

The Role of Discourse in a Theory of Politicized Collective Identity:
The 1995 Québec Referendum Debate

by

Shawn Casey O'Connor
B.A., St. Thomas University, 1988
M.A., University of Victoria, 1993

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department of Psychology

© Shawn Casey O'Connor, 2006
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This document may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by
photocopying or other means, without the permission of the author.

The Role of Discourse in a Theory of Politicized Collective Identity:
The 1995 Québec Referendum Debate

by

Shawn Casey O'Connor
B.A., St. Thomas University, 1988
M.A., University of Victoria, 1993

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Janet Beavin Bavelas (Department of Psychology)
Supervisor

Dr. Ronald A. Hoppe (Department of Psychology)
Departmental Member

Dr. Charles W. Tolman (Department of Psychology)
Departmental Member

Dr. Mary Ellen Purkis (School of Nursing)
Outside Member

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Janet Beavin Bavelas (Department of Psychology)

Supervisor

Dr. Ronald A. Hoppe (Department of Psychology)

Departmental Member

Dr. Charles W. Tolman (Department of Psychology)

Departmental Member

Dr. Mary Ellen Purkis (School of Nursing)

Outside Member

Abstract

Politicized collective identity (PCI) is a recent social psychological model developed by Simon and Klandermans (2001), which theorizes how the identity of social groups engaged in power struggles becomes politically or socially active, that is, how group identity becomes politicized. Virtually absent from current PCI theory is any mention of the role of language in the politicization process. The purpose of the present study was to incorporate recent theorizing in language into a theory of PCI. The analysis focussed specifically on the use of linguistic structures and strategies in both reflecting and shaping the final stage of a fully politicized collective identity, that is, the efforts of groups to involve the wider society in their struggle. Methods and theory taken from critical discourse analysis were applied to campaign material arising out of the intensely contentious political struggle over Québec independence during the 1995 referendum campaign. The primary material was the official referendum campaign booklet, to which both sovereignists (the Yes side) and federalists (the No side) had contributed an extensive outline of their respective positions. Given the advanced stage of politicization of these groups, this material served the third and final stage of PCI—the attempt of each side to involve society by triangulation, in which groups seek to enlist the support of third parties in their struggle. The results revealed how this stage was constituted in and through discourse, that is, in a wide variety of linguistic structures and strategies such as

lexical choice, metaphors, semantic macrostructures, and intertextuality. It was also noteworthy that the first two stages that Simon and Klandermans had proposed (grievances and adversarial attributions) were reintroduced in the third stage as topics of discourse and were recruited into the involvement strategies of the Yes and No sides. These findings demonstrate that the theoretical integration of language and PCI contributes to a greater understanding of how groups enlist third parties and thus builds upon Simon and Klandermans's theory of politicized collective identity.

Table of Contents

Abstract..... iii

Table of Contents.....v

List of Tables vii

Acknowledgements viii

Dedication.....ix

Chapter 1: Introduction..... 1

Chapter 2: Politicized Collective Identity5

 Elements Essential for the Development of Politicized Collective Identity6

 Collective Identity6

 Struggle for Power.....7

 Societal Context.....9

 Stages of the Politicization Process 10

 Developing Shared Grievances.....10

 Making Adversarial Attributions.....12

 Involvement of Society by Triangulation.....12

 Recent Research on Politicized Collective Identity 14

Chapter 3: Discourse and Politicized Collective Identity..... 16

 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)17

 CDA as Discourse Analysis18

 CDA as (Critical) Social Analysis.....20

 Varieties of CDA24

 Approach to CDA in the Present Work32

 Theoretical Elaboration of Politicized Collective Identity: Discourse as a Fourth
Element.....34

 Contributions of the Present Work39

Chapter 4: Methods43

 Materials43

 Analysis44

Chapter 5: Results.....48

 Lexical Choice.....48

 Yes Side Text.....49

 No Side Text.....52

 Metaphors56

 Partnership Metaphors in the Yes Side Text57

 Aggression Metaphors in the Yes Side Text60

Imperialism Metaphors in the Yes Side Text	61
Deception Metaphors in the No Side Text	63
Inclusive-We Pronouns	67
Yes Side Text.....	68
No Side Text.....	70
The Construction of Us-Versus-Them Dichotomies.....	73
Yes Side Text.....	74
No Side Text.....	77
The Use of Questions	78
Semantic Macrostructures	81
Introduction, Orientation, Complication, and Resolution	81
Headings	85
Lists	87
Intertextuality	91
Yes Side Text.....	91
No Side Text.....	94
Hybridity.....	95
Yes Side Text.....	96
No Side Text.....	101
Summary.....	104
Chapter 6: Discussion.....	108
Implications for Politicized Collective Identity	109
Implications for Critical Discourse Analysis	114
Limitations and Future Research.....	116
References	119
Appendix A: Yes Side Text.....	128
Appendix B: No Side Text	151

List of Tables

Table 1. Federalist expressions of independence	54
Table 2. Linguistic devices occurring in the Yes-No campaign booklet, by PCI Stage and Committee	106
Table 3. Macro Themes in the Yes/No Campaign Booklet.....	107

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Bavelas. Her insights into language (both verbal and nonverbal) intrigued me early in my graduate studies, and I have appreciated her guidance, patience, and advice as I worked to complete this research. I would also like to thank my committee members for their insights, constructive comments, and support. Thanks to Dr. Hoppe who first introduced me to the shaping functions of language and to the pages of *Discourse & Society*. Over the years, Dr. Tolman's mentorship has given me an appreciation of what philosophy and history have to offer in furthering my understanding of social psychological processes. Dr. Purkis has been an invaluable committee member. Her critical scholarship has been an inspiration, and I am thankful for the insights she has provided on my work. Finally, I would like to thank my external examiner, Dr. Linda McMullen. My interactions with her have helped to extend my view of what my dissertation does and does not accomplish. Thanks to all.

To my partner and best friend Angie for her support and encouragement throughout my doctoral studies, to my son Graham and daughter Ellen for accommodating my “homework”, and to my parents Helen and Gene who had the wisdom to recognize the value of higher education.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Our society struggles over many contentious issues. Different groups in our society, for instance, hold contrasting positions on lesbian and gay marriage, universal health care, corporal punishment of children, and military intervention to resolve geopolitical issues. Sometimes a single view dominates; at other times, two or more views rival each other, as proponents of each side seek to have their position become the accepted or governing view. This dissertation grew out of my concern over issues like these and with how such issues become the focus of social or political struggle between groups.

Social psychology, which is my home discipline, has had a longstanding interest in social issues such as sexism, racism, and prejudice. However, the typical social psychological theories of these processes are individually centred, for example, attitude change and social cognition. I prefer the approach advocated by a small group of scholars who have, over the years, argued for the necessity of bringing the *social* back into social psychology (e.g., Rose, 1990; Sarason, 1981; Senn, 1989; Solano, 1989; Squire, 1990). This literature had its roots in what came to be called the *crisis in social psychology* (Jackson, 1988), which characterized the field in the late 1960s and early 1970s (e.g., Elms, 1975; Gergen, 1973; Steiner, 1974) and still re-appears in contemporary literature (e.g., Cherry, 1995; Rogers, Stenner, Gleason, & Rogers, 1995).

The socially-centred alternative that I find most appealing is the discursive approach that has emerged at the periphery of mainstream psychology (e.g., Harré & Gillett, 1994; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Shotter, 1993). Authors such as these have re-conceptualized traditional social psychological constructs and processes in terms of

language and discourse, bringing them outside of the individual into the social world. One particularly influential proposal was that language not only “reflects context” but also “determines context” (Giles & Coupland, 1991). Although it was obvious that language reflects our social realities, it was an intriguing insight that language also shapes our social realities. At about the same time, van Dijk’s *critical discourse analysis* (e.g., van Dijk, 1993c) was also emphasizing the shaping function of language, both in relation to group identity and social reality. Another appeal of critical discourse analysis was van Dijk’s focus on pressing social issues, especially, how elites reproduce ethnic dominance and racism in popular culture. All of these influences led to an initial analysis, which explored some aspects of intergroup conflict and identity in Quebec’s struggle for political independence (O’Connor, 1998).

The above combination of a social rather than an individual focus, a discursive approach, and critical discourse analysis were the backdrop for the present work, which focuses on understanding both how politicians attempt to enlist the support of the public in their ideological power struggles and how language is involved in this process. Simon and Klandermans (2001) have recently proposed a social psychological theory of *politicized collective identity*, which conceptualizes how the identity of social groups engaged in power struggles becomes politically or socially active, that is, how group identity becomes politicized. Their theory, described more fully in the next chapter, focuses on the process by which groups, with identities as varied as Black and White South Africans or Palestinians and Israelis, become involved in contentious social-political issues and how these groups seek to have their view adopted by third parties such as society at large. Simon and Klandermans have suggested that people “evinced

politicized collective identity to the extent that they engage as self-conscious group members in a power struggle on behalf of their group knowing that it is the more inclusive societal context in which this struggle has to be fought out” (p. 319). One aim of this dissertation is to examine empirically Simon and Klandermans’s theory of politicized collective identity. In doing so, I will show how their theory of politicized collective identity explains some aspects of one intensely contentious issue, the political struggle during the 1995 referendum campaign on Quebec independence. In this campaign, politicians on each side of the issue sought to have their view of the conflict become the accepted view. The broader implication of this dissertation is the role that this campaign, and language in particular, has in explaining how group identity becomes fully politicized, a final stage in Simon and Klandermans’s politicization process, which centres on groups enlisting the support of third parties in their struggle. I propose that recent theorizing on language will augment a theory of politicized collective identity in part by showing how efforts to involve society are constituted in and through discourse, that is, in the linguistic structures and strategies that comprise a large sample of discourse taken from the 1995 Quebec referendum campaign. This theoretical integration, I argue, will provide a greater degree of explanatory value of how groups enlist the support of third parties than afforded by either a theory of language or a theory of politicized collective identity alone.

Chapter Two introduces Simon and Klandermans’s (2001) theory of politicized collective identity and illustrates this theory with some aspects of the debate over Quebec’s struggle for political independence. In Chapter Three, I review critical discourse analysis, which grounds the view of language taken in this dissertation. I then

propose an extension of Simon and Klandermans's model, focusing on the role that discourse plays in the politicization process they propose. I will argue that discourse needs to be viewed not merely in terms of communicating or transmitting information about the politicization process but rather that this process is constituted in and through discourse.

Chapter 2: Politicized Collective Identity

Because of our diverse backgrounds, interests, and social relationships, each of us identifies with or belongs to a variety of social groups. Not all of these social identities, however, are politicized in the sense that we as group members engage in social or political struggle or seek to establish, maintain, or change power structures or power relationships. For instance, we might be female but not feminists, gay but not gay activists, or environmentalists but not environmental protestors. Group identities that are politicized can be considered a specific form of collective identity, *politicized collective identity*.

As will be shown next, Simon and Klandermans (2001) identified three underlying elements (or “pillars”) essential for politicized collective identity (*collective identity*, a *struggle for power*, and *societal context*) and proposed an hypothesized process by which a group moves from collective identity to politicized collective identity. This process involves a progression through three broad and overlapping stages: developing an awareness of *shared grievances*, making *adversarial attributions* (i.e., identifying an external opponent), and *involving society by triangulation*. This latter stage, triangulation, involves a group’s attempt to control, influence, and enlist a segment of the population with the aim of persuading this third party to side with the group’s position on the issue of interest over the position advocated by an opposing group. It is this latter stage where collective identity fully politicizes.

*Elements Essential for the Development of Politicized**Collective Identity**Collective Identity*

The concept of group identity is well established in social psychology (e.g., Barth, 1969; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, Wetherell, 1987). In an overview of various concepts of social identity, Brewer (2001) distinguished group-based social identities from group-based collective identities on the grounds that the latter not only involves a group of people who share common characteristics and social experience but who also actively shape and forge “an image of what the group stands for and how it wishes to be viewed by others” (p. 119). Collective identity thus provides a critical link between social identity and collective action (Brewer, 2001; Simon & Klandermans, 2001).

Collective identities play an essential role in the process of politicization because of several key attributes. Collective identities are *shared* identities (“we” or “us”) as opposed to a mere representation of the self (“I” or “me”); the latter is a characteristic of other possible conceptualizations of identity (e.g., individual identity or self-concept). Accordingly, collective identity provides a “meaningful perspective on the social world from which this world can be interpreted and understood” (Simon & Klandermans, 2001, p. 321). Collective identities are also *nested* identities in that groups or group members can have identities inside other more inclusive identities (e.g., I can be an inhabitant of Westmount, a resident of Montreal, a Québécois, and a Canadian). Collective identities can also be *overlapping* (e.g., many psychologists are members of the American Psychological Association, but only some psychologists are squash players). Although multiplicity (as found in nested and overlapping identities) is an essential feature of collective identities, collective identities are not necessarily all activated at the same time.

Rather, individual, social, and societal factors will determine which identities become more salient over others.

With respect to Québec's struggle for power within Canada, there is potentially a variety of collective identities associated with each of the two political antagonists. Various proponents of Québec independence, for instance, might view themselves as sovereignists, Canadian, Quebecers, Québec nationalists, members of a distinct society, and Francophones. Various proponents of a united Canada might view themselves as federalists, Canadian, Quebecers, Francophones, Anglophones, or allophones. As evident in the two lists, the two opposing sides share with each other certain collective identities, some of which are nested (a Quebecer is a Canadian citizen) or overlapping (proponents of independence and some proponents of a united Canada might both view themselves as Québec nationalists). In contrast, other collective identities do not overlap (e.g., sovereignist and federalist).

Struggle for Power

Simon and Klandermans (2001) argued that intergroup power struggles are a necessary precursor to politicized collective identity. Observing that groups are embedded in a system of complex intergroup relations and that power is not always evenly distributed, Simon and Klandermans maintained that power asymmetries would frequently be a source of intergroup conflict.

Simon and Klandermans view power as a relational construct, one that "describes a social relationship in which one party has, or is perceived to have, the ability to impose its will on another" (p. 322). A group's struggle for power, they suggest, is best viewed as an attempt to establish, maintain, or change a desired outcome (e.g., cultural, economic, environmental, military, or political). According to Simon and Klandermans,

The more powerful group, by virtue of its superior outcome control, is in a better position to achieve desirable outcomes and to avoid undesirable ones than is the less powerful group. The likely result is an outcome distribution that favors the more powerful group. This should be so even if that group does not engage in active discrimination against the less powerful group but simply follows its own self-interests. . . . Less powerful groups should be dissatisfied with the unfavorable outcome distribution and thus should be motivated to work or even fight for a redistribution of the specific outcomes and ultimately for a redistribution of intergroup power. (p. 322)

It is not always the case, however, that power structures are clearly defined.

Although Simon and Klandermans suggested that intergroup conflicts are typically characterized by asymmetrical power (e.g., students in conflict with administrators over the elimination of the school swimming pool), they readily acknowledged that the power structure might, in some situations, be unclear or unstable. They argued that in these instances, “the struggle for power and the ensuing conflict may be particularly fierce because each group is tempted to secure for itself the lion’s share or at least to prevent the other group from getting it” (p. 322).

Historically, both asymmetrical and unclear or unstable power relations have characterized Québec society and Québec’s place within the Canadian federation. In the past century, there were recognizable power asymmetries in Québec society. Compared to the francophone community, the minority Anglophone community and private institutions— especially the Catholic Church (Ouellet, 1992), had a disproportionate amount of control over the economy, education, and social services. Although there were occasional struggles over specific issues (e.g., conscription during the two World Wars), it was not until the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s that the struggle for power became protracted and power asymmetries began to change (e.g., with the passage of Bill 101 making the French language, “the language of Government and the Law, as well as the normal and everyday language of work, instruction, communication, commerce and

business;" Bill 101, 1977). In recent years, elected sovereignist governments in Québec have battled with the federal government over a variety of federal-provincial policies and programs.

Societal Context

Central to Simon and Klandermans's conceptualization of societal context is that struggles for power are not simply bipolar conflicts occurring in a vacuum. Rather, these struggles involve third parties such as the general public, its institutions, or overlapping or nested groups (e.g., voters). Because the identities of antagonists are embedded within these more inclusive or shared group memberships, it is inevitable that antagonists call on and enlist the support of these groups in the struggle for power. Simon and Klandermans have referred to this as a *triangulated* or *tripolar* approach to power struggles, comprising the two polarized sides and the third parties that they seek to enlist.

As Simon and Klandermans have noted, this tripolar approach is a different perspective than the ingroup-outgroup dichotomy characterizing social psychology theory on group behaviour over the past 30 years (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986). Hammersley (1997) too has noted that an overly simple (bi-polar) model of group behaviour has characterized critical discourse analysis (e.g., of oppressor and oppressed). (The parallelism between theorising in social psychology and critical discourse analysis stems in part from the adoption of Tajfel and Turner's understanding of intergroup relations by both fields.)

Applying this tripolar approach to the Québec referendum, the third parties that Québec sovereignists might want to enlist are French-speaking Quebecers and allophones. For federalists, they too might want to enlist French-speaking Quebecers and allophones, but also English Quebecers and Canadians outside of Québec. Defined more

broadly, the societal context might also include the National Assembly of Québec, the Canadian House of Commons, other countries, the media, investment markets, and the business community.

Stages of the Politicization Process

Having summarized the requisite underlying conditions of politicized collective identity, we can discuss the three stages of the politicization process, which Simon and Klandermans have argued capture the antecedents of a fully politicized collective identity: developing an awareness of shared grievances, making adversarial attributions, and involving society by triangulation. Although Simon and Klandermans argued that these three stages are critical to the politicization process, they also acknowledged that the stages might overlap, interact, and feed back on each other, a notion that will be explored in the Results Chapter. Notwithstanding, they suggested that the three stages have a high heuristic value for a systematic understanding of politicized collective identity (p. 324).

Developing Shared Grievances

As a precursor to nearly all intergroup power struggles, the development of shared grievances can be viewed as a necessary first step in a group's progression toward a politicized collective identity. Simon and Klandermans suggested that collective identity plays a facilitating role in grievances becoming widely shared because "it fosters homogenization and (self-) stereotyping processes that in turn transform 'your' and 'my' experiences into 'our' experiences" (p. 325). Likewise, shared grievances heighten collective identity because they are an attribute of the collective ingroup but not other social groups, thus enhancing *us* versus *them* distinctions. Simon and Klandermans's reading of the social psychological literature points to four broad classes of grievances:

illegitimate inequality, suddenly imposed grievances, violated principles, and threatened privileges.

Consider the grievances that proponents of Québec independence might have. As mentioned in the previous discussion of the Quiet Revolution, Quebecers have long argued that inequality in the economic, education, and social service sectors has been illegitimate. A suddenly imposed grievance is illustrated by Trudeau's 1982 patriation of the constitution against the expressed wishes of the government of Québec. A violation of specific principle or value is the rejection by "English" Canada of Québec as a distinct society. Finally, sovereigntists (and many Francophones) view court challenges to the language law (Bill 101) as a threat to the protection of the French language in a homogenized, English-dominated North America.

Groups opposed to Québec independence also have their shared grievances. For many Anglophones, Bill 101 represents an inequality imposed by the sovereigntist movement (e.g., retail stores must have French names, and French must be the predominant language on commercial signage). Moreover, Bill 101 was also a suddenly imposed grievance. Many federalists consider Québec no more a distinct society than Newfoundland, and their principles of what Canada stands for are violated by any suggestion to the contrary. For federalists, the strongest grievance might well be one of threatened privileges. If Québec were to separate, not only would Canada lose a significant portion of its population and landmass, which would have significant repercussions in several other domains, but Anglophones currently living in the province would become a minority in the new Québec nation.

Making Adversarial Attributions

Developing shared grievances alone is not enough for a group to become politicized. Rather, the aggrieved group must attribute their predicament to others. That is, they must blame an external enemy or opponent for what “they” have done to “us,” a process Simon and Klandermans referred to as adversarial attributions. Sovereignists, for instance, have routinely blamed the federal government or English Canada for their predicament (e.g., for high levels of unemployment), whereas those in Québec who support a united Canada have blamed the ruling Parti Québécois (e.g., for hurting Québec’s economy by focusing too much on political independence).

Simon and Klandermans argued that adversarial attributions result in collective identity becoming more salient thus making it easier for an ingroup (*us*) to identify outgroups (*them*) more readily. Likewise, robust collective identities facilitate the process of identifying an adversary to blame for the ingroup’s grievance. Sometimes, however, an ingroup’s grievance is fully addressed by the adversarial group (e.g., corrective action is taken). In this instance, politicization of the ingroup will not occur. If no redress is made, however, politicization of collective identity progresses to the next stage (triangulation).

Involvement of Society by Triangulation

Bipolar conflicts are triangulated when opposing groups try to enlist, influence, or control third parties such as society at large, particular segments of the population (e.g., voters), or social institutions (e.g., churches, government, etc.). Progression to this stage leads to collective identity becoming fully politicized. As part of the triangulation process, Simon and Klandermans suggested that a group will present itself as “part of the more inclusive general public or population so that its own interests appear to be compatible with, if not identical to, the ‘common’ interest” (p. 323). Drawing from

Mummendey and Wenzel (1999), Simon and Klandermans argued that antagonistic groups could be “expected to strive for hegemony, claiming that their own position is or should be prototypical or normative for that more inclusive ‘in-group,’ whereas the position of the other group is discredited as beyond the latitude of general acceptance” (p. 323). For the views of one group or another to become accepted (i.e., dominant), the wider public must come to share that group’s view. Involvement of society by triangulation is thus an attempt by opposing parties to compel third parties to take sides.

Drawing from reviews of others (i.e., Mushaben, 1986; Reckman, 1979; Sharp, 1973), Klandermans (1997) reported an extensive list of techniques used to mobilize consensus, noting that almost anything that can be used to communicate meaning is applicable:

Public speeches; letters of opposition or support; declarations by organizations and institutions; signed public statements, signed advertisements; declarations of indictment and intentions; slogans; caricatures and symbols, banners, posters; displayed communications; expositions; leaflets, pamphlets, books, newspapers and journals; records, radio, television, audiovisual presentations; art; exhibits; films; information stands in shopping centres; organizing public fora featuring well known intellectuals and political figures; organizing congresses, teach-ins, hearings, publicizing the results of public opinion surveys; symbolic public acts such as prayer and worship; painting; wearing of symbols; performances of plays; music; singing; street theater; concerts; organizing dramatic events such as marches, demonstrations, die-ins, pilgrimages; arranging sports events, door-to-door canvassing. (p. 50).

The ongoing involvement of society by triangulation is an essential feature of the struggle for Québec independence. It is explicit and official in that opposing sides fought several election and referendum campaigns, during which time each side tried to enlist the support of third parties (Québec voters, media, etc.) using techniques typical of political campaigns (speeches, pamphlets, etc.). Consider the triangulation of voters during the 1980 and 1995 referenda on Québec independence. Voters not only had to

choose between one of two options, Yes or No to independence, but also between the opposing collective identities put forth by federalists (Canadian, inclusive, etc.) and sovereignists (French-speaking, distinct society, etc.), in addition to the negative identities the two sides constructed of each other (e.g., deceptive, imperialistic, etc).

