canada's history of colonialism expresses itself in Canada as a nation-state, we can argue that this requirement is indicative of a framework of imperialism that perpetuates settler-colonial power dynamics (Barker, 2023, p. 325). Barker (2023) states that "contemporary colonialism does not necessarily involve the establishment of physical colonies, forced military suppression of peoples, slave labour and other classic characteristics of colonialism [...]" (p. 326). Instead, the identity of the colonized is subordinated by a social order that appears equal, but in reality, allows for exploitation and the reinforcement of uneven power dynamics between the colonizer and colonized. As stated previously, assimilation into an indistinct Canadian culture is difficult due to Canada's fragmented sense of nationhood (Harles, 1997, p. 714). In his case study of Laotian immigrants in Canada, Harles (1997) describes citizenship as the "apotheosis of their commitment to Canada" as their emotional identification with the country depends on their status as documented citizens or holding a primary residence of Canada (p. 721). Therefore, the emphasis on identifying the eligibility for only English and French speakers, in addition to necessitating primary residency, reinforces the distinction between those considered "Canadian" and the "Other"

---

[6]Note that "primary residence" is not the same as "permanent resident." "Primary residence" refers to a specific place of residence, while "permanent resident" is a status granted to individuals immigrating to Canada, allowing them to receive most social benefits that Canadian citizens benefit from, without being an official citizen (Government of Canada).

based on the accessibility of these grant categories. While the Canada Council appears to be inclusive of all language minority communities, its eligibility requirements reflect Canada's historical bicultural and bilingual identity, ultimately excluding those who do not fit within this framework. This is further emphasized by restricting this category to individuals with primary residency in each province, excluding new immigrants, refugees, and other ethnic groups who have yet to establish their 'belonging' through legal residency (CCA, 2017, p. 9). Concerning other available grants specifically for minoritized groups, the Canada Council has a section on its website that discusses both the systemic barriers and the western-focused composition of the Canada Council funding decisions that lead to greater challenges in disseminating funding to minority groups. However, they do not explicitly mention any effort to develop grants catered specifically to ethnic minorities. Instead, they reference the same 2017 Equity Policy to demonstrate their commitment to equitable access to funding. It can be inferred that the grants mentioned in the Equity Policy are the only ones that pertain to equity-seeking groups, which fail to target specific categories like race or class, but attempt to address all categories simultaneously. Although the Canada Council claims to be inclusive of language minority communities, a further look demonstrates that access to the grants that should cater to these communities is, in reality, inaccessible unless grant-seekers belong to a group that also speaks either English or French.

3.2.5 Legislative Context

Within this section of the policy, the Canada Council outlines the specific acts in Canadian legislation that inform their principles of equity. While several policies are referenced, the most relevant to this analysis is the Multiculturalism Act. The Canada Council defines this Act as follows:

> [it] characterizes Canada as a multicultural society and recognizes that all Canadians are free to protect, enhance, and partake in their cultural heritage. It declares that multiculturalism is an essential characteristic to ensure equality between all Canadians and their respective communities of origin and will allow them to overcome barriers. This Act marks the government's recognition of the contributions ethnic groups have made to Canada and affirms that there existed no official culture that any Canadian had to assimilate (CCA, 2017, p. 10).

Parallel to the analysis of the previous sections, we can identify two significant aspects of this description that align with the intentions of the Multiculturalism Act: first, the reference to "all Canadians," which avoids distinguishing between Anglophone and Francophone Canadians and other language minorities; and second, they reaffirm the Act's recognition of the value-added by ethnic minorities. The final line, however, appears to contradict a part of the original act. It claims that "[...] there existed no official culture which any Canadian had to assimilate to" (p. 10). This statement is problematic for two reasons: first, it minimizes the barriers that non-Anglophone/Francophone Canadians face integrating into Canadian culture; and second, it contradicts the primary reason that the act was created— to address the dissatisfaction of the ethnic Other's exclusion and to recognize them as a fundamental aspect of Canadian culture, heritage, and history. This misrepresentation of the Multiculturalism Act has the potential to contradict the equity principles outlined by the Canada Council in the following sections.

3.2.6 Equity Principles, Tools, and Practices

The final section of the policy outlines the specific principles of equity that the Canada Council strives to follow in their decision-making regarding their grant funding

programs, as well as the tools and practices that they use to implement these principles in their everyday practices.

Firstly, the equity principles address the ethnic "Other" within each equity principle. They use the language of "all people," "all other individuals," and "disadvantaged artistic communities," which avoids explicitly differentiating between the French/English and other ethnic groups like the Multiculturalism Act does. Moreover, the principles directly reference categories of discrimination that marginalized groups may face. For example, 5.b and 5.c state that the Council explicitly opposes discrimination, stereotypes, or generalizations based on a wide range of characteristics, including race, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, disability, and pardoned convictions (p. 11). Additionally, the Canada Council states that they value social justice and acknowledge the historical disadvantages faced by individuals in certain groups due to cultural, ethnic, linguistic, racial, religious, regional, generational, gender, sexual orientation, disability, and socioeconomic factors (p. 11).

In addition to referencing these categories, 5. c also acknowledges the "historical disadvantages" that these groups can face. This mirrors the Multiculturalism Act as it considers the historical context of minority group's contribution to Canadian culture and its identity. Therefore, the Canada Council recognizes the historical, equitable, and intersectional dimensions that govern the ethnic "Other's" inclusion within its operations. They also acknowledge the potential for the principles to change in the future and the Canada Council's commitment to "continuous learning and evolution" based on insights from their implementation programs and practices (p. 11). This forward-looking perspective suggests that the Canada Council recognizes the evolving status of marginalized groups and acknowledges that their equity principles must adapt as Canada's national identity and culture change over time.

In contrast, the Multiculturalism Act, which served as a definitive legislative measure to enforce the inclusion of ethnic minorities, has nevertheless remained static despite ongoing changes in minority communities' treatment. This highlights how the Multiculturalism Act is largely symbolic, as it lacks the mechanisms that allow for revision over time. Conversely, the equity policy of the Canada Council is both symbolic and practical, as demonstrated by the section outlining strategies for implementing these principles and for making necessary future amendments.

This section of the policy also outlines the specific strategies designed to implement and mend the equity principles guiding its decision-making body. It can be divided into two parts: first, the overall practices that the Canada Council follows to support equity-seeking communities; and second, the specific tools used to track and analyze its collected data. The former defines the "how" and "purpose" of its equity-seeking practices. For example, the policy emphasizes the importance of "tracking, measuring, and monitoring funding to artists and arts organizations within various demographics to identify gaps, develop appropriate strategies, and evaluate impacts" (p. 11). Additionally, it highlights the need for "implementing targeted funding mechanisms to ensure equitable opportunity to its grants, processes, and services" (p. 11).

These two examples provide a specific plan of action and a justification to make a case to parliament regarding the equity strategies aimed at marginalized groups. They provide a clear methodology that ensures their policies effectively target and benefit marginalized groups, employing detailed language to describe the tools and strategies for implementing each equity principle. For instance, when discussing the "voluntary self-identification form"— a form that every grant applicant can complete to identify their cultural and/or ethnic identity— they offer a three-point description of the form's content, measurement methods, and monitoring processes (p. 12). The policy states that the data is used to periodically

monitor the impact of funding and identify any gaps in support for various demographic groups. It measures funding against external benchmarks, such as the composition of the arts labour force and the population rates of respective groups (p. 12). Additionally, it monitors trends and the development of equity-seeking communities by tracking changes in funding levels and analyzing data collected from final reports and other sources (p. 12). The use of detailed, concise, and action-oriented language justifies utilizing these tools to implement the equity principles. Despite this, the funding initiatives referenced in this section, like the Official Languages Fund and the Market Access Fund, are in reality not inclusive of ethnic minority communities, but focus primarily on language group distinctions. The former is created to counter the "isolation experienced by Official Language Minority Community (OLMC) artists" to support the development of artists and organizations in these communities (p. 13). The latter is designed to support Canadian artists, artist professionals, and art organizations that identify and belong to an OLMC (p. 13). As previously mentioned, OLMC communities refer to Anglophones and Francophones who are minority speakers in their respective provinces (OLA, 1969). Consequently, the inclusivity of these grants remains limited to French and English speakers, reflecting the bilingual and bicultural conception of Canada that existed before the Multiculturalism Act, which is also implicitly upheld in the Act itself. The issue with the Equity Policy focusing solely on grants for OLMC communities is that it reflects Canada's historical conception of national identity as rooted in language, rather than broader forms of diversity. This approach means that these grants may not truly offer accessible opportunities for minority groups, as they are still shaped by the restrictive linguistic structures that defined Canada's identity before the shift towards multicultural recognition in enshrined in legislation. At first glance, the Canada Council appears to address equity issues through its inclusive language and principles. However, upon closer examination, it becomes clear that they are not as inclusive as they claim. It follows that this facade of inclusiveness can "legitimize the institutions that implement them without addressing the "deeper structures of their orientation" (Walcott, 2011).

3.2.7 Conclusion

In this section, I analyzed each part of the Canada Council Equity Policy to determine how it frames majority and minority groups in the context of the underlying principle of Canadian multiculturalism established within the Multiculturalism Act. The Canada Council makes several key assertions:

1. Canadian multiculturalism should exist within a Liberal theoretical framework, advocating for the equitable treatment and distribution of resources for the groups in need;
2. The policy calls for the coexistence of cultures rather than assimilation, emphasizing the interdependence of cultures that constitute Canadian society;
3. The Canada Council recognizes the diversity of languages spoken in Canada without hierarchizing French and English over minority languages;
4. The Equity Policy outlines tools and strategies to ensure these principles are actively implemented, demonstrating their commitment to the policy's overall practicality.

Nevertheless, Canada's bilingual and bicultural conception of identity is still evident in certain sections of this policy. The two grants cited in this policy are directed toward OLMC communities and require the recipient to have a primary residence in Canada. As stated previously, the necessity for individuals to be legally recognized as part of Canada to receive these grants is logical since these grants are funded by the Canadian government. However, when we consider that primary residency is based on a settler-colonial notion of national boundaries and 'belonging' within those boundaries, the additional requirement for recipients to be part of an OLMC reflects Canada's bilingual and bicultural framework, which

inherently excludes minorities that do not fit within this framework. In the following chapter, I explore how the normative discourses present in both policies shape a nuanced understanding of recognition for minority subjects, offering an opportunity to creatively and critically explore a minority's sense of 'belonging' in Canada.

Chapter 4: Countering Normative Constructions of 'Belonging' through Artistic Representation

4.1 Introduction

In this final chapter, I contextualize the normative discourses found in the macro and micro-level multiculturalism policies I analyzed with the work of Azia Jonelle. This section will answer the following question: How is the work of Filipino-Canadian diasporic artists able to challenge the normative discourses found in Canadian multicultural policy? To answer these questions, I refer to Clayton Chin and Sophie Reid's (2023) article "Discourses of Multicultural Acknowledgement in Canada: Liberal and Conservative, General and Specific" (Chin and Reid, 2023), to examine the importance of a sense of 'belonging' for the minority subject, and how both policies construct their conception of 'belonging' that is invariably tied to Canada's colonial history. By bringing in Jonelle's work *Mending ng Angkan* and examining how she defines 'belonging' through her aesthetics, I demonstrate how this photo series resists and deconstructs the colonial logic embedded within multicultural legislation and highlights the obscure dimensions of minority identities that contribute to constructing a sense of attachment to Canadian society. Jonelle must navigate two levels of colonialism due to her Filipino heritage and Canadian upbringing. As a Canadian citizen, she grapples with Canada's history of settler colonialism, which continues to subordinate Indigenous communities today. Historically, Indigenous populations were coerced and indoctrinated through institutions like education, to accelerate their conformity and identification with Canada (Lacchin, 2015, p. 12). This historical form of cultural indoctrination is sustained long-term through its roots in contemporary Canadian legislation. Additionally, the Philippines' history of colonialism by the United States still affects Filipinos through internalized oppression, or a 'colonial mentality (CM)' (David and Nadal, 2013, p. 299). David and Okazaki (2006) argue that the colonial legacy of American rule may have a psychological impact, manifesting as feelings of inferiority, embarrassment of Filipino ethnicity and culture, and tolerance for modern forms of oppression (p. 241-252). Given that Jonelle confronts the legacies of colonialism from both aspects of her identity, her work is inevitably informed and tied to these histories. In light of these contexts, we can see how her work's aesthetics deconstruct these colonial forces as a means of challenging prevailing notions of multiculturalism in contemporary Canada.