Recent Research on Politicized Collective Identity

Numerous authors have drawn on Simon and Klandermans's (2001) understanding of collective identity, collective action, and a politicized collective identity (e.g., Allsop, Jones, & Baggott, 2004; Drury & Reicher, 2005; Hornsey, Blackwood, & O'Brien, 2005; Sears, Fu, Henry, & Bui, 2003). However, these studies have not focused on an empirical examination of PCI.

Three recent studies have examined specific aspects of PCI, most notably the inclusiveness of collective identity and social movement participation. Klandermans, Sabucedo, Rodriguez, and de Weerd (2002) observed that farmers in Galicia (Spain) and The Netherlands who felt a commitment to other farmers and belonged to farmers' organizations were both more prepared to engage in, and actually took part in, collective action. In a continuation of this farmers' protest study, Klandermans, Sabucedo, and Rodriguez (2004) examined the relationship between politicization of farmers and the inclusiveness of their nested identities. These identities ranged from no particular identification to progressively more inclusive identities: local community, national, and European. These researchers found that farmers with more inclusive identification displayed more signs of politicization, as measured by participation in farmers' protests. Similarly, Stürmer and Simon (2004) demonstrated that gay men's identification with a specific social movement organization (the gay movement) increased participation in

collective protests compared to respondents who only identified as being gay men. When intergroup conflict was particularly fierce, as played out in political debate on same-sex marriage legislation, Stürmer and Simon found that respondents' identification as gay men was a predictor of participation in collective protest. One explanation for this politicization may be that the fierce opposition to same-sex marriage aggrieved gay men, and this presumed grievance motivated them to participate in collective action.

Common across these three studies is the focus on the link between the inclusiveness of collective identity (e.g., multiple, nested, or overlapping identities) and the politicization of collective identity. In contrast to the present work, none of these studies examined specific stages of the politicization process nor did they focus on discourse as an explanatory construct.

Chapter 3: Discourse and Politicized Collective Identity

According to Simon and Klandermans, the politicization of collective identity and the power struggle underlying this process unfold as a sequence of politicizing events that involve developing an awareness of shared grievances, making adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society by triangulation (p. 324). What is not entirely clear from their model, however, is the process of accomplishment of each stage. Although not as yet incorporated into what Simon and Klandermans described as their ideal-typical model, a number of additional constructs likely come into play (as they themselves suggest, p. 326). This dissertation will focus on one such construct, the role of discourse to a theory of politicized collective identity.

Research on group dominance has underscored two ways by which hegemonic positions are established, defended, and changed: through the use of force or, as an alternative, *discursively* through control over ideology and public discourse (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Although Simon and Klandermans explicitly discussed neither force nor discourse, the process of politicization that they appeared to envision is not one of force. Instead, they illustrate their theory with examples such as “peace activists who confront the federal government and seek the support of the churches in their struggle against nuclear arms” (p. 327) and they contend that the struggle for power can be understood as *political* group activity (p. 322).

In the absence of force, the importance of discourse to a theory of politicized collective identity needs to be considered more closely. This view is consistent with recent theorizing. In elaborating the notion of group social identity, Ashmore, Jussim, Wilder, and Heppen (2001) have proposed that “groups develop narratives that tell the

story of their group” (p. 237); and, these stories form part of individual and group identities (i.e., they help us make sense of who we are). Similarly, Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe (2004) have proposed that discourse (“content and meaning”) should be considered a key component of collective identity (along with self-categorization, evaluation, importance, attachment and sense of interdependence, social embeddedness, and behavioural involvement). These authors have argued that the importance of content and meaning follows from the observation that identity partly resides in a semantic space, which is informed by self-attributed characteristics, ideology (“beliefs about experience and history of the group over time” p. 94), and narrative (both my story as group member and my group’s story). The recognition of the role of discourse in collective identity underscores its potential import to a theory of politicized collective identity.

This chapter describes the proposed linkages between a theory of discourse and Simon and Klandermans’s theory of politicized collective identity. Theory and practice common to Critical Discourse Analysis (e.g., Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, Fairclough, 1992b; van Dijk, 1993b, 1993c) informs the view of discourse proposed here and will provide the foundation for the subsequently reported analyses, which explore the role that discourse has in constituting the final stage of the politicization process, efforts to involve society by triangulation. The chapter concludes with an overview of the contributions of the present work to not only PCI but also CDA.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a sub-field within the multidisciplinary field of discourse analysis. CDA is both method and theory, bringing together a linguistically oriented analysis and theorizing on discourse and social, political, and cultural processes

and structures. The aim is not only to facilitate a better understanding of social life and socio-political issues but also to explore these from a critical social scientific perspective (Fairclough, 1992b; Fowler, Hodge, Kress & Trew, 1979; Hodge & Kress, 1993; van Dijk, 1993c, 1994a). The remainder of this section explores CDA's characteristic discursive, critical, and socio-political elements; provides an overview of CDA's main intellectual figures; and describes the approach to CDA taken in the present work.

CDA as Discourse Analysis

Across the humanities and social sciences, the modern study of discourse has gained increased prominence since the 1960s (van Dijk, 1997). The field of CDA can trace part of its development to this influence. The discourse analytical component of CDA has been informed, for instance, by various branches of linguistics (e.g., vocabulary, semantics, and grammar), ethnomethodology (conversation analysis), ethnography, semiotics, and sociolinguistics (for reviews see Fairclough, 1992b; van Dijk, 1997). In particular, several noted linguists, including Norman Fairclough (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999) and Teun A. van Dijk (e.g., van Dijk, 1993b, 1993c, 1997), have been widely influential to the development of CDA.

CDA as discourse analysis is characterized by an interpretative, meaning-based inquiry rooted in the systematic description and explanation of naturally occurring language. As van Dijk (1997) has suggested, the discourse analytical focus is on “details of structures and strategies in terms of conceptual devices that produce novel and interesting insights in talk, in its interactional accomplishments, or in its contextual and societal conditions and functions.”

Although there are no constraints on the corpus of language studied, CDA research typically focuses on public discourse dealing with compelling social and

political issues (e.g., power, inequality, dominance, etc.) and may include written, spoken, or visual images. To support analytical claims about how social processes and structures are accounted for in discourse analytical terms, researchers cite excerpts from the corpus under study. Although not always readily visible to the casual reader, the dimensions analysed by scholars in the CDA tradition frequently include the following: grammar and style (e.g., lexical, syntactic), semantics (e.g., coherence), rhetoric (e.g., metaphor, irony, hyperbole), structural emphasis (e.g., headlines, summaries, etc.) narrative, argumentation, hybridity, intertextuality, phonology, pragmatics, speech acts, turn taking, sequencing, politeness, face-management, or intonation (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b; van Dijk, 1993b, 1994b, 1997). With no standard protocols in place for deciding on which discursive structures and strategies to analyse, researchers decide based on a combination of scholarly interests; their disciplinary background and theoretical orientation; the type of discourse under study (i.e., written, spoken, or visual images); the editorial guidelines of journals in which they aspire to publish; and the linguistic devices employed by the speakers and writers they are analysing.

The specific discourse structures and strategies that inform the present work include lexical choice, metaphor, pronouns, *us* versus *them* categories, grammatical questions, semantic macrostructures (e.g., introductions, headings, and lists), intertextuality, and hybridity. Controversy over wording to the referendum question (i.e., sovereignty vs. separation) provided the impetus for focusing on lexical choice and metaphor; albeit, the analysis of these linguistic devices in campaign discourse extends beyond this specific controversy. That is, I have taken an inductive approach in my analysis, and a variety of lexical choices and metaphors emerged from the back and forth

of reading, description, and analysis (the analysis of the other aforementioned linguistic devices followed the same approach). The Methods section explores this issue in more detail. Each of the linguistic devices analysed in this dissertation is used as organizing sections in the Results Chapter, where they are described more fully and juxtaposed with analysed extracts of Québec referendum discourse, which aids in their understanding. This organizational strategy is what distinguishes this work as discourse analysis.

CDA as (Critical) Social Analysis

Critical analysis. CDA is distinguished from other forms of discourse analysis by its critical approach, which often has an underlying political dimension (van Dijk, 1994a). CDA's critical perspective is underscored by a focus on topics such as power, dominance, and inequality and by the attention researchers pay to making visible the ideological loadings of particular discursive structures and processes. The view that resistance and struggle are enacted in discourse can also guide analysts' work. Researchers do not seek merely to describe the world but have the (critical) socio-political goal of challenging dominant ideologies, injustices, and inequalities, that is, social change. Social change is approached in a variety of ways including scholarly critique, critical language awareness in education (e.g., Fairclough, 1992a), and by providing resources or emancipatory knowledge, for instance, to powerless groups. Given CDA's critical perspective, scholars do not profess to be engaged in value-free science. Rather, they frequently take a socio-political stance, with an interest in exposing misrepresentation and discrimination (Fowler, 1996) and answering pressing social issues (van Dijk, 1994b). The goal of CDA is then not only scientific but also moral, social, and political (van Dijk, 1997).

CDA's perspective on critical analysis is drawn in large part from social and political thought arising out of Western Marxism (e.g., Gramsci, 1971; Althusser, 1971; and the Frankfurt School) and earlier Marxist writings (e.g., Bakhtin, 1981, 1986; Volosinov, 1973). (For reviews, see Fairclough, 1992b; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Although CDA researchers have not always placed themselves within this tradition, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) have suggested that their research is nevertheless framed by it. For instance, this research might focus on one or more characteristics of critical research such as examining how discourse is shaped by ideologies or power struggles, showing processes and structures that are hidden, or reflexively positioning the researcher in relation to the issue under study.

The present work follows this critical perspective in several respects. Politicized collective identity has an obvious political dimension, as does the Québec referendum. Moreover, key processes of politicized collective identity, including the struggle for power, societal context, grievances, and adversarial attributions, parallel the critical topics of interest to CDA scholars and, as will be shown, these constructs are enacted, reproduced, and legitimated by Québec referendum discourse. The involvement of society by triangulation, whereby sovereignists and federalists try to enlist Québec voters, is also consistent with CDA's goal of understanding and critiquing the subtle means by which text and talk manages the "minds of others through a manipulation of their beliefs or through manufacturing consent" (van Dijk, 1994a, p. 435).

Social analysis. Drawing on theoretical perspectives from the social sciences, including anthropology, feminist and media studies, political science, psychology, and sociology, CDA research seeks to integrate explicit social, political, or cultural analysis

with the analysis of text and talk. Specifically, the aim is to account for socio-political structures and processes in discourse analytic terms (van Dijk, 1994b). Central to this perspective is the notion that language use, and indeed the whole of social life, is embedded within particular social practices—“habitualised ways, tied to particular times and places, in which people apply resources (material or symbolic) to act together in the world” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 21). (Examples include political campaigns, television news, and children’s bedtime stories.) More generally, social practices can be understood as relatively stabilised forms of social activity (e.g., political, economic, family, etc.) and as “real instances of people doing or saying or writing things” (Fairclough, 1992b, p. 57). As Wood and Kroger (2000) have pointed out, however, it is what people are *doing* with words that is of most interest (e.g., constructing racism, sexism, etc.) and not merely language in and of itself (e.g., grammar, semantics, etc.). This view is shared by van Dijk (1997) who has argued that “if we want to explain what discourse is all about, it would be insufficient to merely analyse its internal structures, the actions being accomplished, or the cognitive operations involved in language use” (p. 21). Van Dijk (1997) has suggested that scholars in discourse analysis need to “account for the fact that discourse as social action is being engaged in within a framework of understanding, communication and interaction which is in turn part of broader socio-cultural structures and processes” (p. 21). Van Dijk’s remarks suggest that, beyond social and textual analysis, *context* is relevant to the critical study of language and to understanding social life more completely. (Context is discussed in the next section.)

CDA scholars engaged in social analyses explore a variety of topics of broad concern to the social sciences; for instance, “gender, ethnicity, class, origin, religion,

language, sexual orientation and other criteria that define differences between people” (van Dijk, 1997, p. 22-23); “inequality in education, employment, the courts and so on; war, nuclear weapons and nuclear power; political strategies, and commercial practices” (Fowler, 1996, p. 5); and “overall societal and political structures and processes of social systems, groups, group relations, institutions, nations, cities or historical changes, or engaging in accounts of their properties” (van Dijk, 1994b, p. 163). The topics of particular interest to CDA scholars reflect the critical goals of the field, including

power, dominance, hegemony, inequality, and the discursive processes of their enactment, concealment, legitimation and reproduction[and] the subtle means by which text and talk manage the mind and manufacture consent, on the one hand, and articulate and sustain resistance and challenge, on the other hand (van Dijk, 1993a).

As these areas of research suggest, CDA is not merely oriented toward disciplinary theory, but in large part to relevant social issues (van Dijk, 1997). The present research is grounded in both these orientations. On the one hand, this dissertation is theoretical inasmuch as it explores the role of language within a social psychological theory of politicized collective identity. On the other hand, Québec independence has been (and remains) a contentious issue in the Canadian politic.

Context. All discourse analysis is the study of text and talk in context. Van Dijk (1997) has offered a preliminary definition of context as “the structure of all properties of the social situation that are relevant for the production or reception of discourse” (p. 19). Although van Dijk (1997) has noted an absence of an explicit theory of context, it is a widely used construct within discourse analysis, albeit, with different understandings. For instance, some scholars working in traditions outside of CDA, such as conversation analysts, take issue with a proposed reality outside the observable features of participants’ talk (see, for example, an exchange between Schegloff (1997, 1998) and

Wetherell (1998); and Schegloff (1997, 1999a, 1999b) and Billig (1999a, 1999b)). In contrast, van Dijk and others have suggested that, within CDA, context is informed by local and global structures such as intentions, setting, sex, class, group membership, hegemony, and inequality (e.g., Billig, 1999a; Hodge & Kress, 1993; van Dijk, 1997; Wetherell, 1998). Relevance is then understood in terms of not only the internally grounded reality of participants but also in terms of broader cultural, economic, political, and social structures and processes, which inform the analyst's orientation. This understanding of context aids in warranting analyst's claims (i.e., assertions are supported by drawing not only on excerpts of text but also on contextual information). As Fairclough and Wodak (1997) have noted, a researcher can draw on local and global context to narrow down not only the range of possible interpretations but also the intentions of speakers or writers. In the present work, assorted contextual information is incorporated into the analyses to aid in understanding, for instance, information related to Canadian and Québec demographics and from historical documents including international law and referenda questions from other periods.

Varieties of CDA

CDA is not a "homogenous method, nor a school or a paradigm, but at most a shared perspective on doing linguistic, semiotic or discourse analysis" (van Dijk, 1993a). The eclectic mix of theoretical backgrounds and analytical strategies that analysts rely upon translates into diverse presentations of research as illustrated, for instance, in articles published in one of the discipline's main journals, *Discourse & Society*. Notwithstanding, two scholars whose writings have been quite influential on submissions to this journal, and CDA in general, are Teun A. Van Dijk—and his socio-cognitive approach (e.g., 1993b, 1993c), and Norman Fairclough—and his socio-cultural change

approach (e.g., Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1997; Fairclough, 1992b). These two figures have likewise influenced this dissertation as too has the work of earlier critical linguists (e.g., Fowler, Hodge, Kress, & Trew, 1979; Hodge & Kress, 1993), as evidenced by the frequent citations in this chapter to all these works.

Critical linguistics, van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach, and Fairclough's socio-cultural change approach have several common features. Generally, all share the understanding of CDA outlined above, that is, a focus on text analysis and a critical, social, and contextual grounding. Additionally, these three perspectives share the view that language accomplishes several interrelated functions including the construction of texts, the enactment and negotiation of social relations (interpersonal), and the representation of reality (ideational) (e.g., Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fowler & Kress, 1979). Next, I present a brief synopsis of the characteristic features of each of these three approaches and in the next section comment on the aspects of these approaches that I find most useful.

Critical linguistics. Developed in the early 1970s, critical linguistics came to prominence with the publication of two seminal texts, *Language as Ideology* (Kress & Hodge, 1979) and *Language and Control* (Fowler, Hodge, Kress, & Trew, 1979). One of the objectives of this early work was to engage social scientists researching political and social issues to take up the study of linguistic form and apply it to their analyses; the authors of these two texts also wanted linguists to incorporate concepts of power and ideology into their analyses and in turn contribute to a more socially responsive discipline (Hodge & Kress, 1993). Commenting on their original 1979 text, Hodge and Kress (1993) suggested that within mainstream linguistics the book was viewed as radical and

suggestive. This was due in part to its concern with “power as the condition of social life” and with a theory of language that explicitly incorporating this view (Hodge & Kress, 1993, p. xii).

In practice, critical linguistics focused on making visible the signs of power and ideology embedded within language. Critical linguistics was innovative because it used naturally occurring, socially situated public discourse in its analyses, for instance, newspapers or speeches, as opposed to invented text or that taken from literature, which was common in linguistics. Two broad linguistic signs that figured prominently in its analyses were grammar and categorization.

The view that grammar conveys social meaning (e.g., power and ideology) was one of the discipline’s central axioms. Syntax, for instance, was regarded as a window into the world-view of writers and speakers. As Fowler and Kress (1979) have argued, “the world-view comes to language-users from their relation to the institutions and the socio-economic structure of their society. It is facilitated and confirmed for them by a language use which has society’s ideological impress” (p. 185). Likewise, critical linguists have argued that the roles and motivations of speakers and writers are constituted in and through linguistic signs, and these in turn are a result of underlying economic and social structures (Fowler & Kress, 1979).

Critical linguistics has also had a strong focus on categorization, which has centred on the particular ways of lexicalizing experiences such as choosing one word over another to represent a construct (Fairclough & Wodk, 1997; Halliday, 1976). As Fowler (1996) has posited, “critical linguistics insists that all representation is mediated, moulded by the value-systems that are ingrained in the medium (language in this case)

used for representation; it challenges common sense by pointing out that something could have been represented some other way, with a very different significance” (p. 4). Because categorization by writers and speakers imposes order over what is classified, it can be used as an instrument of control. Critical linguists thus view categorization as one demonstrable form of social power.

Critical linguistics has come to enjoy a certain academic standing (Fowler, 1996), which underscores its success in reaching one of its original objectives, that of engaging its home discipline of linguistics in a more critical project. As Fowler suggests, however, the development of the model could not be sustained, in part due to the original authors of the aforementioned texts relocating to places and employment that made continued collaborations problematic. In time, what was critical linguistics was subsumed under CDA, the latter providing a richer analysis of not only linguistic form but also a more sophisticated socio-political analyses (van Dijk, 1993c).

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach. Van Dijk is credited as one of the early pioneers of CDA. His influence on the field is reflected in part by the number of citations to his work in this chapter (for instance, in relation to the discursive, critical, and social dimensions of CDA). As with critical linguistics, van Dijk's approach is centrally concerned with the relation between power and discourse. For instance, van Dijk and his colleagues have done extensive research on ethnic prejudice and racism (e.g., van Dijk, 1993b; van Dijk, Ting-Toomey, Smitherman & Troutman, 1997). Using a variety of texts, including academic, media, and parliamentary discourse, these researchers have shown not only how elites use particular linguistic structures and strategies to express and reproduce particular ethnic identities, differences, and conflicts but also the role of shared

ideological representations and mental models in enacting, maintaining, and legitimating systems of inequality and abuse of power.

What differentiates van Dijk's approach from critical linguistics (and other approaches to discourse analyses) is his view that cognition plays a fundamental role in the production and comprehension of text and talk including personal memories and experiences of events (models) and shared socio-cultural representations and processes such as common sense, knowledge, beliefs, rules, norms, values, and ideologies (van Dijk, 1996, 1997). More specifically, van Dijk has argued that cognition mediates the relation between social structures and discourse structures. Van Dijk (1997) draws on a triangle analogy to help articulate his approach, with each point representing one of the aforementioned constructs: cognition, society, and discourse. As van Dijk suggests

each point of the triangle is related to the two others. We are unable to explain text structure and interaction without a cognitive account, and cognition without the realization that knowledge and other beliefs are acquired and used in discourse and in social contexts; whereas cognition, society and culture, as well as their reproduction, need language, discourse and communication. (p. 24-25)

The triangle analogy is a useful heuristic because it underscores the interdependency among the three major elements of van Dijk's approach, which are also focal points of analyses. This triangular approach is also in line with van Dijk's contention that discourse analysis needs to become an integrated, multi-disciplinary field to better capitalize on the breadth of description, analysis and explanation necessary to understand the phenomena it studies, that is, social meaning and language in action (van Dijk, 1996, 1997).

Fairclough's socio-cultural change approach. This approach to CDA is focused on the study of social and cultural change (or transformation) that has been occurring in Western society over the last 20 to 30 years and the role that language use, and changes in language practices, have had in this transformation. For instance, Fairclough (1992b)

has argued that the discourse practices of economics, advertisement, and management have increasingly been incorporated into domains such as education and health services, with significant transformation of these services a result. For example, the marketization of education has resulted in a restructuring of discourse practices from one of students as *learners* to students as *consumers* or *clients* and courses as *packages* or *products*.

Fairclough (1992b) has suggested that these changes have “profoundly affected the activities, social relations, and social and professional identities of people working in such sectors” (p. 6).

Several layers of interrelated analyses characterize Fairclough’s approach to CDA including a textually oriented analysis, an analysis of social practice, and an analysis of a text’s discursive practice (Fairclough, 1992b). The first two of these layers are in line with material described in earlier sections (i.e., “CDA as Discourse Analysis” and “CDA as (Critical) Social Analysis”). The examination of a text’s discursive practice is related, in part, to the study of a text’s context. Fairclough’s approach to the analysis of discursive practice describes that aspect of context related to a text’s production, distribution, and consumption. Production, for instance, relates to who created the text and to the manner by which other texts and discourses were drawn upon in its constitution (e.g., a text’s intertextuality or hybridity, concepts described in the Results Chapter). Distribution relates to the characteristics of a text’s dissemination. Consumption relates to characteristics of the audience. The present work, for instance, provides information on the producers of the campaign discourse under analysis—sovereignists and federalists, how this text was distributed, and on the consumers of the

campaign literature (i.e., Québec voters but also other Canadians). (Discursive practice in relation to Québec referendum discourse is further described in the Methods Chapter.)

As observed earlier, several approaches to CDA share the view that language use and the whole of social life comprises interconnected networks of social practices.