4.1.1 'Mending ng Angkan' by Azia Jonelle

Azia Jonelle is a Filipino-Canadian lens artist based in Toronto, Canada. Her creative practice, based in the nuances and intricacies of her familial relationships, draws upon personal memories of Filipino tradition and culture to establish connections with her heritage. Consequently, her artwork can be interpreted within the framework of her diasporic Filipino-Canadian identity. I look at the first three portraits of her photo series *Mending ng Angkan* and demonstrate how it presents a unique aesthetic that refuses the limiting conceptions of diasporic identity that are influenced by the colonial histories of the Philippines and Canada. This analysis is informed by the theoretical frameworks of Diaspora studies, which refers to a field established in the late 20th C that examines dispersed

populations concerning 'cultural identity,' shaped by "memory, fantasy, narrative, and myth" (Hall, 2019, p. 223-226). Diaspora Studies re-imagines self-identity by examining the material and symbolic effect colonial histories can have on individuals. I also look at this photo series through a queer lens as posited by Marissa Largo (2017) and Casey Mecija (2018), to determine how the representations of Filipino-Canadian artists counter patriarchal and heteronormative associations of the Western diasporic experience. This queer lens introduces an additional dimension of analysis by exploring how diasporic art resists or "queers" normative interpretations of 'belonging' that are identified in each policy. The genre of portraiture *Mending ng Angkan* can be described as traditional portraiture, where the subjects are posed towards the camera and are looking directly at the lens. This type of portraiture provides a certain type of authenticity due to the simplicity of each subject's pose. The pose is the most important aspect of this genre, as "[...] [it] is the subject's presentation of his or her identity to the photographer, an act which ensures the preservation of that identity (Badger, 2007, p. 174). Since the representation of the subject's identity is central in both Jonelle's and my portraits, the poses play a crucial role in connecting the subject with the observer. These poses also influence whether the other elements in the photograph, such as clothing, are noticed or overlooked.

The first three photos of *Mending ng Angkan* are portraits that feature three generations of women from Jonelle's family: her Lola (grandmother), her mother, and Jonelle herself. Each subject wears a "baro't saya" or "baro at saya." Jonelle (2021) describes this garment as a "folded rectangular piece of fabric worn over the shoulders ("pañuelo" or "fichu"), and a short rectangular cloth ("tapis") wrapped over the top of a long skirt ("saya") (p. 3). The baro't saya can be traced back to the 16th-century pre-colonial era of the Philippines. The significance of this garment is highlighted by Mina Roces (2005) in her article "Gender, Nation, and the Politics of Dress 20th-Century Philippines," where she states that the politics of dress in the 20th-century Philippines was inherently political, and represented the gender implications of the Philippines pre-colonialism, which then translated and transformed as the Philippine's entered the 21st century (p. 354). This garment is customized by Jonelle by embroidering names from her extended family, symbolically "[holding] the weight of [her] family tree (Jonelle, 2022, p. 6). The stitching begins with her grandparents, extends to their siblings, then to her mother and her siblings, and finally ends with her and her brother (p. 6). These three portraits connect the women to their family lineage, each wearing the baro't saya with their family names inscribed in their respective portraits.

Figure 3, Figure 4, Figure 5: Portraits of *Mending ng Angkan.* Azia Jonelle, 2021. From Left to Right: Jonelle's mother, Jonelle herself, and Jonelle's grandmother, pictured in a customized baro't saya.

4.2 Towards a Politics of Belonging

Political symbolism that establishes the conditions for 'belonging' for postmigration communities is important for their integration into Western society. The significance of political belonging is explored by Chin and Reid (2023) who state that political belonging is:

> about how a political community imagines the internal relationship of members, what binds them, and makes them at home in this community. This is about setting the terms of membership of a political community (i.e. what is expected of citizens and what they can expect in turn) and it is about setting out the terms of practicing that symbolic politics of community (p. 261).

This quote highlights that political symbolism plays a role in integrating ethnic minorities into Western society by defining their expectations and mutual commitments as citizens. As a result, a sense of 'belonging' to the political community is fostered, allowing them to better identify with the majority population. In examining the two policies, two key points emerge regarding how Canadian multicultural legislation defines the boundaries of inclusion concerning ethnic minorities: first, French and English speakers are prioritized over minority languages; and second, the value of minorities is contingent upon their economic and cultural contributions to Canada (CCA, 2017, p. 8). Furthermore, these two layers of 'belonging' exist within the framework that principles of inclusion and equity apply only to those who are legally recognized by the state (p. 8). This criteria determines whether minority subjects are considered to "belong" or "fit with the majority" within the framework of Canadian multiculturalism proposed by these policies. However, this raises the question of whether these boundaries align with how ethnic minorities perceive their own identity and sense of 'belonging' within Canada.

This friction can be explored by looking at the choice of representations by diasporic artists. Azia Jonelle's work *Mending ng Angkan* illustrates how her diasporic sensibilities and representations are indicative of a politics of 'belonging' that necessitates a particular type of inclusion and acknowledgment within both federal and more niche governmental policies. I argue that Jonelle's use of elements from her diasporic identity and Philippine heritage depicts what Marissa Largo (2018) calls the "decolonial diasporic aesthetic" (p. 14). Largo (2018) states that art that contains this aesthetic can "[...] register the affective impulses of the racialized and diasporic artist [...] that unsettles the multiculturalist fixation on "inclusion" [...]" (p. 99). In the context of *Mending ng Angkan,* exhibiting a traditional garment like the baro't saya, which holds both feminist and anti-colonial significance from the era of Spanish and American colonialism in the Philippines, allows Jonelle to highlight aspects of her experience as a diasporic subject that is often obscured by the guise of "inclusive" multicultural policies. Accordingly, by reinterpreting how Jonelle conceptualizes and represents her Filipino-Canadian identity in this photo series, she reveals the nuanced significance of 'belonging' for the minority subject and the disconnect between policy discourse and lived experience within the framework of multiculturalism (p. 14).

4.3 'Belonging' for the Diaspora

Concerning the ethnic minority subject, or more specifically, the diasporic Filipino subject, calls to identify with Canada are potentially shaped by the colonial histories of the Philippines. Moreover, the Filipino diasporic subject must navigate a dual identity between Canada and the Philippines as a result of their colonially-influenced migratory history. For

example, Diaz (2016) states that patterns of migration for Filipino laborers are influenced by gender employment schemes and multicultural policies, which are shaped by "settler colonialism, systemic racism, misogyny, and entrenched xenophobia" (p. 328). Therefore, an analysis of *Mending ng Angkan* and Jonelle's specific choice of representations reveals how these colonial histories are imprinted upon her body, consequently shaping how she conceives her identity as a Canadian citizen. The incorporation of the baro't saya in Jonelle's artwork becomes meaningful when we consider its historical context, spanning from pre-Spanish colonialism through the authoritarian presidency of Marcos, which also marks the Philippines' path to independence and the reshaping of their nationalist identity (Roces, 2005, p. 359). The baro't saya was considered Hispanic clothing for women, and by the 18th century became the dominant form of dress (p. 359). It is stated that Spanish missionaries imposed this style of dress on the Indigenous women of the Philippines who resisted wearing undergarments and clothing typical of the Spanish colonial era (p. 359). Following this, the era of American colonial rule (1902-1946) witnessed the evolution of the baro't saya, with sleeves gradually shortening and eventually transforming into the butterfly sleeve "terno" recognizable today (p. 359).

Figure 6: La Bulaqueña. Juan Luna, 1895. Painting featuring the Baro't saya.

This evolution is reflected and reinterpreted by Jonelle in her artistic portrayal of the baro't saya in her photo series with the addition of stitching the names of her extended family onto the garment. The period of American colonialism (1902-1946) introduced a gendered aspect to the adoption of this attire, as it coincided with a time when women's roles in the quest for Philippine independence were still heavily debated (p. 360). While men were engaged in the fight for Philippine sovereignty, women were advocating for female suffrage, representing conflicting ideologies supportive of the Philippine nationalist movement (p. 360). In defiance of adopting Western-style attire, known as "Americana," women embraced the clothing of the colonized, symbolizing resistance against the modernization efforts that necessitated "the abandonment of traditional dress" (p. 362). Consequently, wearing the terno

carried a dual significance during this era: firstly, it represented political defiance against the modernization efforts shaping the identity of the Filipino subject amidst Philippine independence and American colonialism; secondly, it functioned as a feminist strategy that redefined the contemporary Filipino woman within a framework of tradition (p. 363). Considering the inherent politicization of the terno, Jonelle's modernized construction of the garment, worn by three intergenerational female members of her family, takes on new significance. According to Largo (2017), Canada's multiculturalism framework, influenced by colonial ideologies, often depicts Filipinas primarily in roles of service and caregiving (p. 101). Similarly, during the Spanish and American colonial periods of the Philippines, the attire of Filipina women symbolized traditional gender roles, devoid of political rights and disconnected from the ideals of the Philippine nationalist movement and female suffrage (Roces, 2005, p. 360). In "wearing the Americana, the Filipino male politicians disassociated themselves from the colonized by claiming to be among the powerful, while women wore the attire of the colonized subject" (p. 360). Thus, the colonial logic is imprinted on the diasporic Philippine subject from two fronts: first, the Philippines' colonial history politicizing the terno; and second, through the colonial logics of multiculturalism that associate the Filipino diasporic subject with subservience and docility. By building on how Largo (2018) shows that Julius Manupul's work "The Cabinet of Queerosities" challenges Western categorization of Filipino artists, we can illustrate how photographing the terno that is worn by three of Jonelle's female family members resists the binary logic and gendered categorizations imposed on the Filipino diasporic subject due to colonial legacies inscribed onto her identity. "The Cabinet of Queerosities" contains representations of the Philippines' colonial history in its depiction of traditional *barong Tagalog* shirts sculptured using butterflies, whilst on blue-eyed, blonde, caucasian mannequins (p. 335) The juxtaposition between colonial-era attire and the caucasian mannequin works to challenge the dominant categories of aesthetic assessment that govern normative artistic understandings of Western and diasporic art (p. 337). As a result, they surpass the hierarchical power structures these categories frequently promote. Manupul's work can challenge the common practices of museums where Indigenous and racialized subjects are abstracted and orientalized, as a means to "return the dominant gaze," that is, encourage the observer to reimagine their conception of "diaspora" and their understanding of racialized museum exhibits in "multicultural" societies, like Canada (p. 335). Similarly, Jonelle rejects the colonial gaze inherent in the baro't saya by first, instilling her own identity through the re-creation of the garment, second, inscribing the names of her family that evoke their experiences and navigations with the colonial histories inherent to their Filipino identities, and third, photographing these subjects for submission and assessment by the Western university she attended, Ontario College of Art & Design (OCAD). Therefore, these representations confront the colonial legacies and gendered categorizations imposed on the Filipino diasporic subject due to her "homeland's" history of colonialism and the Western gaze of her "hostland's" academic institutions through being displayed in this work. Consequently, the aesthetics of this work can be conceived as a rejection of the colonial paradigms that govern its interpretation. Instead, she reconceptualized its use to engage it as a form of feminist self-representation of her Philippine heritage and her diasporic subjectivity in Canada.

4.4 "Decolonizing" Belonging

    After demonstrating how the representations in *Mending ng Angkan* both embody Jonelle's diasporic identity and simultaneously disarticulate the colonial frameworks embedded in her connections to both her "homeland" of the Philippines and "hostland" of Canada, we can also examine how her conception of 'belonging' troubles the conception of