Fairclough extends this view of language and social practices to theoretically ground his approach. He has posited that any given social practice is an “articulation of diverse social elements with a relatively stable configuration, always including discourse” (Fairclough, 2001b, p. 1). For Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), a particular social practice

brings together different elements of life in specific, local forms and relationships—particular types of activities, linked in particular ways to particular materials and spatial and temporal locations; particular persons with particular experiences, knowledges and dispositions in particular social relations; particular semiotic resources and ways of using language. (p. 23)

In conceptualising social practices, Fairclough has adopted Harvey’s (1996) dialectical model of the social process. Harvey’s model comprises six elements, which he proposes represents most of what transpires in social and literary theory. These elements are language and discourse; power; thought, fantasy, and desire; institution building (including rituals); material practices; and social relations. Consistent with a dialectical perspective, these elements are considered free-flowing and not bounded domains (or “permanences”), with each element “constituted as an *internal relation* of the others within the flow of social and material life” (Harvey, p. 80, emphasis in original). As Fairclough (2001b) notes, these six elements are “different elements, but not discrete, fully separate, elements” (Fairclough, 2001b, p. 1). That is, each element incorporates (or internalizes) all other elements, without being totally reducible to any of them. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) have suggested, the heterogeneity within each element

“reflects its simultaneous determination (‘overdetermination’) by all of the other [elements]” (p. 6). Discourse, for instance, is

a form of power, a mode of formation of beliefs/values/desires, an institution, a mode of social relating, a material practice. Conversely, power, social relations, material practices, institutions, beliefs, etc. are in part discourse. (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 6)

One implication of this conceptualization is that it provides an analytical framework in which discourse can be studied to gain insight into the other elements (and *visa versa*). Thus, discourse becomes a window into social processes and the whole of social life that flows in, through, and around these elements (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Harvey, 1996). Fairclough’s research on the commodification of the educational system, for instance, explores the relation between discourse and institution building, social relations, and material practices (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b). Van Dijk’s work on racism can be viewed as examining the interplay among discourse, cognition, institutions, social relations, and power (e.g., van Dijk, 1993b, 1993c). Arguably, Simon and Klandermans’s three elements are incorporated by four of Harvey’s elements. That is, collective identity corresponds to social relations; the struggle for power maps to power; and societal context relates to social relations, institution building/rituals, and material practices. I will return to this argument in a later section.

Another implication of Chouliaraki and Fairclough’s (1999) conceptualization of social practices is a *structuralist-constructivist dialectic*, which transcends the one-sided structuralist or interpretivist theorizing that has characterized linguistics and other areas of language and semiotic theory. As Chouliaraki and Fairclough suggest, this dialectic provides a “way of seeing and researching social life as both constrained by social structures, and an active process of production which transforms social structures” (p. 1).

This understanding helps to address a number of criticisms levelled at discourse analytical approaches, namely reductionism, agency, and relativism. In regard to reducing social life to discourse (e.g., Derrida's claim that "there is nothing outside of text"), the structuralist-constructivist dialectic underscores that there are real instances of inequality supported by existing economic and social structures, and individuals for instance cannot merely change their way of talking or writing to better their situation. Conversely, agency is not negated by a one-sided deterministic commitment to structures alone. Thus, action and social change are possible. The structuralist-constructivist dialectic also helps to address extreme claims of relativism, which suggest that all interpretations are equally valid. Possible interpretations can be judged, in part, based on structural components comprising a particular practice. Moreover, analysts bring with them scientific, political, and moral positions that limit the number of valid interpretations.

Approach to CDA in the Present Work

What can be taken from the preceding review is that CDA is not a homogeneous school but rather a shared perspective on doing discourse analysis. In this spirit, the present research draws selectively from critical linguistics and socio-cognitive and socio-cultural change approaches to CDA. Each of these perspectives has uniquely extended my interest in and understanding of the role of language in reflecting and constituting social life. Next, I highlight aspects of these approaches that have influenced my theoretical and analytical approach.

CDA characteristically focuses on public discourse dealing with social and political issues. Van Dijk's work in particular has underscored the role that written public discourse, most notably the news media, has had in establishing, maintaining, and legitimating societal systems of inequality, dominance, and hegemony. My interest too is

in written public discourse, which is reflected in the sample of discourse I analyse in this dissertation, that is, political campaign material distributed to all Québec households (the Methods section provides additional details on this material).

My experience with discourse analysis in general and with the three reviewed perspectives in particular has led me to favour approaches that combine text analysis and social analysis. Fairclough's multifaceted approach (i.e., a linguistically oriented analysis combined with an analysis of social and discursive practice) has had a strong influence on my approach to discourse analysis. In the present work, text and social analyses are presented together in the Results section. Reflecting in part prescribed rules for writing up research in a Psychology Department, some aspects of the analysis of discursive practice are presented in the Methods section (e.g., a description of producers, distributors, and consumers of campaign discourse), whereas other aspects are presented in the Results section (e.g., the analysis of intertextuality and hybridity in campaign discourse).

My preferred analytical approach is more macro than that found with a number of discourse analytic perspectives, for instance, those grounded in conversation analysis, which is not only more micro but also has a strong focus on non-linguistic features such as the organization of talk, for example, turn taking (Wood & Kroger, 2000). My analytical preference reflects, in part, my interest in written public discourse, which does not have the same linguistic features as conversation. It is also an acknowledgement that my strengths are in social psychological theory not linguistics and its vast array of analytical possibilities. Within CDA, critical linguistics and van Dijk's approach to textual analysis have added to my understanding of the ideological loadings found in elite

discourse and in the specific linguistic structures and strategies that mark these loadings. Critical linguistics, in particular, has contributed to my understanding of the social functioning of discourse, with its emphasis on different ways of lexicalizing experience (e.g., choosing one word over another). Van Dijk's writings have been particularly fruitful in regard to identifying the range of possible micro- and macro-linguistic features available to analysts; so too has Fairclough's research, particularly with respect to macro features including intertextuality and hybridity.

Theoretically, the work of Fairclough and his colleagues has been particularly influential (e.g., Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 1992b, 2001b). Their dialectal conceptualisation of social practices is insightful and resonates with my own understanding of social life and how to study it. One strength of this model is its underlying structuralist-constructivist dialectic, which helps to address several potential criticisms levelled at discourse analytical approaches, namely reducing social life to discourse, the obfuscation of agency, and relativism (all claims are equal). Another strength is that Fairclough et al's view of social practices provides a framework for grounding CDA not only in critical social analysis and critique but also in a theory of language. The result is a robust framework that enables researchers to investigate the social functioning of discourse (e.g., the shaping of group identity).

Theoretical Elaboration of Politicized Collective Identity:

Discourse as a Fourth Element

In this section, I begin by noting the apparent interdependency of Simon and Klandermans's three elements: the struggle for power, collective identity, and societal context. I then suggest that each of these elements appears to involve discourse. This

opens up the possibility that discourse is a process that needs to be considered a fourth essential element, which I argue in the last section of this chapter.

Although Simon and Klandermans's conceptual framework is a useful heuristic to understanding politicized collective identity, their metaphor of these elements as "pillars" implies an independence among power, collective identity, and societal context that they did not necessarily intend. Power, for instance, is inherently a relational concept. In some cases, a powerful group will strive to maintain its influence over other less powerful groups; in other cases, two or more groups will be involved in an ongoing power struggle against each other. The struggle for power is thus inseparable from intergroup relations and collective identity. Further, power is played out in everyday practices be they political, economic, or social and is thus embedded within societal context. In sum, the struggle for power incorporates the notion of collective identity and societal context (and vice versa), the extent of which is dependent on the specific struggle.

I propose here to add *discourse* as a fourth, equally inter-related element to Simon and Klandermans's original three. Consider, for instance, that discourse is a form of power. As previously mentioned, in the absence of force, hegemonic positions are established, defended, and changed *discursively* through control over ideology and public discourse (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). For instance, the ruling whites in apartheid South Africa used discourse to maintain and legitimate the racist policies of apartheid South Africa. These racist views were not only discursively communicated (e.g., in the forms of laws and proclamation) but also constituted in discourse (e.g., racial definitions and descriptions embedded in texts and speeches).

Likewise, I argue that discursive processes function to shape collective identity.

Van Dijk (1993a) has shown how (white) elites use specific linguistic devices to construct adversely the identity of immigrant and minority groups in an apparent effort to establish, maintain, and legitimate systems of inequality. An excerpt reported in van Dijk (1993a), taken from a speech of a representative of the extreme right *Front National* in the French Assemblée, is illustrative: “[the French are] worried in face of an immigration out of control, in face of an Islam pure and hard that might cross the Mediterranean. But the French(man) stays tolerant” (p. 87-88). In this passage, collective identities are shaped in part by a classic denial of racism, signalled by the conjunction “but” and through a combination of positive self-presentation (French are “tolerant”) and negative other-presentation (immigrants paired with “out of control” and the threat of “Islam pure and hard,” the latter drawing on long standing prejudices).

Discursive processes also have an impact on societal context. In Québec, one aspect of societal context is the voting public, a third party to the struggle for power between sovereignists and federalists. Although there is a material basis for the *peuple Québécois* (e.g., institutions, language, place of birth, etc.), what it means to be Québécois can be transformed through discursive strategies such as the recounting of an historical narrative and the repositioning of subjects (e.g., as French settlers, Canadians, French Canadians, Québécois; Charland, 1987). Societal context is thus partly constituted in and through discourse.

Although I am proposing that Simon and Klandermans’s three elements are accomplished in discourse, it is apparent that the relationship works the other way too. That is, collective identity, power, and societal context shape discourse. Indeed, there is

an interdependency among all elements. To social psychologists, a familiar way to describe this interdependence is one of reciprocal effects (e.g., power is affected by discourse and discourse is affected by power). Social theorists in other disciplines might well refer to this relationship as dialectical, as have Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) and Harvey (1996).

Where else might discursive processes be involved? The three stages of the politicization process outlined by Simon and Klandermans are illustrative. It is apparent that if grievances are to become shared among group members, they must be communicated. Likewise, adversarial attributions involve *blaming* an external opponent (e.g., through Opposition questioning of the Government during Question Period). To involve society (as a third party), democratic groups engaged in power struggles must attempt to do so through discursive means. During the Québec referendum campaign, for instance, many of the techniques previously enumerated by Klandermans (1997) were used including:

Public speeches; letters of opposition or support; declarations by organizations and institutions; signed public statements, signed advertisements; declarations of indictment and intentions; slogans; caricatures and symbols, banners, posters; displayed communications; expositions; leaflets, pamphlets, books, newspapers and journals; radio, television, organizing public fora featuring well known intellectuals and political figures; publicizing the results of public opinion surveys; wearing of symbols; singing; organizing dramatic events such as marches, demonstrations, door-to-door canvassing.

However, I propose that the role of discourse is not merely limited to the communication or transmission of information of these stages. Rather, these stages are constituted in and through discourse. A given type of discourse used in efforts to involve society (e.g., see Klandermans's list, above) might include grievances and adversarial attributions, but these would be topics of discourse, which are representations of earlier stages. That is, I

will hereafter make a distinction between the initial stage in which groups become aware of or develop shared grievances and adversarial attributions and the triangulation stage in which antagonists use these topics in strategic discourse aimed at involving society on their side. Consider an excerpt from legislation tabled by the sovereignist government of Québec just prior to the 1995 referendum campaign on independence, which described their proposal for an independent Québec: “The Canadian State contravened the federal pact, by invading in a thousand ways areas in which we are autonomous” (Bill 1, 1995). The verb “contravened” signalled a grievance, as did “invading.” Through personification, “the Canadian State” was given human form and was transformed into an adversary, what *they* have done to *us*. Finally, efforts to involve society by triangulation were signalled in part by the personal pronoun “we,” which presupposed a homogeneous we-group comprising sovereignists (the author of the Bill) and the wider society (e.g., Quebecers). At the same time, the use of “we” helped to exclude those Québec politicians who were elected members of the “Canadian State” (i.e., the Liberal majority), the clear antagonist in this excerpt. Taken as a whole, sovereignists align themselves with other Quebecers while at the same time establishing an adversarial relationship between themselves and federalists as well as between other Quebecers and federalists. This boundary construction, in conjunction with asserted grievances, can be viewed as a sovereignist attempt to involve voters by a process of triangulation. Thus, these adversarial attributions and shared grievances are best conceived as topics of discourse that are reintroduced in this Bill, as opposed to stages that are being constituted for the first time for ingroup members. Further, in the analysis of this example (and in the results to come), involvement of society refers only to how protagonists attempted to enlist third

parties in their struggle and not to the actual involvement of third parties, which is not addressed by the data under analysis in the present research.

Contributions of the Present Work

Politicized collective identity. Theoretically, I am proposing that language use plays a central role in explaining the process of accomplishment in Simon and Klandermans's theory of politicized collective identity. Specifically, I suggest that discourse needs to be viewed as a fourth essential element along with collective identity, the struggle for power, and societal context. Taken together, these four elements are consistent with corresponding elements proposed by Harvey (1996) and used by Fairclough to ground CDA theoretically (e.g., Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2001b). Following from the previous discussion of CDA and in particular the interdependency among elements that comprise social practices, I propose that discursive processes incorporate collective identity, the struggle for power, and societal context; conversely, these elements are in part discursive. Analytically, discursive processes can thus be examined to gain insight into the elements underlying Simon and Klandermans's theory of politicized collective identity and the conceptual triad that these elements support.

Using techniques common to CDA, I will examine my proposal that Simon and Klandermans's third stage of the politicization process—*involvement of society by triangulation*—is a complex discursive construction. As previously suggested, campaign literature is one ubiquitous method to convey information, to mobilize consensus, and, more generally, to involve society. However, at a more detailed, discursive level I expect that strategies to involve society will go beyond mere communication of information and

will be constituted in a variety of discursive structures and strategies identified in this material. Further, I expect that campaign discourse will assert grievances and make adversarial attributions that have been reintroduced from earlier periods. However, it is in the third stage, involvement of society, where collective identity fully politicises, and it is here I argue that the discursive embeddedness of politicized collective identity will be most apparent in campaign discourse. Evidence of the discursive embeddedness of grievances, adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society by triangulation will lend support to the idea that discourse is an essential element that needs to be integrated into a theory of politicized collective identity.

A secondary aim of the present work is to show how politicized collective identity explains the struggle for Québec independence as revealed in a CDA of referendum discourse. Of interest is how campaign discourse marks the politicization of sovereignist and federalist identity and also how these two sides try to have their view of Québec independence become shared by the larger society.

Critical discourse analysis. This dissertation will contribute to CDA in method as well as theory. PCI will provide a broad theoretical test of CDA. That is, CDA has offered a systematic approach to understanding texts and relevant social practices, but its explanatory value in relation to understanding other theoretical frameworks, such as PCI, is not well documented. If the politicization process is found to be constituted in and through a range of discursive structures and strategies, it will not only support CDA's interpretative meaning-based approach but will underscore the import of CDA, and its theoretical view of discourse, as an explanatory construct using real world data.

Second, I propose that support for PCI and in particular the third stage of the politicization process will likewise support a theoretical extension of CDA's implicit view of social relations. Theoretically, PCI offers CDA a more complex but intuitively appealing position, namely that of nested and overlapping identities, two constructs introduced in the PCI section. In contrast, CDA has been criticised for adopting an overly simple (bi-polar) model of social relations, for example, that of oppressor and oppressed having only one relationship between them: domination (Hammersley, 1997). However, there is no clear relationship of domination in Québec referendum politics. For instance, both federalists and sovereignists had relatively equal campaign funding (Referendum Act, 1995), access to, and coverage from mass media (e.g., Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 1995). Federalists had the political power at the national level, but the sovereignists had the political power at the provincial level. Arguably, the group that was being controlled, manipulated, and managed was the voting public. This dissertation will examine how federalists and sovereignists attempted to involve Québec voters (as a third party) in their wider struggle for power. Evidence of the discursive embeddedness of the involvement of society by triangulation, and nested identities, will support a broader conceptualization of social relations than CDA has implicitly envisioned.

Stubbs (1997) has criticised CDA for (a) its failure to conduct adequate comparative analyses (e.g., between individual texts or between features of texts with norms in the language) and (b) for relying on too narrow a range of linguistic features in its analyses. Thus, a third way in which the present work is expected to contribute to CDA is in its use of empirical methods that begin to address Stubbs's concerns.

In regard to comparative analyses, this dissertation will examine texts from sovereignists and federalists individually but also in relation to each other. I propose that there will be times in the analysis of one side's text where the other side's text will help to elucidate the linguistic devices in the first instance. This comparative analysis is expected to result in a richer understanding of the first side's text if not the other side's text as well. Within any given side's text, I propose that the discursive construction of grievances, adversarial attributions, and involvement strategies will be more strongly supported if these constructs are embedded within multiple discursive features (e.g., if grievance are constituted in and through metaphors, headings, hybridity, etc.). Analytically, this assertion will be supported if comparisons across linguistic devices reveal the embeddedness of the same PCI construct.

In regard to the criticism over a narrow range of linguistic features found in previous CDA analyses, the present work focuses on a relatively small but complete corpus of discourse (i.e., approximately 7300 words). This selection permits an in-depth examination of the material for a wide range of discursive structures and strategies including lexical choice, metaphor, pronouns, *us* versus *them* categories, grammatical questions, semantic macrostructures (e.g., narrative structure, headings, and lists), intertextuality, and hybridity.

Chapter 4: Methods

Materials

The present inquiry focused on a critical discourse analysis of a Québec referendum campaign booklet (*Yes/No booklet*; Directeur Général des Élections du Québec, 1995). This booklet described the sovereignist and federalist positions in an allotted amount of space, with the Yes side using approximately 3500 words across 20 pages to describe their position and the No side using approximately 3800 words across 17 pages to describe their position.

The Chief Electoral Officer of Québec distributed a French version of the booklet to all Québec households, with the booklet indicating that English translations of each side's text were available by making a request to the Yes or No side, respectively (i.e., each side provided a translation of their own text). The present analyses were conducted on these English translations (i.e., National Committee for the Yes, 1995, Appendix A; Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, Appendix B), which were obtained from each side, respectively.

Rationale for selection of material. A decision was made to focus on a single sample of referendum discourse, as opposed to analysing a corpus of referendum speeches and texts, because this provided a more robust opportunity for in-depth analysis of the hypothesised embeddedness of the three stages of the politicization process. Specifically, the analysis of the Yes/No booklet was aided by a number of favourable production and distribution properties: a) given the booklet's moderate length, each side was able to articulate its position on Québec independence and comment on the opposing side's position; b) the booklet was available in French and English; c) it was an official

document published by the Government of Québec; and d) it had mass distribution as it was circulated to every household in Québec during the referendum campaign. Given these characteristics, I viewed the booklet as a key document for both sides.

Analysis

The political context of the 1995 Québec referendum provided a starting point for the first phase of analysis. That is, controversy over specific issues, especially, the use of *sovereign* and *partnership* in the referendum question, underscored competing lexicalizations between Yes and No sides and a major No side grievance. Initially, segments of text that appeared relevant to a theme of political independence or partnership/identity (broadly interpreted) were noted, with particular emphasis on the use of figurative language. These categories aside, the initial analyses did not begin with pre-established themes, and even these categories stemmed from exposure to wider referendum discourse. Yes and No texts were read independently, with linguistic features found in one document providing the impetus for examining the other document for like features. The search function of a common word processor aided in the pursuit of certain hunches and in locating instances of particular textual features.

In subsequent readings, variations on the words, metaphors, and other linguistic features located in the initial reading were identified. For instance, the multiple readings resulted in a large collection of recurring words and metaphors with similar connotations, which were organized together and subsequently labelled into very general themes such as deception, militaristic, etc. In an effort to elaborate these emergent themes, the texts were re-examined. This sometimes led to the refinement or the breaking up of a theme

into several others (e.g., a militaristic theme into aggression and imperialism themes), which started the analytical process of re-reading the sample of discourse.

In a second phase of analysis, the emergent themes were interpreted in relation to the three stages of the politicization process—grievances, adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society by triangulation. This process involved continued re-examination of the Yes and No texts for refinement and comprehensiveness. In addition to an analysis of lexical choice and metaphor, other linguistic devices common to critical discourse analysis were examined including inclusive-we pronouns, us-versus-them dichotomies, grammatical questions, semantic macrostructures (e.g., introductions, headings, and lists), intertextuality, and hybridity. (These features are described in the Results Chapter to take advantage of campaign discourse to aid in their interpretation).

Warranting. Wood and Kroger (2000) have suggested that warranting is a co-construction. Specifically, they argue that the transparency of discourse-analytic work, both in the documentation of procedures and in the documentation of data excerpts, enables both analyst and reader to evaluate claims. Approaching the warranting of claims in this fashion underscores the empirical basis of discourse analysis; that is, conclusions are derived from and guided by the data at hand (in this case, excerpted text) as opposed to merely “intuition, authority, faith, or some other means of knowing without recourse to data” (Bavelas, 1995, p. 1).

Consistent with others in the field (e.g., Potter & Reicher, 1987), selected text from the Yes/No booklet is reported in the Results section as numbered block quotations to support assertions. In this way, the reader does not have to take the interpretations presented on faith but can determine for him- or herself if the claims are warranted. When

providing examples of particular discursive features, **bold** format is used in the block quotations to distinguish key words or phrases that exemplify the feature under discussion. Moreover, **bold** is used in place of quotation marks in the text to distinguish the material under discussion, which is consistent with how this type of analysis is reported.

In general, when a given feature or excerpt is discussed, it should be understood that the interpretation presented is sometimes influenced by the larger context in which the feature is situated whether this is the sentence, paragraph, or some larger unit (including the text of the opposing side). Sometimes context is drawn from material other than the Yes/No booklet, such as the written referendum question or quotations from relevant political figures, and is used to support points raised in the text.

Researchers working in the tradition of CDA recognise that their analyses are grounded in not only theory and practice but also in the perspectives and influences that they as individuals bring to the analyses. In the present work, potential influences include a number of nested identities that help shape who I am including an Anglophone living outside of Québec, politically liberal, and a doctoral candidate in social psychology. In regards to the latter, I sometimes draw from work in this discipline to help support analytical claims (e.g., repetition of message, credibility of source). A researcher in history or political science might well have a different basis for grounding analyses. Additionally, my position on political independence is shaped, in part, from travel in my early twenties during which time I viewed borders as walls to keep people in (and out) and as an impediment to a citizen of the world. My view on political independence is that people should have the right to decide for themselves whether they want to be a

sovereign people. There is a caveat. To maintain hegemonic positions, elites have long manufactured the consent of the public by using language as a control (e.g., Herman & Chomsky, 1988). I am thus opposed to the manipulation of language and to those elites who are agents of such manipulation. Applied to the Québec referendum, I am unfavourably disposed to each side's manipulation of campaign discourse in an apparent attempt to involve voters in their wider struggle to which both sides are equally guilty, as will be shown in what follows.

Chapter 5: Results

The main thesis of this dissertation is that discourse plays an integral role in politicized collective identity (PCI), particularly in the third stage of the politicization process, in which the adversaries seek the involvement of the wider society. In this chapter, support for the discursive embeddedness of PCI comes from a variety of linguistically oriented micro and macro features present in the Yes/No booklet: lexical choice, metaphors, inclusive-we pronouns, us-versus-them dichotomies, grammatical questions, semantic macrostructures (e.g., narrative structure, headings, and lists), intertextuality, and hybridity. The results that follow are organized by these features. First, a brief theoretical overview of a given feature is presented, followed by an analysis of the feature in the Yes side text, then by an analysis of the No side text if the feature is applicable. In general, I try to show how these textual devices are used and what they are used to do. In doing this, I move back and forth from analysis to description and summary.