'belonging' proposed by the aforementioned policies. A deeper analysis of how both policies construct 'belonging' for the multicultural subject reveals their roots in the settler colonial ideals that underline Canada's national identity. For example, the prioritization of English and French languages asserted by both policies manifests from the idea that they were considered Canada's "two founding races" (Walcott, 2011, p. 129). In reality, these groups were settlers, arriving after Indigenous communities had long inhabited the land (*The Canadian Encyclopedia*, 2023). The linguistic paradigm once conceived as central to Canada's identity, and still upheld in official multicultural legislation, illustrates how settler-colonial relations entrenched in Canada's history continue to be reinforced today. And further, how these colonial logics are harnessed to relegate the multicultural "Other" to a position of inferiority relative to the settlers. Moreover, conferring value to minority subjects based on their economic and cultural contribution to Canada echoes the colonial sentiment that constructs hierarchical class identities to subjugate minorities. This mirrors how British settlers deemed Indigenous communities valuable only for their cultural trapping knowledge, with their perceived value and recognition declining alongside the decline of the fur trade (Frideres, 2011, p. 21). Lastly, citizenship implies a hierarchical dynamic in which those that are deemed "Canadian" have the authority to decide who else qualifies as a "Canadian." However, the definition of "Canadian," and thus citizenship to Canada itself, is contentious. Marc Woons (2014) presents the concept of "differentiated citizenship," which refers to "asymmetrical forms of belonging to the same political community," particularly regarding how Canada should decide to incorporate Indigenous sovereignty into its nationhood (p. 193). Indigenous groups calling for differentiated citizenship, based on their claims to sovereignty, highlight the need to decolonize the concept of Canadian citizenship, as it currently fails to account for the reality of Indigenous autonomy and rights. Jacqueline M. Lacchin (2015) quotes Baside (1968) and Fanon (1967) in her article "The 'Wretched of Canada': Aboriginal Peoples and Neo-Colonialism":

> [...] the Indigenous population internalizes Eurocentric teachings, they adopt a 'white narcissistic' worldview based on the 'myth of white supremacy' (Bastide 1968: 46-7); put differently, as the 'white gaze' of the colonizer is assumed, the Native comes to define him/herself as the governing, white culture does (Fanon 1967: 90) (p. 14).

In a similar, less obvious sense, the construction of 'belonging' within these policies is indicative of neo-colonial strategies that subordinate the racialized subject within Canada, relegating them to a place of insignificance compared to settlers identified as part of Canada's original peoples (Walcott, 2014, p. 129). Referencing Himani Bannerji (1996), Largo (2022) asserts that "state apparatuses such as multiculturalism policy set conditions of "unbelonging" (p. 41). In another sense, the alienation minority subjects may face when navigating political institutions can result in their *disidentification* with their current place of residence. Therefore, for minority subjects to resist the dominance of the colonial state, their sense of 'belonging' must be defined through their articulation of identity. This is where the "decolonial" aspect of Jonelle's aesthetics comes to light. From a Western gaze, the significance of a traditional garment, family names, or familial female portraits seem to have little significance to the identity of Canada. However, Largo (2018) asserts that "[The] Filipinx diasporic consciousness [...] [can] subvert [the] [West's] prevailing values through aesthetic strategies such as the transformation of trauma into levity, queer aesthetics of ornamentation, the invocation of the supernatural, and non-objective abstraction through refused materiality." (p. 26) The baro't saya, which acts as a symbol of female empowerment and resistance to Spanish and American colonization, is invariably entangled with her Canadian identity and experience. Largo (2018) explains that Marigold Santos' work integrates visual elements from her Canadian surroundings, such as woven textures and northern flora, and blends them with mystical elements inspired by Philippine folklore, to

create an aesthetic that is fueled by the creative potential of her diasporic consciousness (p. 174). Similarly, *Mending ng Angkan* explores new ways in which her diasporic subjectivities are formulated to transcend the colonial constructions of "nation" and "homeland" (p. 174). As a result, this approach can challenge mainstream representations of Canadian 'belonging' by incorporating her diasporic Filipino subjectivities, thereby offering a more nuanced understanding of diasporic cultural integration for the minority subject in Canada.

4.5 "Queering" Belonging

This analysis can be taken further by examining Jonelle's representations through a queer lens, which can challenge the limiting heteronormative imaginaries of multicultural inclusion within legislative frameworks. I define the queer subjectivity in *Mending ng Angkan* not as an explicit reference to sexual identity, but similarly to how José Esteban Muñoz (2009) conceptualizes queer aesthetics as an "attempt to call the natural into question" (p. 139). In his theory of *disidentification*, which refers to reinterpreting cultural texts as a mode for "[...] representing a disempowered politics or positionality that has been rendered unthinkable by the dominant culture," the significance of the "portrait" in Filipino history is complicated through the act of feminist self-representation (p. 31). In this sense, the "queer" aspect of diasporic art can counter normative conceptions of Western subjectivity and "[makes strange] typical Western aesthetic forms (Largo, 2017, p. 107). Artwork analyzed through this lens becomes a symbolic intervention in visuality that "compels viewers to see the intimate and daily struggles of diasporic, queer subject formation vis-a-vis white normative values instilled by the state" (Largo, 2010, p. 137). If the decolonial diasporic aesthetic challenges notions of diasporic subjectivity by producing an aesthetic that is uniquely "in-between," then a "queer" diasporic aesthetic goes further by exploring the production and reconfiguration of queer subjectivity in the context of heteronormative and patriarchal-colonial influences on the diasporic subject's self-identity and aesthetics. I suggest that the depictions in *Mending ng Angkan* not only capture an aesthetic reflecting Jonelle's diasporic identity but also offer a deeper exploration. They transcend her identity by challenging social and colonial concepts of 'belonging' for the queer subject. As Gayatri Gopinath (2005) contends, queer diasporic subjectivity can reconfigure and critique the dominant heteronormative and patriarchal frameworks that underpin post-colonial nations and diasporas (p. 11). This makes visible the queer female subjectivity, which Largo describes as the "impossible" subject that is usually overshadowed by colonial and nationalist ideologies that equate female identity with "tradition, the nuclear family, and heterosexuality" (Largo, 2010, p. 152). The dominant discourses surrounding Filipino migration are defined by labour migration of the Filipino man, yet in Jonelle's work, the emphasis shifts to the intimate by highlighting the often overlooked narratives and representations of Filipino women within the diaspora. Adrian De Leon reminds us of the significance of the portraiture of 20th-century Filipino men, which showcased their masculine sensibilities entrenched within class politics that "operated among migrants in transit across the Pacific" (De Leon, 2021). By showcasing the women of the Filipino diaspora, Jonelle subverts the traditional association of masculinity with portraiture in the Philippines. Her work disidentifies with the colonial and capitalist foundations of Philippine portraiture by putting women at the forefront of her work. This challenges the trope of masculine visibility embedded in the Philippines' history and reveals that the heteronormative and colonially-influenced multicultural discourses found in each policy are not necessarily a reflection of the sensibilities of multicultural subjects. Although these policies ultimately call for the inclusion of ethnic minorities within both macro-level and micro-level government institutions, constructing 'belonging' for multicultural groups necessitates a deeper level of acknowledgment. This

involves recognizing that the nuanced experience of the ethnic subject results in a conception of 'belonging' that is invariably tied to their ethnic identity and is also in opposition to the normative and colonial discourses within official policy. Thus, when theorizing multicultural 'belonging,' Canadian policy must examine the conditions and histories of minorities that allow them to establish a sense of inclusion within such a political community.