Lexical Choice

Lexical choice, the selection of one lexical item over another (e.g., Hodge & Kress, 1993; van Dijk, 1995), is the first of many discursive strategies noted. Two aspects of lexical choice are of interest: the selection of words (this section) and the selection of metaphors (discussed separately in the next section).

I begin with lexical choice because the description and analysis of this feature provides a context from which to interpret subsequently analysed features. It is also one of the more publicly recognized features of the referendum campaign. Given the 1995 Québec referendum was about whether Québec would become an independent country, it

is perhaps not surprising that political independence dominated as a theme. There was a great deal of contention over wording to the referendum question, which is reproduced in Excerpt 1:

1. Do you agree that Québec should become **sovereign**, after having made a formal offer to Canada for a new Economic and Political Partnership, within the scope of the Bill respecting the future of Québec and of the agreement signed on June 12, 1995? Yes or No. (Votes and Proceedings, 1995, p. 717)

Among other claims, the No side argued that the Yes side's question was unclear because it referred to becoming **sovereign** but did not refer to the *separation* of Québec from Canada or to the fact that Québec would be a *sovereign country*. This dispute is over lexical choice.

Yes Side Text

The referendum question underscored the Yes side's preferred construction of political independence as *sovereignty* or *sovereign*. These lexical choices and only these choices were used in campaign discourse. The only exception was a single sentence in which **sovereignty** co-occurred with **autonomy** as shown in Excerpt 2, below. Otherwise, the term *sovereignty* was used numerous times throughout the Yes text and in the text's major headings. Moreover, the meaning of sovereignty was fairly explicit, as suggested by Excerpt 2 and Excerpt 3, the latter being the text's concluding sentence. An examination of other Yes side discourse, including legislative bills relating to independence and parliamentary debates (e.g., Bill 1, 1995; House of Commons Debates, 1995), supports the notion that *sovereignty* was the preferred lexical choice with *autonomy* and *independence* occurring much less frequently, and *separation* not at all (O'Connor, 1998).

2. Only **sovereignty** can answer, now and for the future, Quebecers' desire for **autonomy**. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 21)

3. It is with pride and enthusiasm that Quebecers will say YES to change and that the **new sovereign country** of Québec will soon come into being [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 21)

The Yes side's ubiquitous and consistent use of *sovereignty* and the absence of other synonyms suggest a purposeful communication strategy. In light of No side assertions (i.e., that the referendum was about separation, the break up of Canada, etc.), a strategy of issue management took on added relevance for the Yes side if it was to have its version of Québec independence accepted by the wider public over that of the No side's. Why an issue-management strategy of *political independence as sovereignty* might have been beneficial is discussed next.

Words that denote political independence differ in how they mark the relationship between Canada and Québec. That is, some words convey a lower (or higher) degree of affinity or involvement than others (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b; Wiener & Mehrabian, 1968). For instance, the use of *sovereign* in the referendum question constructed Québec independence without reference to Canada, as shown by the first clause of Excerpt 1, "Do you agree that Québec should become sovereign?" In contrast, other wordings would have been inherently relational (e.g., "Do you agree that Québec should *separate from* Canada). Although all words that denote political independence presuppose a relationship between Canada and Québec to some extent, as the aforementioned examples illustrate, some do so less explicitly than others do and thus may be more strategic. In general, the consistent use of the word *sovereignty* might have prevented unintended and possibly damaging interpretations that could have arisen if other lexical choices were made. Moreover, the use of *sovereignty* over other lexical items might have facilitated the process of involving society by triangulation by not directly engaging voters' connection with Canada.

Several other characteristics of the word *sovereignty* make this lexical choice strategic. The word *sovereignty* is frequently used in international political discourse and thus has a certain degree of legitimacy. The *Charter of the United Nations* (1945/1995), for instance, refers to *sovereignty*, as do several other international agreements (e.g., *Sovereignty of States in the UN*, 1990; *Sovereignty over Natural Resources*, 1990). Within Canada, a recent Supreme Court ruling dealing with certain questions relating to the secession of Québec from Canada made frequent reference to *sovereign*, *sovereignty*, and *sovereignist* (Supreme Court of Canada, 1998).

Public opinion surveys at the time of the referendum also supported the thesis that the Yes side's preferred lexical choice was strategically related to controlling or managing the public's understanding of Québec independence. That is, respondents were more favourably disposed to the notion of Québec independence when queried about *sovereignty* than when queried about *separation* or *independence* (Pinard, 1994). These results suggest that varied expressions of political independence differ in their ability to persuade.

A number of studies in other areas have suggested that people are influenced by the words used to describe an issue or event. For instance, denotatively similar words, such as *baby* versus *fetus*, have been shown to construct very different representations of an issue such as abortion (Danet, 1980). Similarly, the use of *hit* versus *smashed* in questioning observers has been shown to differentially affect the way they recalled an event such as a traffic accident (Loftus & Palmer, 1974). Given that words are one of the smallest units of analysis distinguishable in discourse, word selection is one of the

primary ways in which meaning is conveyed at the local or micro-level. These studies, as well as the Pinard (1994) poll, suggest that even single words are influential.

The term *sovereignty* might also have been strategic because of its historical usage in Québec society. In a 1980 referendum, for instance, the government of Québec asked voters in part to give it a mandate to negotiate an agreement “based on the equality of nations ... [that] would enable Québec to acquire the exclusive powers to make its laws, levy its taxes and establish relations abroad—in other words, sovereignty” (Votes and Proceedings, 1980, p. 747). Further, a precursor to the Parti Québécois during the later half of the 1960s, the Mouvement Souveraineté-Association, actively declared themselves in favour of the disengagement of Québec from Canada (McRoberts & Posgate, 1980).

In general, an issue-management strategy of lexicalizing political independence as *sovereignty* would appear to play an important role in the Yes side’s attempt to attract Québec voters. Specifically, the Yes side’s lexicalization helps to demarcate their position from that of the No side in relatively favourable terms. Although we cannot be sure how many Québécois would have voted for independence had another term been used, the aforementioned factors suggest an empirical and theoretical basis for constructing political independence as *sovereignty*, which is consistent with the triangulation of voters toward the sovereignist option.

No Side Text

One striking feature of the No side campaign booklet was the reformulation of *sovereignty* into *separation*, as suggested below by Excerpt 4. Although the No side said that, **It doesn’t matter what you call it!** (Excerpt 5), their full text suggested otherwise. That is, there were 29 references to separation and only two references to sovereignty,

one instance of which was used pejoratively and the other was shown in Excerpt 5. (This enumeration excludes six unfavourable references to sovereignty by leading sovereigntist figures quoted out of context in the text's margins, as shown in Appendix B.) The No side's wider discourse further supports the notion that *separation* was used purposefully, as in the reported speech of the Prime Minister of Canada speaking in the House of Commons (Excerpt 6).

4. The issue of this referendum is simple: do we want Québec to **separate from** Canada and become an independent country? (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 1)
5. The issue in this referendum is **separation, independence, sovereignty. It doesn't matter what you call it!** In the event of a yes vote, the result would be the same: Québec would no longer be part of Canada, or of the Canadian economic union. An international border would **separate us from** our families, friends and fellow citizens in Ontario, New Brunswick and elsewhere in Canada. Quebecers would no longer be represented in the federal Cabinet or in Parliament. (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 3)
6. We are answering the ambiguous question posed by the PQ and the **separatists**. The question is **separation**. If Quebecers understand well, they will understand that the issue is **separation** and Quebecers do not want to **separate from** Canada. (Jean Chrétien, quoted in House of Commons Debates, 1995, p. 15598)

As excerpts 4-6 suggest, exact repetition of the lexical item *separation* was quite prevalent in the No side text. However, campaign material was not limited to exact repetition of separation, but also included paraphrasing, **Québec would no longer be part of Canada** and **Quebecers would no longer be represented in the federal Cabinet or in Parliament** (Excerpt 5) and repetition with variation as suggested by **separate, break up, and independent** (Excerpt 7, below). These oft-repeated expressions are all lexical choices.

7. The yes side is proposing to **separate us from Canada, to break up the union,** and at the same time make an offer to our former fellow citizens to reconstitute an economic union governed by additional political institutions. **But Québec would**

become an independent country, regardless of the outcome of the offer.
(Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 3)

Québec independence was further defined in No side terms by the scope of lexical choices they used, as suggested by Table 1. Most of these lexicalizations helped shape political independence into something it might not have necessarily stood for if *sovereignty* had been used exclusively. Québec independence as *separation*, for instance, took on connotations of divorce, loss, isolation, abandonment, and destruction. Indeed, most of the lexical choices used by the No side had negative connotations and emphasized the unfavourable consequences of a yes vote for independence (e.g., loss of representation, of economic union, of passport, etc.).

Table 1. Federalist expressions of independence

Autonomy
Break-up
Cease to be part of Canada
A foreign country, foreigners
Independent country/ Québec, independence, out-and-out independence
No longer be part of Canada
No longer be part of the Canadian economic and political union
No longer be represented in the federal Cabinet or in Parliament
No longer living in its [Canada] territory
No longer be citizens [of Canada]
No longer had the right to vote
Separate, separated, separation, separatist leaders/forces
Sovereignty, sovereign
Torn apart
Turned our backs [on Canadians]

Why might the No side use a wider variety of lexicalization than the Yes side?

The use of several related words to denote a single concept, such as political independence, foregrounds its social value more clearly and thus makes the concept more socially charged because of the slightly different but related connotations that a variety of lexical choices draw together (Halliday, 1976). Manipulating concepts in this manner potentially shifts public opinion to a more extreme position than if only one word is used repeatedly (Trew, 1979). For instance, several No side lexical choices repeatedly underscored threatened privileges (one of the four types of grievances identified by Simon and Klandermans), as suggested in Excerpt 5 by **Quebecers would no longer be represented in the federal Cabinet or in Parliament** and by several of the examples in Table 1. As will be discussed in the next section on Metaphor, the No side's (re)definition of political independence provided a context for one of the No side's major grievances—the notion that the Yes side was trying to trick Quebecers with an **ambiguous question** (Excerpt 6).

Lexical choice also enabled the No side to define the referendum campaign in its own terms. This notion was underscored directly in the No side text: **The issue of this referendum is simple: do we want Québec to separate from Canada** (Excerpt 4), **The issue in this referendum is separation, independence, sovereignty** (Excerpt 5), **the issue is separation** (Excerpt 6), and **Separation: the only issue** (heading in No side text, Appendix B, p. 3). The goal of the No side was undoubtedly to persuade Québec voters to share its interpretation of the referendum and reject the Yes side position of independence. By (re)defining political independence, the No side was attempting to strategically control or manage the referendum debate. This corresponds to the

triangulation stage of PCI. That is, the No side was not only demarcating its position from that of the Yes side through lexical choice but was doing so in an active campaign in which it was trying to persuade voters to take their view and therefore choose its option over that of the Yes side.

Another aspect of No side efforts to involve voters in campaign material was the degree of affinity among lexicalizations of political independence conveyed by the No side compared to the Yes side (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b; Wiener & Mehrabian, 1968). As alluded to previously, many of the No side's relexicalizations of sovereignty had a high degree of affinity, underscoring the relationship between Québec and the rest of Canada. For instance, to become *separate* presupposes that one must separate from something else, as suggested by "Do you agree that Québec should separate from Canada?" No side choices were characteristically relational and suggested distancing or potential loss, attributes not associated with the Yes side's preferred choices (e.g., *sovereign*, *independence* or *autonomy*), which occurred infrequently in the No text.

Metaphors

Discourse analysts view metaphors as more than merely poetical adornments. Rather, metaphors help convey a particular understanding of a text, first by suggesting an analogy or comparison (e.g., a flood of immigrants); they help us understand one thing in terms of another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). They also enable us to talk about an issue on an additional, ostensibly more concrete level, which can give form to an idea that may be difficult to express directly. Fairclough (1992b) has suggested that by selecting one kind of metaphor over another (one kind of lexical choice), it is possible to shape reality in different ways. For instance, in an analysis of policy discussions about illicit drugs in the

United States, McGaw (1991) observed frequent war metaphors such as *this fight against drugs, victory over drugs is our cause, total offensive, and the gravest domestic threat facing our nation today is drugs*. McGaw suggested that war metaphors had the effect of guiding policy solutions on illicit drugs toward law enforcement and punishment and away from treatment or legalization. Taken together, the aforementioned properties of metaphor make their use particularly appealing to politicians who frequently want to persuade the public to accept a particular way of viewing an issue or group.

A variety of metaphors in the Yes side text contributed to the discursive construction of grievances, adversarial attributions, and involvement strategies. As will be shown, a proposed economic and political treaty linking Quebecers in an independent Québec with Canada was underscored by a *partnership* metaphor, which implied an involvement strategy. The Yes side also metaphorically cast the Canadian state as an *aggressor*, which conveyed grievances and adversarial attributions, and rich imagery was used to portray Quebecers as suffering under an *imperialistic* central government, which likewise emphasized grievances and adversarial attributions. In the No side text, a *deception* metaphor contributed to the construction of a major No Side grievance and functioned to construct adversarial attributions and the triangulation of society. These metaphors and their implications to a theory of PCI are discussed in turn.

Partnership Metaphors in the Yes Side Text

Throughout the Yes side text, frequent reference was made to the kind of relationship Quebecers in an independent Québec would have with Canada, namely, a *partnership*. The prevalence of a partnership metaphor can be attributed to the inclusion of a partnership treaty in the Yes side's platform. The referendum question itself, for instance, referred to an **offer to Canada for a new Economic and Political Partnership**

(Excerpt 1). Metaphorically, a partnership linked a sovereign Québec with Canada, as suggested by Excerpts 8 and 9.

8. ESTABLISH within a new political partnership a council of ministers in which the two STATES, acting as equals, will decide on how the treaty is to be implemented [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 11)
9. The partnership offer which shall be made to Canada, following a YES victory in the referendum, is inspired by values of openness and respect for two peoples called by geography and history to live side-by-side as good neighbours [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 21)

By selecting a partnership metaphor, the Yes side extended the typical view associated with bilateral relations between two countries. That is, most people do not regard such a relationship as a partnership, but as something less (e.g., an alliance, friend, etc.). Moreover, the metaphor helped to elaborate the kind of partnership proposed by the Yes side. That is, it depicted an equal relationship, as suggested explicitly by Excerpt 8 (**acting as equals**), and a close friendly working relationship, as suggested by the metaphor of **good neighbours** in Excerpts 9. The modifiers *economic* and *political* (Excerpt 1) further extended the domain of the proposed partnership.

The emphasis on equality and neighbourliness might well have spoken to different groups. On the one hand, that aspect of the partnership metaphor emphasizing equality might help to involve those Quebecers who supported the sovereignist project because it denoted an equal relationship between Canada and Québec (nation to nation). This facet of the partnership metaphor thus challenged an opposing view, popular among federalists, of Québec as but one of ten equal provinces. On the other hand, the aspect of the partnership metaphor that emphasized neighbourliness might appeal to those Quebecers wary of cutting ties with Canada because it suggested a future relationship between Canada and Québec that was close and friendly. As an involvement strategy, this

dual positioning might well influence a greater number of people to vote for Québec independence than would otherwise be the case.

The notion of a partnership metaphor as an involvement strategy in the Yes side text is further supported by a consideration of the historical context surrounding Québec independence. Specifically, the 1995 Québec referendum's partnership metaphor was a change from the Yes side's earlier position of an *association* with Canada. The 1980 referendum question on Québec independence, for instance, asked Quebecers to give the government of Québec a mandate to negotiate an agreement that "would enable Québec to acquire . . . sovereignty—and at the same time, to maintain with Canada an economic association" (Votes and Proceedings, 1980, p. 747). Although Bill 1, which was referred to in the referendum question, made reference to a *partnership treaty* and both Bill 1 and the 1995 referendum question (as shown in Excerpt 1) referred to an *economic and political partnership* (Bill 1, 1995; Votes and Proceedings, 1995, p. 717), an earlier draft of the Bill, tabled in the Québec National Assembly the previous year, also referred to an *economic association* (Draft Bill, 1994). Linguistically, the change from *association* to *partnership* was a change toward a higher degree of affinity or involvement between Canada and Québec (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b; Wiener & Mehrabian, 1968). That is, partnership implied a closer relationship between Canada and Québec than did *association*. For those Quebecers wary of cutting ties with Canada, a strategy that linked partnership and sovereignty might be regarded more favourably and thus help to triangulate voters than a strategy that linked association and sovereignty or one using sovereignty alone.

Others have used a partnership metaphor in the past with some success. In Italy during the early 1920s, an offer of industrial *co-partnership* by the Government of Giolitti to the unions helped settle a serious labour dispute, an approach followed successfully by De Gaulle 48 years later in France during worker and student demonstrations (Gramsci, 1971). Here, too, it would appear that an involvement strategy centring on creating a partnership metaphor was considered strategic.

As will be shown, the Yes side's use of a partnership metaphor laid the foundation for one of the No side's more powerful metaphors (and grievance), that of the Yes side as tricksters who are trying to deceive voters by "playing with words" (Jean Chrétien, House of Commons Debates, 1995, p. 15641).

Aggression Metaphors in the Yes Side Text

Although the offer of a future partnership with Canada suggested the prospect of a positive workable relationship, other metaphors in the Yes side text portrayed the past, present, and even future relationship between Canada and Québec as one of federal aggression against Québec and its inhabitants. These metaphors discursively positioned the federal government as Québec's adversary and helped colour a number of the Yes side's purported grievances.

Several lexical choices contributed to the metaphorical portrayal of the Canadian State as an aggressor toward Québec and its people. For instance, we see **strike** in Excerpt 10, **coup de force** in Excerpt 11, and **crush** in Excerpt 12. The role of the Canadian State as an aggressor was further advanced in the text by the mix of verb tenses. That is, Canada was portrayed as being both an aggressor in the past (as shown by Excerpts 11 and 12) and in the future if Québec should remain in Canada (as shown in Excerpts 10 and 12). Political independence was thus positioned as the only option that

would protect Québec (as suggested by the inverse of the rhetorical phrase **By voting NO** in Excerpt 12).

10. The next reform, which the federal government refuses to divulge, will **strike at women and the young**. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 13)
11. Then came the reply: Jean Chrétien **orchestrated a coup de force** to repatriate the Canadian Constitution in 1982, despite the formal refusal of the National Assembly [*italics in original*]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 14)
12. By voting NO: Jean Chrétien is handed a blank cheque to **crush** Québec. He will continue to **crush us** by centralizing in Ottawa even more **powers**. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 15)

Although the aggressive acts mentioned in Excerpts 10-12 did not literally occur, the rich imagery portrayed by these metaphors could shape some people's views of federalists (i.e., as adversaries). The pairing of metaphors of aggression with a mix of factual and plausible grievances could further shape perceptions. That is, if Quebecers were wary of past federal reforms, concerned about the manner in which the constitution was repatriated without the consent of the government of Québec (Excerpt 11), and believed that powers were too centralized in Ottawa (Excerpt 12), they might be more disposed to accept the Yes side's metaphors of aggression. In any event, the negative connotations associated with these metaphors underscored adversarial attributions and Yes side grievances and may well cause grievances to resonate more forcefully with voters than would otherwise be the case. This strategy appeared designed to foster an involvement of society through processes of triangulation (vote No and they will **crush us**).

Imperialism Metaphors in the Yes Side Text

The Yes side grievance of federalist forces as aggressors extended to a related, more specific characterization of Canada as an imperialistic regime governing over an

oppressed people. The portrayal of Québec as suffering under an oppressive (federal) government would appear to parallel, if not draw from, other struggles of oppressed groups such as Natives, Blacks, and people living under the control of a colonizing or repressive government. Rich lexical choices combined to shape the Canadian state as an oppressor; for example **regime**, **denies**, and **deprives** in Excerpt 13, **federalism of trusteeship** and **domination** in Excerpt 14, and **regime** again in Excerpt 15. The Yes side extends this metaphorical portrayal by casting the Canadian state in an authoritative or controlling role over Quebecers, as suggested by **central government** and **general powers it holds** in Excerpt 14 and the ironic use of **offers us** in Excerpt 15. The active voice (subject-verb-object) underscores these constructions (e.g., **A federal regime that denies we are people and deprives us**). Moreover, present tense suggested that the Yes side's purported grievance of the Canadian State as oppressor was not merely historical but true in present day as well.

13. [Independence] offers the only possible response to a **federal regime** that denies we are a people and **deprives us** of the means to ensure our own development. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 2)
14. If Québec wants to **emancipate** itself from the **federalism of trusteeship** and from the **domination of a central government** constantly reinforced by the dynamic of the **general powers it holds**, there is no way out except sovereignty. (Tremblay, cited in National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 8)
15. DECIDE on our priorities and put an end to the **inequities** of a **regime** that **offers us** social assistance and unemployment insurance while outside of Québec it creates jobs [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 9)

By portraying the Canadian State as an oppressor, Quebecers were unavoidably cast as oppressed. This not only reinforced boundaries between Québec and Canada (*us* vs. *them*), but also underscored a common Québec identity (i.e., of an oppressed people). The Yes side reinforced this common identity with the inclusive pronouns **we**, **us**, and

our (Excerpts 15 and 17), a discursive strategy that will be discussed in more detail in a subsequent section.)

Metaphors of imperialism and the resulting construction of boundaries functioned as an involvement strategy through a process of voter triangulation. By presenting a mix of factual and plausible grievances, the Yes side positioned the Canadian State as an oppressive adversary, which might make some voters wary of the No side and the position the No side represented. At the same time, the Yes side drew on the context of an oppressed people to situate the sovereignist project, which presumably could make voters more sympathetic toward their cause. Strategically, by portraying the current relationship between Canada and Québec as one of oppressor and oppressed, political independence was positioned as the justifiable alternative to the status quo. The Yes text underscored this interpretation: sovereignty **offers the only possible response** (Excerpt 13, above), sovereignty would **emancipate** (Excerpt 14, above), and put **an end to the inequities** (Excerpt 15, above).

Deception Metaphors in the No Side Text

The Yes side's referendum question came under severe criticism by the No side, through suggestions that its reference to *sovereignty*, *partnership*, and a previous *agreement* obscured the Yes side's true intention, which the No side argues was to make Québec a completely independent country following a Yes vote in the referendum. The No side exploited Yes side lexical choices of political independence by drawing on them to support their main grievance, that of Yes side dishonesty. This deception theme was exemplified by the pairing of references to the referendum question with rich metaphors about trickery, for example, **option** with **shrouded** and **fog of confusion** (Excerpt 16),

the question with **smoke and mirrors** (Excerpt 17), and in a previous section with the pairing of **the ambiguous question** with **separation** (Excerpt 6).

16. The separatists have **shrouded** their **option** in a **fog of confusion** (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 15)
17. This referendum is about whether or not we separate from Canada. **The question** speaks of sovereignty and of partnerships and agreements. But beyond the **smoke and mirrors**, we know that the only sure result of a yes vote would be that Québec would no longer be part of Canada. (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 15)

In addition to direct references to the referendum question, other segments of No side campaign discourse oriented toward the Yes side's alleged general lack of trustworthiness including **one grand illusion** (p. 4), **the/an illusion** (p. 4 and 15), **selling the illusion** (p. 15), **Enough tricks!** (heading, p. 5), **another example of trickery** (p. 5), and **deceptive appearance** (p. 8). As with the No side's repeated use of negative words to denote political independence (separation, break-up, etc.), the deception theme drew together a collection of related words, each having a slightly different negative connotation. From these, an identity was implied (e.g., liar, trickster, swindler, magician, or charlatan). Metaphorically, these lexical choices not only underscored the No side's preferred point of view (i.e., the Yes side is deceptive) but potentially directed voters to view the Yes side as sharing other characteristics associated with this identity. For instance, the stereotypical trickster (read *separatist*) is not only deceptive, but might also be dishonest, sinister, and even threatening.

Metaphors of deception, and in particular their pairing with the referendum question, suggested a purposeful strategy by the No side to undermine the referendum question, the Yes side's credibility, and the credibility of the sovereignist project in general. If doubt about Yes side claims was established, voters might well be wary of

Québec independence. Research on the trustworthiness of communicators supports this general argument. People regarded as having lower levels of credibility are found to be less persuasive than those having higher levels (e.g., Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Pratkanis & Aronson, 1991).

Applied to politicized collective identity, metaphors of deception functioned to shape grievances, adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society by triangulation. A grievance took the form of a violated principle. Democracies are founded on a fair and open vote, whether for elected representatives or concerning issues put to the public for ratification, such as referenda. "Playing with words" to seek advantage violates this fairness/democratic principle. In Québec referendum discourse, this violation quite naturally led to adversarial attributions, **We are answering the ambiguous question posed by the PQ and the separatists** (Excerpt 6). The discursive construction of this grievance and the resulting adversarial attribution it implied functioned not only to portray the Yes side and their project in a negative light but provided the No side with a stepping off point for counter claims. These claims and counter claims signalled the No side's effort to triangulate voters toward their option and away from the Yes side. That is, federalism was purported to be the safe bet and sovereignists and their claims were cast as trickery, leading to the conclusion that Quebecers should vote No in the referendum. As we shall see, other discursive features in the No side text reinforced this general argument.

Although substantiating the claims of either side is not the focus of the present work, Yes side deception can be seen in part as an ideological construction of the No side if one considers a wider context. The Yes side may well have manipulated the wording of

the referendum question to its advantage. However, the referendum question was not entirely at odds with one used earlier by the federal government for the national referendum on the Charlottetown Accord. [The Charlottetown Accord was an attempt to amend the Constitution that was supported by the 11 First Ministers, one of whom was from Québec, in addition to Territorial and Aboriginal representatives. The Accord was rejected by a majority of Quebecers and by a majority of voters in the rest of Canada. Its phrasing **Do you agree that the Constitution of Canada should be renewed on the basis of the agreement reached on August 28, 1992?** (House of Commons Debates, 1992, p. 12786) was arguably as ambiguous as **Do you agree that Québec should become sovereign, after having made a formal offer to Canada for a new Economic and Political Partnership, within the scope of the Bill respecting the future of Québec and of the agreement signed on June 12, 1995? Yes or No** (Votes and Proceedings, 1995, p. 717)]. Moreover, the No side's claim that the reference to *sovereign* in the referendum question was not fully understood by voters to mean that Québec would become an independent country ignored the position of the Yes side given in the Yes/No booklet and sent to all Québec households (e.g., Excerpt 2 and 3). The June 12 agreement cited in the referendum question and distributed within Québec prior to the referendum also made explicit that a sovereign Québec would become a country, as suggested by Excerpt 18:

18. On the date fixed in the proclamation of the National Assembly, the Declaration of sovereignty appearing in the Preamble shall take effect and Québec shall become a sovereign country; it shall acquire the exclusive power to pass all its laws, levy all its taxes and conclude all its treaties. (Bill 1, 1995)

Québec voters were inundated with claims and counter-claims from both the Yes and No sides. This brief examination of the wider context within which the No side's deception

theme was situated highlights that these claims were ideologically shaped, by using lexical choice and metaphor, which suggests an involvement strategy of triangulating voters by way of disparaging the Yes side and its position.

Inclusive-We Pronouns

The use of first-person plural pronouns (we, us, our, ours, and ourselves) is one of the principal ways in which politicians align themselves with others, for example, in relation to a political party, government, country, region, or voters (Chilton & Schäffner, 1997; de Cillia, Reisigl & Wodak, 1999). Politicians accomplish this in part by manipulating the intended referents of these pronouns.

With the *exclusive we*, politicians use such pronouns to refer only to themselves. That is, they do not imply that their position or claim is shared by other reference groups (Fairclough, 2001a). For instance, a leader might state his or her party's position on a particular issue and use first-person plural pronouns to refer to the party, with no intention of implying that *we* or *our* refers to society at large.

With the *inclusive we*, politicians draw on nested identities to speak not only for themselves but also for other parties (a part is speaking for the whole). This form is frequently used despite the heterogeneity of the larger group (e.g., differences in class, religion, language, or political ideology). The *inclusive we* does not always have clear referents and is thus sometimes ambiguous or indeterminate (Chilton & Schäffner, 1997). An example of the *inclusive we* would be a political party that presents its position (or interpretation) as that of the larger we-group by using personal pronouns to link itself with this wider group. Implicit in the use of this form is that the writer or speaker has the authority to speak for others (Fairclough, 2001a).

Simon and Klandermans (2001) have suggested that politicized collective identity is “always nested identity in that it presupposes identification with the more inclusive social entity” (p. 326). Applied to politicized collective identity, the *inclusive we* is one way by which politicians discursively draw on nested identities and thus attempt to involve society or parts therein.

Yes Side Text

Several nested identities or we-groups appeared in the Yes text including the Yes side, Québec, Quebecers, French Québec, and Francophones. The document opened with the only instance of the *exclusive we*, occurring in a direct quotation: **We agree to join forces and coordinate our efforts. . . Jacques Parizeau Lucien Bouchard Mario Dumont** (p. 2). This extract helped to communicate a united front among three prominent Québec politicians, each of whom led their own political party, collectively forming the Yes side. Of particular interest to the present discussion are the *inclusive-we* passages having the referent Québec (or Quebecers). As shown by Excerpt 19 (the first of five items in a bulleted list of warnings), the Yes side used *we* to unite themselves with other Quebecers and to extend their interpretation of a No vote to all. Excerpt 19 (and the list’s other bulleted points, for example, Excerpt 20) also underscored how the Yes side used the *inclusive we* in an apparent attempt to persuade the wider society to share purported grievances (threatened privileges).

19. This time, Quebecers have been warned:

By voting NO: We accept that the elderly, the unemployed, and in particular women and young people would be the first victims of federal cuts. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 15)

The *inclusive we* was also used to bind the Yes side with an ethnolinguistic we-group, specifically French-speaking people, as indicated by Excerpt 20. Additionally, the

reference to French-speaking people worked in part to exclude those people who were not French speaking, suggesting a purposeful involvement strategy centring on the triangulation of ethnolinguistic groups (a claim further supported by the reference to “English speaking”). The construction of *we-versus-they* or *us-versus-them* dichotomies and their role in efforts to triangulate society will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

20. By voting No: **We** refuse to give ourselves the powers necessary to ensure our future as a **French-speaking people** in North America and we take the risk that, within one generation, the majority of Montrealers will be **English-speaking**. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 16)

The Yes side’s use of the *inclusive we* was sometimes ambiguous because the nested group(s) being linked were not always clear. As suggested by Excerpts 21, the ambiguity resulted from the mix of references to (all) Québec and Quebecers on the one hand and indeterminate references to other sub-groupings such as ethnolinguistic. For instance, the potential referents of **we** in Excerpt 21 included the Yes side and Quebecers but also the notion of **a people** (Excerpt 21). The indeterminacy arose out of the possible meanings attributed to “people,” which might be viewed as implying geography, culture, or language. Identification of the specific *we*-group aside, the *inclusive we* allowed Yes side grievances to be transformed into grievances of the larger *we*-group. The inclusive *we* thus facilitated a shared collective identity among sovereignists and Quebecers, which according to Simon and Klandermans (2001) heightens the awareness of shared grievances.

21. [Independence] offers the only possible response to a federal regime that denies **we are a people** and deprives **us** of the means to ensure **our** own development. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 2)

As suggested previously, with the *inclusive we*, the part (the Yes side) was speaking for the whole (Quebecers, Francophones). The argument that the sovereignist government of Québec was the only body that spoke for Quebecers (or French Quebecers) was rejected outright by former Prime Minister Trudeau, who argued that this notion was the very essence of sovereignist ideology. He suggested that “if one believes in Canada, one must equally believe that, in matters constitutional, Québec members elected to the Canadian Parliament represented Québec’s electorate just as much as the members of the Québec National Assembly” (Pierre Trudeau, 1996, February). Denis Coderre, a Liberal Member of Parliament, echoed Trudeau’s beliefs in the House of Commons:

I would just make one correction to what my [Bloc Quebecois] colleague said, and I will be doing this often. There should be no talk of **we the people of Québec**, because I am one of the people of Québec and because 62 percent of the people of Québec voted for a federalist party in the last election. (House of Commons Debates, 1997, p. 1700)

These sentiments aside, an analysis of the Yes side text suggests that the *inclusive we* was used in an effort to involve Québec society in the sovereignist project, including feelings of being aggrieved as a group. The nested identities that the Yes side had in common with other Quebecers made this involvement strategy and proposed sharing of grievances possible.

No Side Text

With respect to the *exclusive we*, the No side text had no clear instances, paralleling the Yes side text, which had only one. The repeated use of the personal pronoun *we* and the corresponding possessive pronouns in the No side text were entirely of the *inclusive-we* type. This allowed the No side to speak for third parties (without permission) and underscored No side nested identities or *we*-groups.

The nested identities observed in the No side text differed slightly from those of the Yes side. Although both texts drew on **Quebecers** as we-groups, the No side text extended this group to include references to **Canada** or **Canadians** (Excerpt 23-24). The *inclusive we* functioned not only to bind the No side with Quebecers and Canada but allowed the No side to assert, on behalf of Quebecers, their nested identity with Canada (with resulting benefits). As suggested previously, creating a greater degree of affinity between Québec and Canada functioned to unite Quebecers with Canada thus potentially making Quebecer's rejection of federalism more difficult (e.g., Fairclough, 1992b; Wiener & Mehrabian, 1968).

22. Dear Quebecer,

Like you, I am proud to be a Quebecer and proud that we are part of Canada.
(Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 1)

23. We, the women and men of Québec,

confident in our abilities, free to choose, and accountable to future generations,
affirm that:

we are proud to be both Quebecers and Canadians . . . we do not want to
renounce Canada, a country which is ours, whose quality of life is among the best
in the world and which offers us the best chances for progress. (Committee of
Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 2)

The *inclusive we* also functioned to link the No side to a nested identity based on the French language, as suggested by the reference to **our Francophone majority, we are a distinct society, our distinct identity, our common language, our common tongue, and French language** (Excerpt 24). There was some ambiguity here, however, in that English Quebecers might be able to identify with some but not all of these referents. For instance, **our Francophone majority** and **we are a distinct society** could be viewed as attributes of Québec society common to all Quebecers, whereas **our common**

language and our common tongue arguably excluded those Quebecers who did not have the French language in common, that is, English speakers.

24. Québec's place in Canada

Because of our history and **our Francophone majority**, we are a genuine national community. We are a **distinct society** within the Canadian federation. In particular, our identity is expressed through **our common language**, our culture and our institutions. Our identity is not being challenged and does not depend on this referendum or on constitutional debates.

Two recent attempts to amend the Canadian constitution have been unsuccessful. While we regret that it has not been possible to resolve this important problem, we do not conclude that we have to separate because of that.

Indeed, we have affirmed **our distinct identity** within the Canadian federation. We have passed legislation to affirm the place of the **French language** and we have succeeded in making it **our common tongue**, while respecting diversity and minority rights. We have gained control over immigration. We have withdrawn, with compensation, from a number of federal programs in order to set up made-in-Québec programs tailored to our needs. (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 12)

The absence of any direct reference to English we-groups in the No side text was underscored by the contrasting explicit reference to the French language. Although we see a vague reference to **diversity and minority rights** in the last paragraph of Excerpt 24, the whole of the No text made no specific reference to English groups (either as a nested we-group or otherwise). This absence has strategic implications. The No side had little to gain by linking to English Quebecers because they already had virtually the total support of the Anglophone community. Underscoring this connection or drawing attention to issues of concern to English Quebecers, such as language rights, could put off francophone Quebecers concerned with protecting French language and culture. As an issue management strategy, it minimized a potentially damaging involvement strategy that benefited the opposing side.

As previously mentioned, the No side text did not make any clear references to the *exclusive we*. The middle paragraph of Excerpt 24 (**Two recent attempts. . .**) is the closest the No side text comes to using the *exclusive we* (i.e., the No side speaking only on behalf of itself). The first two instances of **we** might well be interpreted as being in reference to the No side, but ambiguity was introduced with the last **we** (obviously, the No side could not separate by itself so this **we** must refer to Québec/Quebecers and possibly the Francophone majority). This slide into the *inclusive we* made it possible for the No side to have its analysis of the potentially awkward issue of constitutional amendments shared by the larger we-group.

The Construction of Us-Versus-Them Dichotomies

As a discursive strategy, an *us-versus-them* dichotomy is used to portray groups as good or bad and can occur at the local or global levels of a text. Although the first- and third-person pronouns (e.g., we, us, our, ours, ourselves, they, them, their, theirs, and themselves) cue the presence of this device, the antecedent nouns of these pronouns (e.g., Yes side, Quebecers, federal government, etc.) signal it as well (even in the absence of pronouns).

An *us-versus-them* dichotomy is not a new idea to political discourse and has taken on several variants including *we* versus *they* and *good* versus *bad*. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* spoke of the advantages of making "the audience well-disposed towards yourself and ill-disposed towards your opponent" (trans. 1981, book 3, chap. 19). Commenting on World War I wartime and post-war propaganda, Biddle (1931) noted that a pattern of *we* versus an *enemy* is present in all propaganda of conflict. Bronfenbrenner (1961) observed that during the Cold War of the 1960s, Americans and

Soviets portrayed each other in simplified categories of *good* and *bad* by selecting particular phrases such as “their policy verges on madness,” “they are aggressors,” and “they cannot be trusted.”

For politicians, there are several possible advantages to constructing *us-versus-them* dichotomies. These social categories can polarize particular groups and positions and can therefore sustain existing differences or establish new relations (van Dijk, 1993a). Similarly, they redefine or reassert a preferred identity (Seidel, 1987), create a positive group distinctiveness, enable an ingroup to justify certain actions against an outgroup, and make it easier for an ingroup to attribute blame or social causality for negative events that befall it (Tajfel, 1982). Underscoring group boundaries also makes membership in a group salient and thus amplifies group identity and ingroup favouritism (Brewer, 1979).

From the perspective of politicized collective identity, the discursive construction of an *us-versus-them* dichotomy relates, in part, to adversarial attributions and to a group’s effort to triangulate society. To revisit Aristotle, the strategy of making “the audience well-disposed towards yourself and ill-disposed towards your opponent” (trans. 1981, book 3, chap. 19) can be seen as referring to the triangulation of society by the construction of *us-versus-them* dichotomies. Although politicized collective identity theorizes a tri-polar approach to group relations, a dichotomous strategy as discussed here is consistent because—as we have seen—the *us* (or *we*) pole of the dichotomy is characterized by the *inclusive we*, which nests the speaker with the targeted third party.

Yes Side Text

The contribution of words, metaphors, and pronouns in constructing *us-versus-them* social categories was a discursive strategy found throughout the Yes text, most

strikingly in relation to metaphors of aggression and imperialism. The Yes side's positioning of the Canadian state as a hegemonic power that had repeatedly aggressed against Québec (e.g., **strike, crush us, coup de force**, as previously described in Excerpts 10-12) functioned to portray the federal government (*them*) negatively and to underscore an *us* (victims) versus *them* (aggressors) dichotomy. Similarly, metaphors of imperialism in the Yes side text helped to further this dichotomy, a function Biddle (1931) had previously noted about imperialistic discourse. For instance, we see **a federal regime that denies we are a people and deprives us of the means to ensure our own development** (Excerpt 13); **If Québec wants to emancipate itself from the federalism of trusteeship and from the domination of a central government constantly reinforced by the dynamic of the general powers it holds** (Excerpt 14); **a regime that offers us social assistance and unemployment insurance** (Excerpt 15). The first-person plural pronouns juxtaposed with "a people" and "Québec" formed one pole of the dichotomy (the *inclusive we*) and the federal "regime," with its characteristically negative imperialistic portrayal, formed the other pole (them/they/bad).

An *us-versus-them* dichotomy, which centred on aggression and imperialism metaphors, accomplished a great deal of ideological work for the Yes side and for the politicization process (i.e., in constructing shared grievances, adversarial attribution, and the triangulation of groups). In the context of an *us-versus-them* dichotomy, these metaphors, which represented Yes side grievances, not only conveyed the idea of being shared by the larger we-group (e.g., as a result of the *inclusive we*) but also underscored Yes side adversarial attributions (e.g., **He [Jean Chrétien] will continue to crush us**, Excerpt 12). The discursive construction of grievances and the demarcation of groups

into *us versus them* (*good vs. bad*) aimed quite clearly at the triangulation of society (making voters well-disposed toward the Yes side and ill-disposed toward the No side).

An ethnolinguistic dichotomy also characterized the Yes side text, centring on *we* (French) versus *they* (English). As shown previously in Excerpt 20, the Yes side raised the fear that French-speaking people would risk being outnumbered by English speakers within a generation if political independence were not achieved. The Yes side's ethnolinguistic construction of *they* also included reference to a homogenized English Canada. Excerpt 25, for instance, framed Québec's longstanding grievance of not being recognized as a distinct society in ethnolinguistic terms. Similarly, Excerpt 26 underscored another longstanding grievance held by sovereignists, with the adversary again being English Canada. Note, however, that although English was the dominant language outside of Québec, the Yes side's categorization of groups by language and the resulting adversarial attributions was something of an oversimplification. At the time of the referendum, several senior members of the federal government, including the Prime Minister of Canada, were Québec Francophones. Moreover, only 60% of the population living in the rest of Canada were Anglophones, 7% of whom were bilingual (Statistics Canada, 1997); a small francophone population resided outside of Québec; and New Brunswick was a bilingual province. Therefore, the simple *us-versus-them* dichotomy based on language is, in part, a discursive construction.

25. English Canada must understand very clearly that, whatever we say and whatever we do, Québec is today and for all time a distinct society, free and capable of assuming its own destiny and its development. (Robert Bourassa, cited in National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 3)

26. After the rejection by English Canada, in June 1990, of the Meech Lake Accord and the five conditions described by Robert Bourassa as the most minimal ever presented by Québec, the National Assembly created the Commission on the

Political and Constitutional Future of Québec. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 4)

The construction of boundaries around French and English groups further underscored how the Yes side discursively constructed grievances, adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society. Language-based grievances were reinforced by ethnolinguistic categories, which were themselves the basis for Yes side adversarial attributions. In general, ethnolinguistic classification resulted in socially constructed boundaries that not only communicated a false consensus but also exaggerated group differences and discord. This functioned to normalize the division between ‘genuine’ Quebecers and (English) Canada and provided an opportunity to triangulate society.

No Side Text

The occurrence of *us-versus-them* dichotomies in the No side text also reflected their effort to involve society by triangulation. The sovereignist project, a No side grievance, provided an initial context for a dichotomy based on groups opposed to or in support of independence, as suggested by Excerpt 7 (**The yes side is proposing to separate us from Canada, to break up the union**). The negative lexicalizations of the Yes side as **separatists** (Excerpt 6, above) and as **separatist forces** (No side text, p. 15) further underscored the portrayal of *them* as bad. Likewise, the deception theme cast the Yes side as dishonest, thus providing a common adversary to both the No side and other Quebecers. The construction of these boundaries and the resulting negative portrayal of independence and of the Yes side functioned as an attempt to force voters to take sides, which is the essence of the triangulation stage.

In addition to an *us-versus-them* dichotomy taking the form of opposed to versus in support of independence, there was also an *us-versus-them* dichotomy centred on a

foreigner narrative. Biddle (1931) noted that propagandists have long used a discourse of an 'enemy other' in an attempt to divide people into categories of *we* versus a *foreign enemy*. As early as 1651, Hobbes wrote of men coming together in unity to defend against foreigners (Hobbes, 1651/1946). In the No side text, an imagined foreigner was constructed by casting Quebecers forward into a future independent Québec. The *us-versus-them* dichotomy was thus one of Quebecers (living in Canada) versus imagined foreigners (in an independent Québec), as suggested by Excerpts 27 and 28. The implicit grievance was one of threatened privileges.

27. We would become **foreigners** in the country we have built. (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 3)

28. Is it realistic to think that Canada would allow a **foreign country** . . . to obstruct it in areas as sensitive as customs and currency? (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 5)

Following from Biddle (1931), the No side's foreigner narrative (and arguably the separatist and deception narratives) implied an *enemy other*, constructing boundaries rather than the partnership alluded to in the Yes side's text. This boundary construction worked to the No side's advantage in their effort to triangulate the Québec public to choose the No option over the Yes option. The recruitment of voters would be the goal of the unfavourable characterization of Quebecers in an independent Québec as imagined foreigners, which by implication would weaken that side of the triangle linking voters with a Yes vote for independence.

The Use of Questions

Chilton and Schäffner (1997) have suggested that the control of information is a discursive process centrally involved in the exercise of political control. Asking for information and giving information are two simple ways in which this control is

exercised. Writers and speakers not only control information through the asking of questions but also have control over the proposed information embedded within their questions.

Fairclough (2001a) has identified two broad classes of questions within CDA. First, questions often elicit a yes or no response. Second, there are *wh* questions, which include who, what, where, when, why, which, and how.

The variation in grammatical questions found within the Yes and No side texts is particularly noteworthy. Specifically, there were no questions in the Yes text but 15 questions in the No text (12 *yes/no* questions and three *wh* questions). Two *yes/no* questions were simply reformulations of the Yes side's referendum question (e.g., Excerpt 4, above). The remaining 10 *yes/no* questions and two of the three *what* questions were grouped in three discrete sections in the No side text (i.e., a bulleted list of questions and a series of questions in two separate paragraphs).

Arguably, one function of No side questions was to raise doubt among voters about Québec independence. That is, the No side was able to use grammatical questions to assert consequences of a Yes vote (e.g., suddenly imposed grievances and threatened privileges) and invite voters to reflect on these consequences (e.g., Excerpt 29 and 30). In general, if doubt is raised about Québec independence, voters might be less willing to vote Yes in the referendum. For the Yes side, raising doubts about independence was not necessarily strategic. Rather, they asserted what the consequences of a No (or Yes) vote would be in terms favourable to their position (e.g., Excerpt 2, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 21).