4.6 Concluding Statements

In this chapter, I demonstrate how the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and Canada Council Equity policy construct a normative conception of 'belonging' to Canada's political communities based on three key aspects: first, they prioritize French and English speakers, reflecting Canada's historical bilingual and bicultural identity; second, they value minority communities based on their tangible contributions to Canada's economy and society; and third, both the Act's provisions and Equity Policy's principles apply only to those legally recognized by the state. By examining the work *Mending ng Angkan,* I demonstrate how these aspects of 'belonging' reflect the colonial frameworks underlying Canada's cultural and legislative institutions. Her work deconstructs this conception through a "decolonial diasporic aesthetic," offering a new articulation of her diasporic identity and sense of 'belonging' in Canada that also has the potential to address the colonial histories of both the Philippines and Canada that are imprinted onto diasporic subjects and embedded within Canadian multicultural policy. Moreover, a queer lens into her work reveals a critique of the heteronormative colonial relations that frame her identity, which further informs the choice of representations within her work. Considering this, I determine that recognition of the minority subject's place in Canadian legislation, despite the consideration of systemic inequalities that they might face, is inadequate to construct a sense of 'belonging' for the minority subject in Canada. The colonial, heteronormative frameworks that influence the minority subject's conception of self-hood are necessarily imprinted onto them, and thus multicultural discourses and policy frameworks must consider these dimensions if they wish to continue their project of integrating the multicultural "Other" in Canada's project of national identity construction.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

This thesis explored how the normative discourses of multiculturalism found in two significant Canadian multicultural policies could be uncovered through critical discourse analysis, and how such discourses could be critiqued through the representations found in the art of the Filipino-Canadian diaspora. More specifically, this research investigated the construction of 'belonging' within Canadian policy, and how this conception can be pushed further by comparing it with how ethnic minority artists, like Azia Jonelle, represent 'belonging' in their work. This thesis answered the following questions: How do the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the Canada Council Equity Policy reflect normative discourses of Canadian multiculturalism? How is the work of Filipino-Canadian diasporic artists able to challenge these normative discourses?

The findings from this analysis aligned with existing literature on Canadian multiculturalism while also providing new insights. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act was the foundational policy that established 'belonging' for ethnic minorities within Canada. The Act reflected this aim, positing ethnic minorities as an intrinsic aspect of Canadian heritage and history, despite their previous lack of recognition before the Act's creation. Moreover, the Act called for the recognition and acknowledgment of ethnic minorities within Canadian political institutions, further asserting their place within Canada's political sphere of

influence. Nevertheless, the framing of minority identities reflected Canada's ambiguous conception of its identity. Hanson Hosein (1991) states that "[...] the promotion of multiculturalism and the use of non-official languages are emphasized in the Act; however, the caveat of French and English is always present" (Hosein, 1992, p. 15). Consistent with this statement, the influence of Canada's bilingual and bicultural conception of its national identity pre-Multiculturalism Act was evident. The Act alluded to the linguistic paradigm that previously constituted Canada's identity by establishing a hierarchy that relegated minority-language speakers to a lower place of significance relative to those who speak one of Canada's two official languages (French or English). This raises the question: if the Act is supposed to lay the foundation for multicultural inclusion, why does it still implicitly cater to Canada's two founding peoples? (Walcott, 2011, p. 129)

The analysis of the 2017 Canada Council Equity Policy led me to a conclusion similar to that about the Multiculturalism Act. The Equity Policy was much more explicit in its efforts towards equity within the institution, detailing specific implementation strategies and principles that depict the policy as dynamic rather than merely a symbolic gesture of the Canada Council's commitment to equity. Despite this, an implicit hierarchy of ethnic groups based on language, reminiscent of the historical importance of language before the Multiculturalism Act, was evident. The criteria for eligibility for the two grants featured in the Equity Policy were that the recipient is part of an OLMC and that they had a primary residence in Canada. Thus, minority groups seeking funding who do not speak English or French are excluded. Grant eligibility is dependent on their relative position to Canada as a nation-state, alluding to the necessity of legal documentation and housing status for ethnic subjects. While the policy delineates the Canada Council's commitment to inclusion and equity, there appear to be barriers to achieving this equity. These barriers stem from its status as a federal crown corporation linked to the Canadian government and its application of government policies, such as the Official Languages Act and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, which still contain historical biases. These factors influence the extent to which the Canada Council can truly be equitable, as it perpetuates the same prejudices that defined Canada's national identity before efforts to be more inclusive of the multicultural "Other."

There are three layers to how both policies provide a normative definition of 'belonging' in Canada: first, the subject must be documented, second, that the subject must be an English or French speaker, and third, that their presence brings about economic benefits to Canada. These normative ideas of 'belonging' presuppose a selection process that determines whether the subject is considered part of Canada or not. Rather than being explicitly excluded, those who do not fit within these categories are rendered invisible. In Jonelle's work, we see a negotiation of 'belonging' that challenges these normative definitions, drawing on her cultural identification with Canada through her Filipino identity. Her critique of 'belonging' highlights aspects that these policies not only overlook but render invisible within their normative conceptions of multicultural inclusion. Through an analysis of *Mending ng Angkan,* I determine that Jonelle's choice of representations constructs a new understanding of 'belonging' that takes into account the subjectivities of the Filipino-Canadian diaspora. By choosing to exhibit the baro't saya onto three female intergenerational members of her family, she presents us with a personal narrative of what she finds significant to represent her experience as a diasporic subject. This historically feminist-charged garment that she places onto members of her family with different migratory histories and experiences in Canada constructs a conception of 'belonging' that is centered on family, tradition, and feminism. Contrary to the previous policies' construction of 'belonging,' where both economic value and linguistic identities are prioritized, Jonelle offers a new perspective that counters the heteronormative, capitalist, and Western-centric view of the multicultural subject. Aligning with the work of Mecija (2017), Jonelle "queers" the

dominant Western gaze through this work, implicitly critiquing Canada's exclusionary multicultural rhetoric that seeks to both universalize and trivialize the experience of the multicultural "Other." As a result, Jonelle illuminates new ways to conceptualize multicultural inclusion, particularly in a country that is often seen as a model for the integration and recognition of ethnic communities within Canadian society.

Limitations to this study must be acknowledged. First, the policies I chose to analyze differ in their scope and application: the Act proposes a foundational framework for multicultural inclusion across all Canadian governmental institutions, whereas the Equity Policy is limited to principles governing a very precise subset of Canadian governance. While my choice of these two policies offers granularity, one can argue about the compatibility and cohesiveness of analyzing both policies together. However, while the Canada Council is only a small subset of Canadian governance representing the art world of Canada, it nevertheless is a governmental institution and engages with Canadian subjects as such. Therefore, its impact is still significant and has the potential to relegate the multicultural subject to a place of inferiority. Governmental institutions, like the Canada Council, have the potential to uphold the colonial logic of a nation even more dangerously. Since they pertain to a very specific aspect of Canadian society, the Canada Council is not as heavily focused on, unlike the Multiculturalism Act, which serves as the foundational policy for other institutions to follow suit. Furthermore, due to limitations in length for this thesis, I restricted my analysis of art to a single photo series from one artist. While their representations offer a glimpse into the potential of diasporic art to critique multicultural discourses, *Mending Ng Angkan* alone cannot provide a comprehensive critique of multicultural discourse nor can it make broad statements about the influence of multiculturalism on diasporic aesthetics and sensibilities. Despite this limitation, this thesis can be expanded upon in the future through the analysis of more Filipino-Canadian artists, or even artists from various diasporic backgrounds, to provide a more comprehensive critique of multiculturalism discourses.

While there are numerous multicultural policies in place in Canada, they are rooted in historical notions of 'belonging' that fail to recognize the diverse contributions and forms of identity being shaped by newer generations of Canadians. These individuals, like Jonelle and myself, are part of Canada but do not fit within the traditional categories of Francophone or Anglophone. Instead, we are finding new ways to define our identity through art and aesthetic representation. My identity as a Filipino-Canadian artist has greatly influenced this research and has allowed me to gain deeper insight on how the work of emerging artists from diverse backgrounds holds a unique power to critique the multicultural frameworks of both federal institutions and smaller organizations alike. My motivation to explore new forms of artistic expression in the context of my identity is not driven by the pursuit of grants or recognition of my "uniqueness" to the rest of Canadian society, but by a desire to understand my feelings of discomfort in Canada and authentically express who I am. As we consider the future of art in Canada, it is essential to recognize that its landscape is becoming more intersectional as it continues to evolve. In aligning with Indigenous groups and recognizing the place of ethnic minorities, it is redefining what it means to be Canadian in a global context. This evolution must be institutionalized, or we risk perpetuating the 'othering' that multicultural policies, despite their intentions, continue to impose. A multicultural policy that fails to adapt to these changes will ultimately harm those it aims to uplift. The creation of art influenced by affect and lived experience inherently serves as a form of resistance. Through their work, artists can challenge and redefine the narratives imposed by dominant cultural and political structures still influenced by colonialism, while also redefining their positionality in the ongoing pursuit of true equity and representation within Canadian society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alburo, J. (2007). Boxed in or out?: Balikbayan boxes as metaphors for Filipino American (dis)location. *Ethnologies, 27*(2), 137–157. https://doi.org/10.7202/014044ar

Badger, G. (2007). *The genius of photography: How photography has changed our lives.* Quadrille.

Bannerji, H. (2010). *The dark side of the nation: Essays on multiculturalism, nationalism and gender.* Canadian Scholars' Press.

Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (2010). Canadian multiculturalism: Global anxieties and local debates. *British Journal of Canadian Studies, 23*(1), 43–72. https://doi.org/10.3828/bjcs.2010.3

Belfiore, E., Hadley, S., Heidelberg, B. M., & Rosenstein, C. (2023). Cultural democracy, cultural equity, and cultural policy: Perspectives from the UK and USA. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 53*(3), 157–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2023.2223537

Belkhodja, C. (2008). Le discours de la «nouvelle sensibilité conservatrice» au Québec. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 79–100. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.0.0056

Branch, L. S. (2023, April 18). Consolidated federal laws of Canada, Canadian multiculturalism act. *Canadian Multiculturalism Act.* https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-18.7/page-1.html

Brosseau, L., & Dewing, M. (2009). Canadian multiculturalism. *Canadian Parliamentary Information and Research Service.*

Canada Council for the Arts. (n.d.). *How we make funding decisions*. Retrieved April 20, 2023, from https://canadacouncil.ca/funding/funding-decisions

Canada Council for the Arts. (n.d.). Canada Council for the Arts. Retrieved from https://canadacouncil.ca/

Canada Council for the Arts. (2017). *Canada Council for the Arts Equity Policy 2–16.*

Canada Commons. (n.d.). *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy*. Retrieved March 28, 2024, from https://canadacommons-ca.lib-ezproxy.concordia.ca/artifacts/2313026/the-making-of-the-mosaic/3073554/view/?page=23&search=amended

Chan, A. 2014. Righting Canada's Wrongs: The Chinese Head Tax: And Anti-Chinese Immigration Policies in the Twentieth Century. James Lorimer Limited, Publishers. https://books.google.ca/books?id=Bh-NBAAAQBAJ.

Chin, C., & Reid, S. (2023). Discourses of multicultural acknowledgment in Canada: Liberal and conservative, general and specific. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 44*(2), 257–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2022.2102595

Chinese head tax in Canada. (n.d.). *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/chinese-head-tax-in-canada

Dalley, P., & Begley, M. (2008). Fragmentation sociale et cohésion sociale en éducation au Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 125–139.