29. Is it realistic to think that Canada would allow a block of seven million people no longer living within its territory to enjoy the rights associated with Canadian citizenship, including the right to vote and the right hold [sic] a Canadian

passport, without having to pay taxes to Canada in return? (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 5)

30. Let's look first at the economic consequences of separation. On the day after a yes vote, Québec would enter a period of uncertainty of unknown length. Would the break-up take place smoothly? Would the new country be financially viable? All these risks would worry international lenders. Would the Canadian dollar fall on the markets? Would Québec loans held abroad lose their value? International experience indicates that such major political changes drive interest rates up. (Committee of Quebecers for the No, 1995, p. 7)

Several textual features helped to underscore No side grammatical questions and by implication No side grievances and the consequences of a Yes vote. For instance, the first of the three sections containing No side questions had four *yes/no* questions in a single bulleted list, with each bulleted item being a separate question (e.g., Excerpt 29 is one item). The bulleted list undoubtedly helped to emphasize the No side's message, as too did the syntactic parallelism at the beginning of all four questions (i.e., **Is it realistic to think**, p. 4-5). Whether by design or not, the answer to all four questions was No, which paralleled the No side's desired response to the referendum question. Lists were also a feature of the two remaining groupings of No side questions, with each list occurring in a single paragraph (e.g., Excerpt 30). The organization of all these grammatical questions into lists suggested a purposeful strategy.

Grammatical questions functioned to not only raise doubt about the consequences of a Yes vote (many of which were grievances in the form of threatened privileges) but also may well have functioned to discursively involve society through a process of triangulation. The relational nature of grammatical questions invited a degree of involvement, an aspect reinforced in the No side text by **Let's take a look:** (the phrase immediately preceding the bulleted list of which Excerpt 29 is an item, p.4) and **Let's look first at the economic consequences of separation** (Excerpt 30). Consistent with

several other linguistic features discussed, the process of triangulation took the form of weakening that side of the triangle linking the Yes side with voters (by casting doubt about the sovereigntist project).

Semantic Macrostructures

Van Dijk (1997) has posited that global topics or themes are expressed in macro features such as introductions and headings. These macrostructures tell us “what we are talking or reading about . . . [and] define the overall ‘unity’ of discourse” (van Dijk, 1997, p. 10). Headings, for instance, provide readers with the gist of a text and introductions provide slightly more detail (Fairclough, 1992b). How shared grievances, adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society by triangulation are constituted in and through semantic macrostructures—including introductions, headings, and lists—is the focus of this section.

Introduction, Orientation, Complication, and Resolution

Yes side text. Excerpt 31, which appeared on the first full page of the campaign booklet provided an introductory overview of the Yes side’s position and arguably helped to orient readers to several Yes side themes. Specifically, the passage encapsulated the gist of the referendum and the sovereigntist project. In doing so, it foreshadowed several of the topics or themes that occurred in later parts of the text including the notion that (a) sovereignty and a new economic and political partnership with Canada was a natural progression that **fits in with the history of Québec and with modern trends in the world today**, (b) sovereignty is **the only possible response**, (c) the past has been bad—a **federal regime that denies we are a people and deprives us of the means to ensure our own development**, and (d) the future will be better (as suggested, in part, by the reference to **aspirations**).

31. This project on which you will be casting your vote fits in with the history of Québec and with modern trends in the world today. It offers the only possible response to a federal regime that denies we are a people and deprives us of the means to ensure our own development. It makes concrete the aspirations so often expressed by the men and women of Québec and by our prime ministers, ... all but one. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 2)

This passage included several elements associated with a narrative including *introduction* (a summary or abstract of the story), *orientation* (the who, what, where, and when of the text), *complication* (the problem or issue to be addressed), and *resolution* (e.g., Stubbs, 1983; van Dijk, 1988). The excerpt's orientation was indicated in part by the temporal ordering of themes (e.g., the past is bad, the future will be good). Other aspects of orientation are illustrated by the brief identification of setting (**Québec**) and characters including protagonists (**we, us, the men and women of Québec, and our prime ministers**) and antagonists (**federal regime** and **all but one**, a reference to the leader of the No side, Daniel Johnson). The narrative's complication drew on the imperialism theme referred to previously (**a federal regime that denies we are a people and deprives us of the means to ensure our own development**). A resolution was suggested in the second sentence, where [sovereignty] **offers the only possible response**. With all of these narrative elements occurring in such close proximity, and coming at the beginning of the text, the introductory character of the excerpt was underscored.

The narrative structure of the Yes side's opening not only foreshadowed the thematic content of the text but also underscored the discursive embeddedness of grievances, adversarial attributions, and an involvement strategy. For instance, grievances were discursively constructed as part of the passage's complication (**denies** and **deprives**). Adversarial attributions relate to the orientation (or who) of the excerpt (**a federal regime**). The triangulation of society is discursively managed by the whole

narrative structure: the side of the triangle that would link voters with the No side is attacked (**federal regime that denies we are a people and deprives us of the means to ensure our own development**) and, Québec independence is positioned as the **only possible response**.

No side text. The first page of the No text was a typical introduction (Appendix B), functioning to provide overall coherence to the text and its global meaning (e.g., van Dijk, 1997). Specifically, the text opened with a letter from the President of the No side, Daniel Johnson. The salutation, **Dear Quebecer**, signalled part of the letter's *orientation* (*who*). Both the first and last few lines of the letter conveyed positive aspects of being both a Quebecer and a Canadian, which helped to further the text's orientation. Tannen (1989) has used the term "bounded episodes" to describe this opening and closing strategy, a type of repetition that functions to set a theme at the beginning and a coda, or conclusion, at the end. Stressing the nested identity of voters as Quebecers and Canadians arguably functioned as an involvement strategy.

The letter's second paragraph oriented to *what* the referendum was about, **the issue of this referendum is simple: do we want Québec to separate from Canada and become an independent country?** This underscored one of the more prominent themes featured in the No side text, *independence as separation*. This provided an initial context for one of the main grievances the No side expressed in other parts of text, notably that the Yes side was trying to trick Quebecers.

The text's *complication* arose in the middle part of the letter, underscored by the No side's assertion that independence might have a real cost. From the perspective of PCI, this signalled grievances that were suddenly imposed and threats to existing

privileges. For instance, the letter indicated that **there would be no guarantee that we would be able to regain the advantages that we had given up** and it would **weaken Québec by causing a drop in employment and the value of our currency and an economic slowdown**. The construction of No side grievances was underscored not only by this complication stage but also by having this stage embedded in the larger narrative structure of an introduction.

The casting of grievances into the future signalled the temporal ordering of certain propositions. This orientation foreshadowed a recurrent theme in the No side text of the *future will be bad* if Québec becomes independent, a view supported by several other macro-features described subsequently.

The letter's opening temporal ordering extended to a view that the *past has been good*: **We have been able to develop Québec according to our own spirit, while taking our rightful place within Canada**. This related temporally, in part, to the letter's *resolution*, centring on *the future will be good* (in a united Canada): **Let's keep Québec strong!** and **The only answer is No!** This sequence underscored a continuation of past benefits into the future.

The emerging themes introduced in this opening letter relate to PCI in several respects. Grievances were well represented in the letter, as indicated by the complication stage. Although the letter did not contain explicit adversarial attributions, it did link the Yes side with voters and contrasted the Yes and No side options, which potentially contributed to the triangulation of voters (i.e., it weakened the Yes side's position while reinforcing the No side option).

Headings

A text's semantic macrostructure and its overall coherence are frequently expressed by headings, a salient feature of campaign discourse. Headings provide readers with the gist of a text and alert readers to the text's major topics (Fairclough, 1992b). They also provide an interpretative framework for subsequently presented material.

Yes side text. One global theme signaled by several Yes side headings was that the Canadian federation had not worked for Quebecers in the past (e.g., Excerpt 32, 33, and 34), which underscored the discursive embeddedness of a major Yes side grievance.

- 32. After thirty years of striving, still a deadlock (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 3)
- 33. From the failure of Meech to the Allaire Report (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 4)
- 34. A grim balance sheet (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 12)

Other headings in the text signalled the Yes side's preferred solution to correcting past grievances, that of sovereignty and a partnership, as suggested by Excerpt 35. Repetition of these themes occurred in the text's subsequent headings (e.g., Excerpt 36 and 37) and were further strengthened by associated lists falling underneath these headings.

- 35. An agreement for sovereignty and a formal offer of partnership (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 7)
- 36. SOVEREIGNTY TO: [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 8)
- 37. AN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PARTNERSHIP TO: [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 10)

Additional themes discernable from the text's headings included the notion that the future would be bad if Québec remained in Canada (Excerpt 38)—signalling yet

another grievance (suddenly imposed and threatened privileges)—and the notion that the future would be better in a sovereign Québec (Excerpt 39 and 40). Excerpts 38 and 40 contained references to the No and Yes option, respectively. Arguably, these headings helped communicate one aspect of the text's overall coherence—the disadvantages of the No side's position and the favourableness of the Yes option. These headings thus suggested an involvement strategy, whereby the Yes side attempted to triangulate voters to their preferred option, additional support for which came from other discursive features that fall under these headings (e.g., metaphors, lists, etc.).

38. The dangers of a NO: a vacuum and collapse [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 14)

39. QUÉBEC'S STRENGTH [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 18)

40. YES...AND IT ALL BECOMES POSSIBLE [capitals in original]. (National Committee for the Yes, 1995, p. 21)

As with the section on introductory narrative, the contrasting of past and present temporal circumstances in Yes side headings potentially contributed to a sovereigntist strategy of triangulating certain segments of society. Specifically, numerous headings in the text discursively signalled (a) an attack on the side of the triangle that would link voters with the No side (note the past grievances embedded in Excerpts 32, 33, 34, and 38, cited above) and (b) the present and future advantages of siding with Yes forces (e.g., Excerpts 35, 36, 37, 39, and 40, cited above).

No side text. Several of the themes observed in the No side's introductory letter were also evident in the text's headings including: (a) togetherness—**We, the women and men of Québec** (p. 2); (b) independence as separation—**Separation: the only issue** (p. 3); (c) grievances centred on the future will be bad—**No to a weaker Québec** (p. 7);

Loss of influence (p. 8); **A huge waste of energy** (p. 9); (d) the past has been good/the future will be good in a united Canada—**Canada: the result of our efforts, the guarantee of our success** (p. 10); and (e) the future will be good—**Our best option for the future** (p. 11). The correspondence in themes between the opening letter and the text's headings functioned to reinforce these emergent themes and the No side's overall message. Other headings in the text functioned to delineate themes to which the No side oriented and underscored the embeddedness of grievances and (indirectly) adversarial attributions including: the proposed economic partnership of the Yes side—**The offer of partnership: an empty shell** (p. 3), **The Proposed Partnership – an Illusion** (p. 15), and Yes side trickery—**Enough tricks** (p. 5). In general, grievances were well represented in the No side text (pp. 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, & 15, as detailed above).

Other less defined but potentially important themes in the No booklet included Québec identity—**Québec's place in Canada** (p. 12) and desired co-operation and participation between Québec and federal government—**Beyond the referendum** (p. 2) and **Federalism: the way of the future** (p. 13). These latter headings oriented readers to the No side's preferred option and, taken in conjunction with other No side themes and discursive features (e.g., headings underscoring grievances), contributed to efforts to involve voters by triangulating Yes and No side positions.

Lists

Lists contribute to a text's overall thematic content in several ways. Their repetitive structure adds emphasis and additionally conveys that the authors found the list items important enough to organize into a list, suggesting that the reader should as well; moreover, lists underscore that there are a considerable number of points, perhaps even more than the ones specified (Tannen, 1989).

Yes side text. The global meanings suggested by Yes side lists not only reinforced but also elaborated the themes previously expressed (e.g., grievances, the past has been bad, future will be good in a sovereign Québec). This occurred in part because thirty-eight percent of all words in the Yes side text fell into lists. Thus, many of the discursive features, themes, and associated stages of PCI discussed in previous sections appeared in lists. For instance, lists functioned to help organize thematic content under more than half the text's headings including: **After thirty years of striving, still a deadlock** (p. 3); **A grim balance sheet** (p. 12); **The dangers of a NO: a vacuum and collapse** (p. 14); **Sovereignty to** (p. 8); **An economic and political partnership to** (p. 10); and **Québec's strength** (p. 18). As the first three of these headings suggest, a good deal of the thematic content of Yes side lists centred on grievances (the past has been bad, the future will be bad in Canada). Organizing grievances in lists gave them additional emphasis. In addition to lists of grievances, the Yes text had lists outlining the benefits of a future sovereign Québec (as suggested by the last three headings, above). Overall, lists of grievances and lists of the benefits of sovereignty created an apparent contrast. This arguably served as an involvement strategy centred on triangulating voters. That is, lists of grievances functioned to weaken the No option for voters, whereas the enumeration of the positive aspects of sovereignty strengthened the Yes option.

No side text. Four separate lists in the No side document marked yet another macrostructure used by federalists. The two bulleted lists on the second page of the No side text were particularly noteworthy because of their location at the beginning of the document, which gave them the quality of an outline or introduction (Excerpts 41, 42, respectively). Indeed, the first list reiterated the thematic content introduced in the

opening letter on the first page and together these two macrostructures foreshadowed topics found in subsequent parts of the text. As suggested previously, the significance of lists comes in part because writers and speakers have deemed items worthy of including in a list, with the implication that so too should readers. The macro themes identified in the first No side list on page 2 (Excerpt 41) were: (a) togetherness/involvement—**We are proud to be both Quebecers and Canadians**; (b) the past has been good—**We are proud of the progress that Québec has achieved in all areas within Canada**; (c) independence as separation—**A yes vote would lead directly to the separation of Québec**; and (d) the future will be bad if Québec becomes independent—**The Canadian economic union could not simply be reconstructed after being torn apart by the separation of Québec** (and also **economic uncertainty/weakening** and **waste years rebuilding**). Applied to PCI, list items underscored No side grievances and an involvement strategy.

41. **We, the women and men of Québec,**

confident in our abilities, free to choose, and accountable to future generations, affirm that:

- we are proud to be both Quebecers and Canadians.
- we are proud of the progress that Québec has achieved in all areas within Canada.
- we do not want to renounce Canada, a country which is ours, whose quality of life is among the best in the world and which offers us the best chances for progress;
- a yes vote would lead directly to the separation of Québec;
- the Canadian economic union could not simply be reconstructed after being tom apart by the separation of Québec.

- we do not want the economic uncertainty that would inevitably follow a yes vote, and, in particular, the economic weakening of Québec which would result;
- in the event of a yes vote, the Government of Québec would waste years rebuilding the state, while ignoring our real challenges;
- the only way to ensure that we keep our citizenship, passport, currency, economic union and the right to work anywhere in Canada is to vote NO.

The No side's second list on page 2 functioned to unify the past and present temporally by constructing a theme consistent with the idea that the past has been good/the future will be good in a united Canada (also observed in the opening letter). For instance, list items indicated that **Québec will remain a distinct society and we want to continue to develop freely** (Excerpt 42). This list was in contrast to the list coming immediately before (Excerpt 41) in which the notion that the future will be bad if Québec becomes independent was developed. Arguably, this contrast helped the No side in their effort to involve voters by processes of triangulation. That is, they were able to raise doubt and fear about the Yes side option (1st list, Excerpt 41) while presenting the No option as a desirable outcome (2nd list, Excerpt 42).

42. BEYOND THE REFERENDUM, we affirm that:

- Québec will remain a distinct society within Canada, notably through its language, its culture and its institutions;
- our national identity is expressed specifically through the policies and institutions we have established for ourselves within the federal system and which we want to continue to develop freely.
- in voting NO, all avenues, including the constitution, remain open to us to fulfil our aspirations.

The lists occurring on pages 4 and 7 of the No side document comprised a series of grammatical questions. As the use of questions was analysed in a previous section, these lists will not be discussed here other than to reiterate that they were replete with

grievances and seem designed to function to discursively triangulate society by juxtaposing the opposing positions of the two sides in a manner favourable to the No side. Of significance is that this is another example of grievances, adversarial attributions, and an involvement strategy being embedded within multiple discursive features.

Intertextuality

The discursive embeddedness of grievances, adversarial attributions, and involvement strategies was evident in the Yes/No booklet's intertextuality, which is a strategy of incorporating material from other sources, whether through direct quotation or unattributed (Fairclough, 1992b). Intertextuality sometimes functions to recontextualize (or reintroduce) issues or concerns held in another time or place. This not only reinforces claims made in the present text but can also be used to create meaning, for instance, by forming new linkages that may not necessarily exist in reality. A text's message can be further strengthened by a more specific kind of intertextuality, namely, quoting experts and credible sources (e.g., Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Pratkanis & Aronson, 1991).

Yes Side Text

Intertextuality by means of direct quotation was quite frequent in the Yes side text. For instance, the text began with an extract of Bill 1, authored by the leaders of the three political parties who came together to form the Yes side (i.e., Jacques Parizeau, Lucien Bouchard, and Mario Dumont). This quotation not only underscored the shared position of the three sovereigntist leaders (and their parties) but also helped to set the text's orientation, most notably with respect to identity and group membership (who we are).

Through Yes side intertextuality, the shared position of present day leaders in Québec was also extended to past leaders. Specifically, the text's second page included

historical quotations from five former Québec prime ministers¹ (Jean Lesage—1962; Daniel Johnson Sr.—1965; René Lévesque—1968; Robert Bourassa—1990; and Daniel Johnson Jr.—1994), the first four prime ministers conveying strong support for Québec as a distinct society and for Québec independence. Daniel Johnson Sr., for instance, indicated that he **would like to be the first president of the Republic of Québec**.

The quotations from Yes side leaders and past Québec prime ministers suggested that throughout the recent history of Québec, its leaders have shared a common project. Although the prime ministers' quotations were from different historical periods and political contexts, and despite the fact that these leaders were not all sovereignists, intertextuality brought these voices together into the present to convey the appearance of an inclusive project. However, based on research on persuasion and credibility of source (e.g., Hovland & Weiss, 1951; Pratkanis & Aronson, 1991), these quotations likely strengthened the Yes side's message and thus their effort to involve society because these prime ministers were respected and widely viewed as knowledgeable and trustworthy.

The primary function of intertextuality, however, might well have been one of contrast, as suggested by the line preceding the quotations from the five prime ministers **[Sovereignty] makes concrete the aspirations so often expressed by the men and women of Québec and by our prime ministers, ... all but one** (ellipses in original). Following the first four supportive quotations, Daniel Johnson Jr., the president of the No committee (and son of Daniel Johnson Sr., who is also cited) was quoted as saying **I am a Canadian first and foremost**. This underscored his departure from the views of a long line of respected Québec leaders (including his own father) and suggested that he is more

¹ The Quebec *prime minister* is a position commonly referred to as *premier* in the rest of Canada.

concerned with Canada than Québec, and even that he is weak or is perhaps not a true Quebecer.

Applied to PCI, the intertextuality in this section of the text facilitated an adversarial attribution and an involvement strategy by constructing a relational contrast between apparent supporters of the sovereigntist project and its main opponent, Daniel Johnson Jr. The fact that not all of the quoted prime ministers were sovereigntists was lost in the decontextualization afforded by intertextuality.

Through quotation of other political and business leaders in the text, the Yes side also used intertextuality, and the associated credibility of source entailed, to underscore numerous grievances that were first introduced in another period. For instance, Yes side grievances against federalism were reinforced by intertextual quotations from the Allaire Report (pp. 4-5), from Senators from Québec (pp. 8-9), and from past and present liberal Ministers in the Québec government (pp. 13, 15). Once again, these excerpts reintroduced concerns raised in another time and place. Additionally, No side grievances centring on the negative economic impact of independence were challenged in the Yes side document with quotations from a number of high profile business figures including the Governor of Vermont (p. 10), corporate leaders from the United States and Canada (pp. 11, 12, 20), and a “financier and advisor to American Presidents” (pp. 17-18). The layout of these extracts helped underscore the thematic content given their placement (as sidebar quotations in the margin), formatting (i.e., bold and italic type), and readability (short snippets of text).

Several senior leaders of the opposing No side were also quoted in the margins of the Yes text including its president (p. 14), deputy chair (p. 16), and chairman (p. 19). As

with the sidebar quotations in other parts of the text, these quotations—taken out of context from discourse originating 3-4 years prior to the referendum—supported Yes side grievances as well as challenged No side assertions about the negative impact of sovereignty. This intertextuality clearly aimed to triangulate society by simultaneously strengthening the Yes side message and discrediting No leaders by underscoring the contradictory positions they held.

No Side Text

Intertextuality through quotation was also a feature of the No text, drawing on the two main leaders of the opposing Yes side, Jacques Parizeau (quoted four times) and Lucien Bouchard (quoted twice), as well as Pierre Fortin (quoted once), who was an economist and economic advisor to René Lévesque, a past sovereigntist leader. These extracts, taken out of context, were underscored by their layout as side bar quotations in the margin.

A number of the quotations highlighted grievances developed in other parts of the No text (e.g., the Yes side's alleged intention to deceive voters by declaring sovereignty without intending to negotiate and the negative economic impact of independence). Moreover, these extracts portrayed the leaders of the sovereigntist project, and the project itself, unfavourably (e.g., **I am not the most credible person**, Jacques Parizeau, p. 5). The construction of grievances and adversarial attributions were thus embedded within the text by intertextuality.

Another instance of intertextuality in the No side document occurred with the phrase **We, the women and men of Québec** (p. 2, 14). The expression was a paraphrase of multiple segments of text found in Bill 1 (the Yes side's "declaration of independence"); specifically, **We, the men and women of this place; We, the men and**

women of this new country; and **We, the people of Québec** (Bill 1, 1995). Arguably, the No side phrase, and the Yes side segments, were part of a larger intertextual chain dating back at least to the United States Constitution of 1787, which began with the phrase **We the people of the United States**. This phrase (and its associated list items) facilitated the No side's triangulation of society because of its contrastive and relational elements. That is, it represented something of a rebuttal to a section in Bill 1 containing the similar phrase, wherein it is also used as a title of a list. Specifically, in Bill 1, the sovereignists suggested Quebecers believe one thing, but in the referendum booklet, the No side suggested Quebecers believe something else. The phrase's use of the *inclusive we* functioned to let the No side speak for all Quebecers and, viewed in relation to Bill 1, was reclaiming the voice of Quebecers.

Hybridity

Texts are constituted from a configuration of discourse types, which are realized in the semantic and lexico-grammatical features of texts (Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002). For instance, a text can be formal or informal in style. Its subject matter or topic can be constructed from a variety of discourses including that of business, academic social sciences, or politics. Additionally, a text has a particular genre (and potentially several sub-genres), which are a set of conventions associated with the enactment of some type of activity such as everyday conversation, a news report, a scientific article, or political campaign literature (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Texts that are hybrid have a mix of these discourse types.

An analysis of hybridity provides textual evidence for characterizing the overall sample of discourse and for identifying how this material is put together. For instance,

hybridity provides information on how the text was produced, distributed, and consumed (Fairclough, 1992b). Hybridity not only functions to frame material (e.g., as academic discourse) but also has the potential to recontextualize material (e.g., from one genre to another). Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) note “different interpretations entail bringing different discourses to the interpretation of a text, creating in a sense a new, hybrid text which combines the text interpreted with the discourses that are brought to it in the process of reading” (p. 14). Such recontextualization is open to manipulation by selectively mixing and combining a text’s discourse types.

As indicated previously, the Yes and No side texts were combined into one booklet, which was sent to each household in Québec by the Director General of Elections, in the context of a referendum campaign on Québec independence. These structural factors determined several aspects of the booklet’s discursive practice (i.e., text production and distribution) and the discourse types upon which each side’s text drew. First and foremost is the booklet’s dominant genre, that of political campaign literature. The other discourse types occurring in each side’s text will be explored in more detail below in relation to the text’s hybridity.

Yes Side Text

In the concluding paragraph of the Yes text, the sovereignists claimed that their project “appeals to the heart as well as the mind” (p. 21). This assertion was borne out in the text, the evidence for which comes from its hybridity. A mix of academic discourses, such as political and economic history, combined with personal and impersonal exposition to produce a narrative that was passionate in some places and reasoned in other places.

What emerged from the analysis of the text's hybridity was a series of discursive junctures characterized by shifting genres and changing styles, as discussed below. These junctures marked three distinct sequences of a grievance-resolution discourse, which corresponded to themes centring on (a) the past has been bad, the future will be good with sovereignty, (b) the past has been bad, the future will be bad if Quebecers vote No, and (c) the future will be good if Quebecers vote Yes. Although these themes paralleled those arising out of the analysis of semantic macrostructures reported earlier, they should not be viewed as pre-established analytical categories. Indeed, they were first identified in this analysis of the text's hybridity.

The Yes side text opened with what can be characterized as an appeal to the heart (**you will be speaking for yourselves, for your children, and for all the generations that will follow**, p. 2). Following the first page, however, the text entered a kind of academic discourse, which can best be described as historical. The use of impersonal exposition conveyed an objective rendering of the material, one that appealed more to the head than the heart. The text's first two headings (and the accompanying text, p. 3-7) underscored this discourse type by emphasizing particular historical periods: **After thirty years of striving, still a deadlock** (p. 3) and **From the failure of Meech to the Allaire Report** (p. 4).

There were several sub-texts running through the history discourse type. One was of an extensive consultative process, as evident by references to the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, **the 600 briefs submitted to the Commission, the studies undertaken by 55 experts, the hearings held across Québec** (p. 4), and the Commissions on the Future of Québec in which **more than 55,000 persons took part in the process and 5500**

briefs were submitted (p. 6). This consultative sub-text supported the claim of a democratic process (**the process of accession to sovereignty is profoundly democratic**, p. 6) and contributed to the construction of a presumed consensus among Quebecers, which could well help the Yes side triangulate voters.

Another sub-text within the history discourse type corresponded to a grievance and (proposed) resolution structure. This structure occurred in three distinct phases in the Yes side text. In the first instance, grievances were signalled by the text's first two headings (**After thirty years of striving, still a deadlock**, p. 3; and **From the failure of Meech to the Allaire Report**, p. 4) and took shape in the accompanying text. Because grievances were situated in an historical context, there was a sequential accumulation of grievances, which would not be possible to the same extent in the absence of the history discourse type. The enumeration of grievances within an historical context not only invited a degree of reflection but also a course of action: The corresponding resolution to these grievances is one of sovereignty, a proposal arrived at **quite naturally** (p. 7). The naturalness of the project was advanced by the historical recontextualization and consultative process presented and by the text's style of impersonal exposition. The use of third person throughout divorced the Yes side from the text and thus implied that the proposed resolution was arrived at quite independently from the Yes side and the governing sovereigntist party, the Parti Québécois.

Although the history discourse type ended on page seven, the resolution sub-text continued and presented as a discourse in its own right (p. 8-12). Mixed with it was a political discourse type encompassing economics and a social-fiscal theme centring on employment, health, and social programs (the business case for sovereignty). The two

discourses worked well together with the resolution type underscoring the proposed course of action (sovereignty and partnership) and the political type underscoring the ensuing political/fiscal advantages. Two lists helped to define these discourse types. The first outlined the merits of sovereignty (p. 8). The impersonal exposition of the previous section gave way in the list to a more informal presentation characterized by the personal pronouns **our** and **us**. This exposition might well signal an involvement strategy of the Yes side. That is, linguistically the text brought together the Yes side and other Quebecers, which allowed both groups to share in the possibilities of a sovereign Québec. The second list underscored **An economic and political partnership** (p. 10-12, original title in capitals). Impersonal exposition characterized this list and there was strong quantification rhetoric (Augoustinos, Lecouteur, & Soyland, 2002; van Dijk, 1993b). This helped to convey in an objective manner what the partnership had to offer and what could be expected from it.

In the middle part of the text, a discourse of resolution gave way to a return to the history discourse type, as evidenced by (a) a list containing historic and present-day grievances (**A grim balance sheet**, p. 12-13), (b) a reference to the 1980 referendum on independence (p. 14), and (c) a description of the repatriation of the Canadian Constitution (p. 14), which was a grievance shared by many Quebecers (the Night of the Long Knives). These grievances signalled the start of a second distinctive grievance-resolution structure.

The political/fiscal discourse type from the earlier part of the text carried forward into the recurring history discourse, as did its impersonal exposition. However, there was a change from one of advantages associated with the sovereignty/partnership resolution

in the first part of the text to one of the disadvantages of federalism. The political/fiscal discourse type served a particular purpose in this middle section. That is, it tied together historical and present day grievances, and grievances that were expected to carry on into the future if Quebecers voted No in the referendum.

As with the first instance of the grievance-resolution discourse type, this second sequence took the form of the past is bad. However, it extended to a pattern characterized by the future will be bad if Québec remains in Canada. The proposed resolution was presented as a rhetorical option: Vote No for **a vacuum and a collapse** (p. 14-16). As the text shifted to the discourse of resolution, there was a corresponding shift from impersonal exposition to colloquial, every day language characterized by personal plural pronouns (**we, our, us**). This construction facilitated the sharing of grievances and an appeal to the collective heart of Quebecers, which brought voters and sovereignists together in opposition to No forces.

In a third and final grievance-resolution sequence, the political/fiscal discourse type characteristic of the middle sequence continued, but changed from being negative to being positive, as suggested by the segment's headings: **A deficit comparable with that of many other countries** (p. 16) and **Québec's Strength** (p. 18, Capitals in original). This change signalled a corresponding shift from the previous sequence's theme of the future will be bad to a theme of the future will be good in a sovereign Québec. The final heading on the last page of the text signalled this conclusion, **YES... AND IT ALL BECOMES POSSIBLE** (p. 21).

The analysis of the Yes text's hybridity underscored how discourse types framed the three stages of the politicization process. For instance, the history discourse type

functioned to organize yes side grievances and by implication adversarial attributions. Micro features of the text, such as metaphor and lexical choice, supported these constructions, as earlier sections detailed. The shifting style between personal and impersonal exposition was consistent with the Yes side's notion of appealing to the heart and to the head, respectively. The informality of personal exposition (e.g., characterized by personal pronouns) facilitated the sharing of grievances. Impersonal exposition, on the other hand, facilitated an objective (academic) rendering of the material, thus potentially enhancing the persuasiveness of the message. This objective rendering was further facilitated by the pairing of impersonal exposition with the history and social/fiscal discourse types.

Three sequences of a grievance-resolution subtext emerged from the analysis of Yes side hybridity, each marked by distinct discursive junctures. These junctures underscored shifting macro themes, which contributed to the text's overall argumentative structure: (a) the past has been bad, the future will be good with sovereignty, (b) the past has been bad, the future will be bad if Quebecers vote No, and (c) the future will be good if Quebecers vote Yes. The construction of these temporal and contrasting relations underscored the embeddedness of an involvement strategy within the text's hybridity. That is, the No side's position (of federalism) was constructed as beyond the latitude of acceptability (through the assertion of grievances) and the Yes side's position (sovereignty) was asserted as the natural consequence (and one that was shared by all Quebecers).

No Side Text

Paralleling the Yes text, the dominant genre of the No side document was that of political campaign material, reflecting the structural reality of the Québec referendum. A

prominent feature of this discourse type (and the text as a whole) was its colloquial (vernacular) style. This was underscored on the opening page by a personal letter from Daniel Johnson, addressed to all Quebecers, and throughout the whole text with the high prevalence of the possessive pronouns **we**, **us**, and **our** (pp. 1-4, 6-17). The vernacular campaign style of the opening letter extended to the text's second page. Together these first two pages had an introductory character, as noted earlier, and thematically oriented to: the future will be bad in an independent Québec, the past has been good for Québec, and the future will be good in a united Canada.

Because the political campaign genre and its associated colloquial style characterized the No side text from start to finish, other discourse types were less salient. Notwithstanding, there were subtle shifts in discourse types that supported the text's hybridity. The first such shift followed the introductory text of the opening two pages. That is, an oppositional discourse emerged on the text's third page, signalled by purported grievances that would result from a Yes vote for independence (pp. 3-9). The theme suggested by these grievances was that the future will be bad in a sovereign Québec. In contrast to the introductory pages, there were no references to past or future benefits of a united Canada in this section, which resulted in a more cogent presentation of the oppositional discourse.

The oppositional discourse gave way to positive characterizations of the past and future in a united Canada (pp. 10-13). On page 10, for instance, the vernacular campaign genre took on a nationalism/patriotic tone (with respect to Canada and Québec): **We are proud of our identity as Quebecers and of our Canadian citizenship and It is a great country which Francophones have settled from East to West, and which many**

Quebecers have governed. This tone underscored the notion that the past has been good to Québec. It also provided the context for the construction of a familiar contrast: the past has been good but **Separation would put an end to these benefits** (p. 10). Page 11 continued with the past has been good theme, but also extended to the notion that the future will be good in a united Canada. Emerging from this presentation was another contrast: the future will be good in a united Canada but **Once separated, we would no longer have the same clout or the same influence.** The positive characterization of past and future events was further underscored by a discourse of advocacy (e.g., **we want** and **we expect**, pp.11-12) and by a discourse of Québec nationalism (**our history and our Francophone majority** and **our distinct identity**, pp. 12-13).

An oppositional discourse returned on page 14 and ran through the remainder of the document (pp.14-17). With the exception of the overarching colloquial campaign genre, however, no discourse type dominated as the advocacy and patriotic/nationalism discourses of the previous section were also present. This hybridity reflected the summary character of the section. That is, the themes developed in the earlier parts of the document were reiterated, as were the discourse types in which they were embedded.

Hybridity in the No side text was distinctive for what was not present. Whereas the Yes side document appealed to the head and heart, the No text appeared to be directed only at the heart. For instance, there was an absence of any historical or economic analysis unlike the Yes side text. The colloquial style of the No text further contributed to this emotive presentation. In general, the dominant genre of campaign discourse in the No text can be viewed as representing a social psychological sub-genre, consistent with traditional writings on persuasive communication (e.g., Hovland & Weiss, 1951;

Pratkanis & Aronson, 1991). For instance, we see *fear appeals* associated with No side grievances, *repetition* of these fear appeals, and attacks on Yes side *credibility*.

In relation to PCI, the text's hybridity functioned to both organize and construct No side grievances. For instance, an oppositional discourse (pp. 3-9), bounded by the opening two pages and a discourse of nationalism/patriotism, underscored a number of grievances centring on the future will be bad in a sovereign Québec. The co-occurrence of all these grievances within this discourse type undoubtedly worked to strengthen the overall presentation of these grievances. Although the No side's discourse of advocacy and patriotism/nationalism appeared inconsequential to grievances given the positive outlook presented, these discourse types enabled several contrasting comparisons, which themselves are in the form of grievances (e.g., the past has been good but separation would put an end to this; the future will be good but once separated Québec would not have the same clout). The juxtaposition of these temporal positions can also be viewed as an involvement strategy. That is, voters were presented with alternative scenarios and invited to share the No side's interpretation (e.g., with the *inclusive we*) over the scenarios purportedly resulting from a Yes vote. In general, the analysis of No side hybridity provided support for a number of discourse types within which grievances were constructed and contrasting relations characterized an involvement strategy, thus supporting the discursive embeddedness of these constructs.

Summary

Political campaigns, such as the Québec referendum, are meant to involve society. These campaigns typically lay out reasons and draw conclusions as to why voters should support (or reject) a particular position, candidate, or both. In short, campaigns provide

arguments for (or against) certain options, with the objective being to obtain the consent of voters. From the perspective of politicized collective identity, these arguments signal involvement strategies. The results revealed the diverse ways in which language reflected and shaped Simon and Klandermans's final stage of a fully politicized collective identity, that is, efforts to involve society by processes of triangulation. Shared grievances and adversarial attributions, as topics of discourse, were also shown to be embedded within discourse and were integral to the arguments that comprised each side's involvement strategies.

Recall that it is in seeking to enlist the involvement of society where collective identity fully politicizes, and sovereignists and federalists are two groups whose politicization is well advanced, which may account for the finding that virtually all of the linguistic devices analysed at this stage were explicitly involved in the discursive constructions of each side (see Table 2, below). Moreover, the topics of the two earlier stages were dominant themes in the linguistic features identified in this study: Most of the discursive devices portrayed shared grievances, and just over half of them presented adversarial attributions. Most of the shared grievances and adversarial attributions were, according to Simon and Klandermans, reflections of stages first created in another time and place. However, the results suggest strongly that they persist as important topics of discourse and as strategies for societal involvement in the Yes/No booklet.

Table 2. Linguistic devices occurring in the Yes-No campaign booklet, by PCI Stage and Committee

Linguistic Device	Involvement of Society		Shared Grievances		Adversarial Attributions	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Lexical choice	✓	✓		✓		
Metaphor	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Inclusive-we pronouns	✓	✓	✓			
Us-versus-them categories	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Use of questions		✓		✓		
Narrative structure	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Headings	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Lists	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Intertextuality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Hybridity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

In the present work, shared grievances and adversarial attributions were often embedded in macro themes of good/bad contrast (Table 3). For example, one of the more prominent Yes side macro themes was that the past had been bad for Québec and therefore the only option is sovereignty. A second macro theme centred on the notion that the future will be bad if Québec stays in Canada (e.g., **The dangers of a NO: a vacuum and collapse**, p. 14, heading), with the proposed solution a yes vote. A third macro theme suggested that the future will be better if Québec becomes sovereign (**Yes ... and it all becomes possible**, p. 21, heading). Individually, each of these themes underscored an involvement strategy that incorporated grievances and adversarial attributions. Taken together, these sequences represented a more sophisticated strategy of triangulating voters, one designed to weaken the link between the No side and voters (sequence 1 and 2) and strengthen the link between the Yes side and voters (sequence 3).

Table 3. Macro Themes in the Yes/No Campaign Booklet

Yes Side Text	No Side Text
Past has been bad	Past has been good
Future will be bad (if Québec stays in Canada)	Future will be bad (if Québec separates)
Future will be good (if Québec becomes sovereign)	Future will be good (if Québec stays in Canada)

The same macro themes appeared in the analyses of No side text, aimed at persuading Quebecers to take the No side’s preferred option. One such strategy was grounded in the notion that the past has been good to Québec (therefore vote no). A second theme that emerged was that the future would be bad in an independent Québec (e.g., a Yes vote would lead to political uncertainty, economic and social costs, and loss of political influence, pp. 7-9) so vote **No to a weaker Québec** (p. 7, heading). A third identifiable macro theme centred on the argument that a united Canada is **our best option for the future** (so vote no, pp. 11 and 14, last line). As with the Yes side, these three themes signalled a No side involvement strategy of triangulating society by weakening that side of the triangle linking the Yes side (and its position) with voters and by reinforcing the link between voters and the No side (and its position).

In brief, the results demonstrate that the involvement strategies of the Yes and No sides were complex and rich discursive constructions. They included shared grievances and adversarial attributions, which were reintroduced as topics of discourse and were also woven into triangulation strategies through macro themes.

Chapter 6: Discussion

The results demonstrate how the third stage of the politicization process—the involvement of society by triangulation—is constituted in and through discourse, that is, in a wide variety of linguistic structures and strategies that comprised the Yes/No booklet. It is also noteworthy that Simon and Klandermans's first two stages (grievances and adversarial attributions) were reintroduced in this material and were enlisted into the involvement strategies of the Yes and No sides.

These results have several implications, which will be discussed in detail below. The first is an argument for the inclusion of language in a theory of PCI. In Chapter Three, I proposed that discursive processes should be viewed as a fourth essential element along with collective identity, the struggle for power, and societal context. These results also support the view that, in the third and final stage, efforts aimed at involving society by triangulation are complex discursive constructions, which recruit the earlier shared grievances and adversarial attributions as discourse topics. In addition, PCI can reveal some specific characteristics of the struggle for Québec independence, for instance, how sovereignists and federalists position their communications strategies. Turning to critical discourse analysis, this research begins to address a number of criticisms of CDA, including the limitations of its view of social relations as bi-polar conflicts and inadequate use of comparative analyses. Moreover, the results underscore CDA not only as a method but also as a theory having explanatory value. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the limitations of the present study and outlines possible next steps.

Implications for Politicized Collective Identity

The finding that discursive processes play an integral role in reflecting and shaping efforts to involve society by triangulation—and with shared grievances and adversarial attributions, as topics of discourse—provides support for the inclusion of discourse as a fourth underlying element of PCI, along with the struggle for power, collective identity, and societal context. The addition of discursive processes into PCI's theoretical backdrop parallels recent social theory, as discussed in the introductory chapters. That is, this idea is consistent with the view of social practices as outlined by Harvey (1996) and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) who conceptualize social practices as being comprised of an interplay of discourse and language, power, social relations, material practices, beliefs, values, desires, and institutions and rituals. Although Simon and Klandermans's underlying theoretical triad is a useful heuristic, the three elements comprising this triad are conceptualized as bounded, discrete, concrete things (or “pillars”). Harvey (1996) and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) warn about crystallizing or creating permanencies out of free-flowing processes. As suggested in the earlier chapters, Simon and Klandermans's underlying elements (i.e., collective identity, the struggle for power, and societal context) appear to be interdependent. The present findings demonstrate that an interdependent view of underlying elements adds to the theoretical understanding offered by PCI, particularly so when discourse is included as a fourth element.

Beyond suggesting generally that discursive processes have a role in a theory of PCI, these findings have particular significance for the third stage of the politicization process—the involvement of society by triangulation. The results demonstrate that the

theoretical integration of discourse and PCI contributes to a greater understanding of how groups enlist third parties and thus builds upon the process of accomplishment theorized by Simon and Klandermans.

The involvement strategy of reintroducing grievances and adversarial attributions as topics of discourse takes PCI in a new direction. The coming together of the antecedents to a fully politicized collective identity in the Yes/No booklet makes sense because the politicization of sovereignists and federalists is well advanced: There has been ongoing political struggle between these groups for several decades. Within each group, grievances and adversarial attributions emerged some time ago, and both groups have worked to involve voters in their struggle, for instance, in numerous elections and several referenda. The Yes/No booklet is thus a product of two groups in the final stage of the politicization process, that is, the involvement of society by triangulation. What is significant is that stages constituted in earlier historical periods are reintroduced in the Yes/No booklet. More directly, the results of this study suggest that, in many cases, efforts to involve society by triangulation are accomplished by a strategy of recruiting Quebecers into federalist and sovereignist shared grievances and adversarial attributions, a finding that was demonstrated over and over again by the linguistic analysis. The present study suggests that shared grievances, adversarial attributions, and the involvement of society are not always stages but rather can be interdependent, cumulative, and overlapping processes that are sometimes shaped by discourse and at other times are topics of discourse.

The results demonstrate that assertions of shared grievances and adversarial attributions, and efforts to involve society, are repeatedly embedded in multiple linguistic

features, which strengthens the case for a discursive approach to them. One could object that the various linguistic features that reflected and shaped these processes sometimes drew on the same segments of text (e.g., a grievance could be shaped by a metaphor, which is itself embedded within a bulleted list found within an introduction). However, there is no reason why different devices should be isolated in different segments and not overlap, as they refer to different levels of the discourse. Moreover, I initially searched for each linguistic device independently, one at a time. Only subsequently did I put them together, looking for interconnectedness with other linguistic devices. This multi-layered approach provides converging linguistic evidence where at every level of the Yes/No booklet, the linguistic structures and strategies were serving the aims proposed by PCI. Thus, the repetition further supported the prediction that PCI is constituted in and through discourse, that is, in the linguistic structures and strategies that make up the Yes/No booklet.

A further contribution of this research is the identification of a number of linguistic structures and strategies that directly reflect and shape the third stage of the politicization process. The inclusive-we merits attention because it allows each side to speak for third parties (such as Quebecers or Francophones) without permission, thus discursively co-opting the involvement of society. Processes of triangulation are particularly evident when the inclusive-we is used in conjunction with an *us* versus *them* dichotomy. The results of the analysis of the inclusive-we lend support for Simon and Klandermans's contention that groups try to involve society by drawing on nested and overlapping identities. The inclusive-we also acts as an issue management strategy whereby each side both ingratiate itself with some third parties, such as Francophones

and at the same time (in the case of the No side) distances itself from Anglophones by omitting references to this group.

Based on this research, several general conclusions can be drawn about the PCI theory of involving society: Within any side's text, efforts to involve society are put into action by multiple linguistic features. Involvement strategies embed discursive representations of shared grievances and adversarial attributions; the involvement strategies found in these data formed overarching themes, which themselves were more comprehensive macro involvement strategies (e.g., Table 3). Both sides manipulated temporal references (past and future), but the outcomes prescribed by each side were opposed in a manner that maximized each side's triangulation of society (e.g., good vs. bad and sovereignty vs. federalism). Whether the aforementioned observations are general characteristics of involvement strategies is something that future research into other social and political issues will need to address.

Beyond demonstrating that asserted grievances (and adversarial attributions) are constituted as topics of discourse, these data extend the view of grievances described by Simon and Klandermans (2001) and Klandermans (1997). That is, the analysis of each side's text identified grievances that were projected into the future, a possibility not explicitly mentioned by Simon and Klandermans; for example, "In the event of a yes vote. . . an international border would **separate us from** our families, friends and fellow citizens" and "By voting NO: We accept that the elderly, the unemployed, and in particular women and young people would be the first victims of federal cuts." By projecting grievances into the future, it is much more difficult (if not impossible) to refute

their veracity. These prospective grievances are thus much more likely to be open to manipulation and to serve the side's purpose of involving society.

Another aim of the present study was to show how Simon and Klandermans's theory of politicized collective identity contributes to our understanding of the struggle for Québec independence, as revealed in a linguistically oriented analysis of referendum discourse. The results of this study provide several new insights into this power struggle including an evidenced-based explanation of how linguistic structures and strategies might foster an involvement of Québec voters through processes of triangulation in which voters were forced to choose sides, that is, yes or no to Québec independence. These results also revealed that the sovereignists and federalists positioned their communication strategies quite differently. As demonstrated by the analysis of hybridity and supported by analysis of other linguistic features, sovereignists appealed to voters hearts as well as to their minds (an assertion that sovereignists themselves made on the last page of the Yes side text, albeit in reference to the referendum question and the June 12 agreement). Whereas passionate oratory about Québec's aspirations for political independence and reasoned arguments for the sovereignist project characterized Yes side discourse, the contrasting No side discourse was characterized by repeated emotional messages that attacked the trustworthiness of sovereignists and appealed to voters' fears about the viability of an independent Québec. With their overriding emphasis not only on fear appeals but also on repetition of their message and attacks on Yes side credibility, the federalist communication strategy could well have been grounded in traditional social psychological approaches to social influence.