David, E. J., & Okazaki, S. (2006). The Colonial Mentality Scale (CMS) for Filipino Americans: Scale construction and psychological implications. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(2), 241–252. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.2.241

David, E. J., & Nadal, K. L. (2013). The colonial context of Filipino American immigrants' psychological experiences. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(3), 298–309. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032903

De Leon, A. (2021). Transpacific Rizalistas: Portrait photography and the Filipino becoming-subject. *The Trans-Asia Photography Review, 11*(1). http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.7977573.0011.102

Diaz, R. (2016). Queer unsettlements: Diasporic Filipinos in Canada's World Pride. *Journal of Asian American Studies, 19*(3), 327–350. https://doi.org/10.1353/jaas.2016.0030

Eastern Edge Gallery. (2021, July 20). Marigold Santos: Mirror/mother/fragments. *Eastern Edge Gallery.* https://easternedge.ca/marigold-santos-mirrormother-fragments/

Fatona, A. M. (2011). Where outreach meets outrage: Racial equity at the Canada Council for the Arts (1989–1999) (Doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto.

Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies, 7*(2), 177–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2013.798239

Fleras, A., & Elliott, J. L. (2010). *Engaging diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada.* W. Ross MacDonald School Resource Services Library.

Frideres, J. S. (2011). *First Nations in the twenty-first century.* Oxford University Press.

Gagnon, M., & McFarlane, S. (2003). *The capacity of cultural difference*. Minister's Forum on Diversity and Culture, Department of Canadian Heritage, April 2003, Ottawa; and *Cultures, diversity and everyday life*, Council of Europe, May 2002, Montréal.

Garcea, J., Kirova, A., & Wong, L. (2008). Introduction: Multiculturalism discourses in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.0.0069

Gaudet, S., & Robert, D. (2018). Choosing qualitative inquiry. *A Journey Through Qualitative Research: From Design to Reporting*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529716733.n1

Gaudet, S., & Robert, D. (2018). Ethical challenges in qualitative research. *A Journey Through Qualitative Research: From Design to Reporting*, 121–137. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529716733.n5

Gopinath, G. (2005). *Impossible desires: Queer diasporas and South Asian public cultures.* Duke University Press.

Hall, S. (2021). *Selected writings on race and difference* (P. Gilroy & R. W. Gilmore, Eds.). Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1hhj1b9

Heidelberg, B. (2019). Learning from negative space: Categorizing success in arts policy entrepreneurship. *Artivate, 8*(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1353/artv.2019.0011

Jonelle, A. (n.d.). *Mending ng Angkan*. Azia Jonelle. https://aziajonelle.com/concept/mendingngangkan

Karim, K. H. (2008). Press, public sphere, and pluralism: Multiculturalism debates in Canadian English-language newspapers. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 57–78. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.0.0074

Kirova, A. (2008). Critical and emerging discourses in multicultural education literature: A review. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.0.0065

Kymlicka, W. (1991). *Liberalism, community, and culture*. Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2003). Canadian multiculturalism in historical and comparative perspective: Is Canada unique? *Constitutional Forum / Forum constitutionnel, 13*(1), 1.

Labelle, M. (2008). Les intellectuels québécois face au multiculturalisme: Hétérogénéité des approches et des projets politiques. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 33–56. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.0.0067

Largo, M. (n.d.). Reimagining Filipina visibility through 'Black Mirror'. In *Diasporic Intimacies* (pp. 99–118). https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47wd88.12

Largo, M. (n.d.). Unsettling imaginaries: The decolonial diaspora aesthetics of four contemporary Filipinx visual artists in Canada.

Manalansan, M. F. (2007). *Global divas: Filipino gay men in the diaspora*. Duke University Press.

Mecija, C. (n.d.). Good-bye Ohbijou. In *Diasporic Intimacies* (pp. 119–133). https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47wd88.13

Office of the Historian. (n.d.). *Milestones in the history of U.S. foreign relations*. U.S. Department of State. Retrieved July 31, 2024, from https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/war

Office of the Historian. (n.d.). The Philippine-American War, 1899–1902. In *Milestones: 1899–1913*. U.S. Department of State. Retrieved July 31, 2024, from https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/war

Philip, M. N. (n.d.). *Frontiers: Essays and writings on racism and culture. Canadian Book Review Annual Online*. Retrieved October 28, 2024, from https://cbra.library.utoronto.ca/items/show/12614

Researching multicultural discourses. (2006). *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 1*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/10382040608668527

Roces, M. (2005). Gender, nation and the politics of dress in twentieth‑century Philippines. *Gender & History, 17*(2), 354–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0953-5233.2006.00385.x

Sriskandarajah, A. (n.d.). Demonstrating identities: Citizenship, multiculturalism, and Canadian-Tamil identities.

Taylor, C. (2016, May 27). The politics of recognition. *Political Not Metaphysical.* https://politicalnotmetaphysical.wordpress.com/2016/05/27/charles-taylor-the-politics-of-recognition/

The Canadian Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Colonialism in Canada. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved July 31, 2024, from https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/colonialism-in-canada

The Canadian Encyclopedia. (n.d.). Chinese head tax in Canada. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved July 31, 2024, from https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/chinese-head-tax-in-canada

Thurairajah, K. (2017). The jagged edges of multiculturalism in Canada and the suspect Canadian. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 12*(2), 134–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2017.1319377

Trebilcock, M. J., & Kelley, N. (1998). *The making of the mosaic: A history of Canadian immigration policy*. University of Toronto Press. Retrieved March 28, 2024, from https://canadacommons.ca/artifacts/2313026/the-making-of-the-mosaic/3073554/

Uberoi, V. (2016). Legislating multiculturalism and nationhood: The 1988 'Canadian Multiculturalism Act'. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique, 49*(2), 267–287.

University of Ottawa Press. (2008). *Multicultural dynamics and the ends of history*. https://doi.org/10.1353/book.4433

Walcott, R. (2014). The book of others (Book IV): Canadian multiculturalism, the state, and its political legacies. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 46*(2), 127–132. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2014.0018

Wong, L. (2008). Multiculturalism and ethnic pluralism in sociology: An analysis of the fragmentation position discourse. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*(1), 11–32. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.0.0066

Wong, L., & Guo, S. (2015). Revisiting multiculturalism in Canada. In *Revisiting Multiculturalism in Canada* (pp. 1–14). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-208-0_1

Wood, P. K., & Gilbert, L. (2005). Multiculturalism in Canada: Accidental discourse, alternative vision, urban practice. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 29*(3), 679–691. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2005.00612.x