Implications for Critical Discourse Analysis

Hammersley (1997) has criticised CDA for adopting an overly simple, bi-polar model of social relations (e.g., that of oppressor and oppressed). Theoretically, PCI's conceptualization of the triangulation process, whereby two antagonists who are engaged in a power struggle then enlist the support of third parties, offers CDA a more sophisticated but intuitively appealing position on group relations. The discursive embeddedness of the triangulation process in the Yes/No booklet provides support for this more complex view of group relations. The analysis of the inclusive-we in particular supports nested and overlapping identities in campaign discourse. These results argue for an extension of the analytical frame in CDA beyond an implicit bi-polar (us vs. them) model, which has previously characterized research in this tradition.

The interest in the Yes/No booklet stems in part from its quasi-experimental qualities, an influence from my disciplinary background in experimental social psychology. This field commonly uses data from two or more groups (whether pre-existing or assigned to experimental conditions), with the frequent goal of explaining variation between groups. The decision to choose the Yes/No booklet as material for analysis made possible a analogous *comparative analysis* between the discourse of the two sides, an analytical design that Stubbs (1997) has argued is lacking in much of CDA research, to the detriment of the field. This study demonstrated that the analysis of any given side's text is strengthened by comparing it to the other side's text (e.g., lexical choices of sovereignty versus separation or temporal references as revealed in analysis of hybridity). The result of this comparative analysis is a richer understanding than would otherwise be the case. Stubbs has also criticized CDA for the paucity of analyses that

report converging linguistic evidence in support of any given construct. These results begin to address this concern in that the discursive construction of grievances, adversarial attributions, and involvement strategies were supported by the embeddedness of these constructs within multiple discursive features (see Results for specific examples and Table 2 for a summary). Conducting research that addresses criticisms levelled at CDA makes at least some of the enterprise of CDA stronger.

Although I am not proposing that CDA should adopt the methodology of social psychology, I do suggest that interdisciplinary research like the present study offers new perspectives for both areas. The results of this study have implications for not only PCI but also for social psychological constructs, for instance, degree of affinity, positive (and negative) self-presentations, and credibility of source. These strategies were shown to work at a detailed discursive level, which is in contrast to the typical cognitive explanation for these concepts within social psychology. By incorporating the views of discourse presented in this study, future research might be able to extend further our understanding of these concepts, both in practice and theory

Research in the CDA tradition frequently centres on description and analysis of pressing social issues, the results of which provide new insights and make significant contributions to the literature. Less common is work that uses CDA to examine theoretical constructs. It is in the latter spirit that the present work was conceived and conducted. The finding that efforts to involve society are constituted in and through a variety of discursive structures and strategies and that grievances and adversarial attributions as topic of discourse are likewise shaped by discourse not only supports

CDA's interpretative approach but also underscores the import of CDA and its theoretical view of language as an explanatory construct for real world data.

Limitations and Future Research

The results of this study supported the idea that language not only reflects but also shapes the politicization process. What is needed is a clearer understanding of the process of accomplishment of all of these stages (e.g., transitions from one stage to another). As previously mentioned, the politicization of sovereignists and federalists was well advanced even before the 1995 Québec referendum, with numerous grievances and adversarial attributions first appearing in earlier historical periods. To develop further the role that language plays in the politicization process, discourse from these earlier periods could be analyzed. For instance, examining linguistic structures and strategies from the first assertion of a grievance would certainly provide additional theoretical insight into PCI and the role of language in this stage.

Another potential limitation is that the material analysed was all in English. The French version of the Yes/No booklet was distributed to all Québec households and included information on how each side's text could be obtained in English, as translated by each side. This study used these English translations. Although there was no record of contention over these translations, there is another sense in which translation warrants discussion. Because English translations of French (or vice versa) might not convey some linguistic features in exactly the same manner as the original text, the present analysis was constrained to textual features that were not likely to be affected by translation. As a result, some linguistic features (e.g., active or passive voice) were not included in the analysis. For these reasons, I hoped to minimize translation issues.

To aid the reader in assessing claims, discourse analysts always provide excerpts of text and invite readers to assess critically the interpretation provided by the analyst. Inevitably, the analyst has a different position to the material under study than any given reader. The results of this study need to be interpreted in light of my position. I am an English speaker who has never lived in Québec. Someone with a different history (e.g., a Francophone, a Quebecer, older or younger) may well have different insights into the material examined. There may be grievances represented in the Yes or No side text that escaped me but that would resonate with other people. Another aspect of my background that may well have influenced these results is my opinion on political independence for Quebec, to which I am not necessarily opposed. However, I am opposed to elites manipulating language or manufacturing the consent of the public (e.g., Herman & Chomsky, 1988). As a result, my inclination is to side with marginalized groups. In my own way, I accomplish this by exposing meaning that is hidden or obscured. More directly, in this study, I shed light on the Yes and No side strategy of involving society by processes of triangulation. One next step would be to share these findings with a larger audience.

Concluding Remarks

For social groups engaged in political struggles, campaign literature is a common method used to convey information, to mobilize consensus, and, more generally, to involve society in preferred versions. This study demonstrated that, at a more detailed discursive level, efforts to involve society go beyond mere communication of information and are constituted in a variety of discursive structures and strategies. Enlisted in support of this third stage are discursively constructed grievances and adversarial attributions.

Evidence of the discursive embeddedness of these stages in campaign discourse supports the thesis that discourse is an essential element that needs to be integrated into a theory of politicized collective identity. The results of this study also demonstrate that critical discourse analysis offers not only a systematic approach to understanding texts and relevant social practices but also has explanatory value in relation to understanding a theoretical frameworks such as politicized collective identity. Additional work remains in understanding the role of discourse in the process of accomplishment theorized by politicized collective identity. However, we are now a step closer to understanding social and political struggle between groups, including their contentious public debate.

References

- Allsop, J., Jones, K., & Baggott, R. (2004). Health consumer groups in the UK: a new social movement? *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 26, 737-756.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London: New Left Books.
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 80-114.
- Ashmore, R. D., Jussim, L., Wilder, D., & Heppen, J. (2001). Toward a social identity framework for intergroup conflict. In R. D. Ashmore, L. Jussim, & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction* (pp. 213-249). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Augoustinos, M., Lecouteur, A., & Soyland J. (2002). Self-sufficient arguments in political rhetoric: constructing reconciliation and apologizing to the Stolen Generations. *Discourse & Society*, 13, 105-142.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogical imagination* (H. Holoquist, Ed., C. Emerson & H. Holoquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (C. Emerson & H. Holoquist, Eds., V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barth, F. (Ed.). (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Bavelas, J. B. (1995). Quantitative versus qualitative? In W. Leeds-Hurwitz (Ed.), *Communication as social construction: Social approaches to the study of communication* (pp. 49-62). New York: Guilford Press.
- Biddle, W. (1931). A psychological definition of propaganda. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 26, 283-295.
- Bill 1: An Act respecting the future of Québec, National Assembly of Québec, 35th Legislature, 1st Sess. (1995).
- Bill 101: Charter of the French language, National Assembly of Québec, 31st Legislature, 2nd Sess. (1977).
- Billig, M. (1999a). Conversation Analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 572-576.
- Billig, M. (1999b). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 543-558.

- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B. (2001). The many faces of social identity: Implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 22, 115-125.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961). The mirror image in Soviet-American relations: A social psychologist's report. *Journal of Social Issues*, 17, 45-56.
- Canadian Broadcast Corporation. (1995). *Report on CBC/SRC Quebec referendum coverage*. Toronto: Author.
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the people Québécois. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 133-150.
- Charter of the United Nations. (1945/1995). In B. Simma, H. Mosler, A. Randelzhofer, C. Tomuschat, R. Wolfrum, H. Brokelmann & C. Rohde (Eds.), *The Charter of the United Nations: A commentary* (pp. 19-38). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Cherry, F. (1995). *Stubborn particulars of social psychology: Essays on the research process*. New York: Routledge.
- Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology. a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse & Society*, 13, 185-208.
- Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and Politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Vol.2, (pp. 206-230). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Committee of Quebecers for the No. (1995, Fall). *Referendum '95: Manifesto of Quebecers for the No: The only answer is no*. (Available from Le Parti Libéral du Québec, 4364 Saint-Denis, Montréal, Québec, H2J 2L1)
- Danet, B. (1980). 'Baby' or 'fetus'? Language and the construction of reality in a manslaughter trial. *Semiotica*, 32, 187-219.
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 149-173.
- Directeur Général des Élections du Québec. (1995). *Non: Québec 95 référendum/Oui: Québec 95 référendum* (DGE-6230, 95-10). Québec City, Canada: Author.
- Draft Bill: An Act respecting the sovereignty of Québec, National Assembly of Québec, 35th Legislature, 1st Sess. (1994).

- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: a comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 35-58.
- Elms, A. C. (1975). The crisis of confidence in social psychology. *American Psychologist*, 30, 967-976.
- Fairclough N. (1992a). *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (2001a). *Language and power* (2nd edition). London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001b). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus*, 14, 231-242.
- Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. In R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in CDA* (pp. 3-14). London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., & Kress, G. (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, R. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 185-222). London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (Eds.). (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge.
- Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell-Smith, Eds. and Trans.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1976). Anti-languages. *UEA Papers in Linguistics*, 1 (April), 15-45.
- Hammersley, M. (1997). On the foundation of critical discourse analysis. *Language & Communication*, 17, 237-248.
- Harré, R. & Gillett, G. (1994). *The discursive mind*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. London: Blackwell.
- Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon.
- Hobbes, T. (1651/1946). *Leviathan: Or the matter, forme and power of a commonwealth ecclesiasticall and civil* (M. Oakeshott, Ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

- Hornsey, M. J., Blackwood, L., & O'Brien, A. (2005). Speaking for others: the pros and cons of group advocates using collective language. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 8, 245-257.
- House of Commons Debates: Official Report (Hansard), 10 (41, September 9th), 34th Parliament, 3rd Sess [Canada]. (1992).
- House of Commons Debates: Official Report (Hansard), 133 (235-249), 35th Parliament, 1st Sess [Canada]. (1995).
- House of Commons Debates: Official Report (Hansard), 9 (1700), 36th Parliament, 1st Sess [Canada]. (1997).
- Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 15, 635-650.
- Jackson, J. M. (1988). *Social psychology, past and present: An integrative orientation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Klandermans, B., Sabucedo, J. M., Rodriguez, M., & de Weerd, M. (2002). Identity processes in collective action participation: farmers' identity and farmers' protest in the Netherlands and Spain. *Political Psychology*, 23, 235-251.
- Klandermans, B., Sabucedo, J. M., & Rodriguez, M. (2004). Inclusiveness of identification among farmers in The Netherlands and Galicia (Spain). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, 279-295.
- Kress, G. R., & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of automobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13, 585-589.
- McGaw, D. (1991). Governing metaphors: The war on drugs. *American Journal of Semiotics*, 8, 57-74.
- McRoberts, K., & Posgate, D. (1980). *Quebec: Social change and political crisis*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 158-174.

- Mushaben, J. M. (1986). Grassroots and gewaltfreie aktionen: A study of mass mobilization strategies in the West German peace movement. *Journal of Peace Research*, 23, 141-153.
- National Committee for the Yes. (1995, Fall). *Yes: Québec 95 référendum*. (Available from the Parti Québécois, 1200 Papineau Avenue, Montréal, Québec, H2K 4R5)
- O'Connor, S. C. (1998). Intergroup conflict: The discursive battle over Quebec independence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54, 777-794.
- Ouellet, F. (1992). The Quiet Revolution: A turning point. In T. Axworthy & P. Trudeau (Eds), *Towards a just society* (pp. 357-385). Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Parti Libéral du Québec. (1995, February). *The separation of Quebec: What does it mean to you, Some of the Reasons why the Quebec Liberal Party is opposed to the separation of Quebec* [Brochure]. Montreal: Author.
- Pinard, M. (1994). The secessionist option and Quebec public opinion, 1988-1993. *Canada Opinion*, 2 (3), 1-5.
- Potter, J., & Reicher, S. (1987). Discourse of community and conflict: The organization of social categories in accounts of a 'riot.' *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 25-40.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pratkanis, A., & Aronson, E. (1991). *Age of propaganda: The everyday use and abuse of persuasion*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Reckman, P. (1979). *Naar een strategie en methodiek voor sociale actie*. Baarn: Bosch and Keuning.
- Referendum Act (1995, September), Directeur Général des Élections du Québec R.S.Q., c. C-64.1. Les Directeur Général des Élections du Québec.
- Rogers, R. S., Stenner, P., Gleeson, K., & Rogers, W. S. (1995). *Social psychology: A critical agenda*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Rose, N. (1990). Psychology as a 'social' science. In I. Parker & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Deconstructing social psychology* (pp. 105-116). New York: Routledge.
- Sarason, S. B. (1981). An asocial psychology and a misdirected clinical psychology. *American Psychologist*, 36, 827-836.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8, 165-187.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 413-416.

- Schegloff, E. A. (1999a). Naivete vs sophistication or discipline vs. self-indulgence: A rejoinder to Billig. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 577-582.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999b). 'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data': A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 558-572.
- Sears, D. O., Fu, M., Henry, P. J., & Bui, K. (2003). The origins and persistence of ethnic identity among the "new immigrant" groups. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66, 419-437.
- Seidel, G. (1987). The white discursive order: The British New Right's discourse on cultural racism with particular reference to the Salisbury Review. In I. M. Zavala, T. A. van Dijk & M. Díaz-Diocaretz (Eds.), *Approaches to discourse, poetics and psychiatry* (pp. 39-66). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Senn, D. J. (1989). Myopic social psychology: An overemphasis on individualistic explanations of social behavior. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *The state of social psychology: Issues, themes, and controversies* (pp. 45-52). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sharp, G. (1973). *The politics of non-violent action*. Boston: Porter Sargent.
- Shotter, J. (1993). *Conversational realities: Constructing life through language*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *An interpersonal theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, 56, 319-331.
- Solano, C. H. (1988). The interaction perspective: Getting the social back into social psychology. In M. R. Leary (Ed.), *The state of social psychology: Issues, themes, and controversies* (pp. 35-44). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sovereignty of States in the UN. (1990). In E. J. Osmańczyk (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the United Nations and international agreements* (2nd ed., p. 859). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Sovereignty over Natural Resources. (1990). In E. J. Osmańczyk (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of the United Nations and international agreements* (2nd ed., p. 859). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Squire, C. (1990) Crisis what crisis? Discourses and narratives of the 'social' in social psychology. In I. Parker & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Deconstructing social psychology* (pp. 33-60). New York: Routledge.

- Statistics Canada (1997). 1996 Census: Mother tongue, home language and knowledge of languages. *The Nation* (catalogue no. 93F0024XDB96000). Ottawa, Ontario: Author.
- Steiner, I. D. (1974). Whatever happened to the group in social psychology? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 94-108.
- Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's children: critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan & A. Wray (Eds.), *Evolving models of language* (pp. 100-116), Papers from the 1996 Annual Meeting of BAAL, Milton Keynes: Multilingual Matters.
- Stürmer, S., & Simon, B. (2004). The role of collective identification in social movement participation: a panel study in the context of the German gay movement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 263-277.
- Supreme Court of Canada (1998). Reference by the Governor in Council concerning certain questions relating to the secession of Quebec from Canada (File No. 25506). Ottawa, Ontario: Author.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 33, 1-39.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1984). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- The United States Constitution. (1787). Retrieved May 8, 2002, from <http://www.house.gov/Constitution/Constitution.html>
- Trew, T. (1979). 'What the papers say': Linguistic variation and ideological difference. In R. Fowler, R. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.), *Language and control* (pp. 185-222). London: Routledge.
- Trudeau, P. E. (1996, February). Lucien Bouchard, illusionist. Retrieved October 25, 2000, from <http://www.uni.ca/trudeau.html>

- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News analysis: Case studies of international and national news coverage in the press*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993a). Editor's forward to critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4, 131-132.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993b). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993c). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4, 249-283.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1994a). Critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 5, 435-436.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1994b). Discourse analysis as social analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 5, 163-164.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse & Society*, 6, 243-289.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, cognition and society. *Discourse & Society*, 7, 5-6.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). The study of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (pp. 1-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G., & Troutman, D. (1997). Discourse, ethnicity, culture and racism. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 144-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Volosinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1929)
- Votes and Proceedings, 96, 31st Legislature, 4th Sess National Assembly of Québec (1980).
- Votes and Proceedings, 77, 35th Legislature, 1st Sess National Assembly of Québec (1995).
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 387-412.
- Wiener, M., & Mehrabian, A. (1968). *Language within language. Immediacy: A channel in verbal communication*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix A: Yes Side Text

["Oui Québec 95 Référendum" was printed in large font across the page.]

[Graphic: A black and white portrait of Jacques Parizeau covering the majority of the page. Portrait title is reproduced underneath the picture (see below).]

Mr. Jacques Parizeau

Chairman of the National Committee for the YES

"We agree to join forces and coordinate our efforts so that during the referendum in the fall of 1995, Quebecers will be able to speak out in favour of a genuine change: to bring about the sovereignty of Québec and to formally propose a new economic and political Partnership with Canada..."

Jacques Parizeau Lucien Bouchard Mario Dumont

Agreement signed June 12, 1995

On October 30, every Quebecer will be called on to express his or her opinion about the future of Québec. You will be speaking for yourselves, for your children, and for all the generations that will follow.

This project on which you will be casting your vote fits in with the history of Québec and with modern trends in the world today. It offers the only possible response to a federal regime that denies we are a people and deprives us of the means to ensure our own development. It makes concrete the aspirations so often expressed by the men and women of Québec and by our prime ministers, ... all but one.

After thirty years of striving, still a deadlock

"We have attained political maturity. Now we are ready for economic liberation and we are no longer talking about 'now or never'; tonight we say that it is now that we shall become masters in our own house."

Jean Lesage, 1962

"I would like to be the first president of the Republic of Québec, a State associated with the rest of Canada."

Daniel Johnson Sr., 1965

"We need to dare to grasp for ourselves the full freedom of Québec, its right [...] to complete control over each and every one of its main collective decisions. Which means that Québec must become as quickly as possible a sovereign State."

René Lévesque, 1968

"English Canada must understand very clearly that, whatever we say and whatever we do, Québec is today and for all time a distinct society, free and capable of assuming its own destiny and its development."

Robert Bourassa, 1990

"I am a Canadian first and foremost."

Daniel Johnson, 1994

From the failure of Meech to the Allaire Report

After the rejection by English Canada, in June 1990, of the Meech Lake Accord and the five conditions described by Robert Bourassa as the most minimal ever presented by Québec, the National Assembly created the Commission on the Political and Constitutional Future of Québec: the Bélanger-Campeau Commission.

In March 1991, the Commission recommended that the National Assembly of Québec adopt a law providing for a referendum on the sovereignty of Québec, to be held by October 26, 1992 at the latest. The recommendation stemmed from the following findings:

"The vision of an exclusive national Canadian identity emphasizes the centralization of powers and the existence of a strong 'national' government. This vision appears to have a levelling effect: an exclusive national Canadian identity centred on the equality of individuals actually becomes a prohibition for Québec to be different as a society."

"Two courses are open to Québec with respect to the redefinition of its status, i.e. a new, ultimate attempt to redefine its status within the federal regime, and the attainment of sovereignty."

The 600 briefs submitted to the Commission, the studies undertaken by 55 experts, the hearings held across Québec were so conclusive that the Liberal Party of Québec decided to present the following alternative to Canada: either Ottawa transfers 22 powers to Québec, accords it a right of veto, and abandons its spending power or there will be a referendum on sovereignty.

This recommendation in the Allaire report became the official programme of the Liberal Party after it was adopted by a strong majority at the party convention in March, 1991. This official policy of the Liberal Party testifies to the strength of the consensus in Québec, as well as to the inconsistency of the same party which, under Daniel Johnson, now offers nothing but a vacuum and consequently the possibility of being crushed before Jean Chrétien. Yet the Allaire Report was clear:

"The inflexibility of the current structure is deeply prejudicial to the interests of Québec, and will be even more so in the future."

"Provided the referendum deals with sovereignty and that the result is positive, the next step will then be a formal request by the National Assembly to the government of Canada to enter negotiations, as soon as possible, leading to the sovereignty of the Québec State. In these negotiations, according to this second hypothesis, Québec would offer the rest of Canada an economic union managed by confederal institutions."

In June 1991, in the wake of the report by the Bélanger-Carnpeau Commission and in accordance with his party's programme, Robert Bourassa had the National Assembly adopt Law 150, in which the first article made it compulsory to hold a referendum on sovereignty by October 26, 1992 at the latest.

Two months before that deadline, Robert Bourassa went back on his promise never again to negotiate as one against ten; the Liberal Party turned its back on its own programme and forced the National Assembly to modify Law 150. The referendum would deal instead with the Charlottetown Accord. Quebecers rejected it because there was nothing in it for Québec and Canadians did the same, because they saw it as offering still too much to Québec.

The Commissions on the Future of Québec and the June 12 Agreement

As soon as it was elected, the Parti Québécois government undertook to meet its commitment to allow Quebecers to take their own decision on their future. A draft bill was tabled in the National Assembly and the Commissions on the Future of Québec initiated consultations with the population. More than 55,000 persons took part in the process and 5500 briefs were submitted.

In addition to identifying sovereignty as the only option liable to respond to the aspirations of Quebecers, the commissions showed a strong consensus on four points:

- **the process of accession to sovereignty is profoundly democratic;**
- **Quebecers want to participate in the process and to be fully informed;**
- **they long for change: sovereignty must make possible the emergence of a blueprint for society;**
- **they hope relations between Québec and Canada will be maintained.**

Three political parties – the Parti Québécois, the Bloc Québécois, and Action Démocratique – responded to these expectations: an agreement signed by the three leaders endorses a fresh, new, fully modern proposal, while the document they signed, entitled "Our Hearts in Our Work," offers an outline for a genuine blueprint for society.

An agreement for sovereignty and a formal offer of partnership

On June 12, 1995, in a synthesis of their parties' goals and also of the Allaire Report, Jacques Parizeau, Lucien Bouchard, and Mario Dumont arrived quite naturally at the proposal of a Québec that will be free to vote all its laws, sign all its treaties, and raise all its taxes; a Québec that will offer Canada a new economic and political partnership.

"If Québec wants to emancipate itself from the federalism of trusteeship and from the domination of a central government constantly reinforced by the dynamic of the general powers it holds, there is no way out except sovereignty."

-Senator

Arthur Tremblay,

September, 1995

SOVEREIGNTY TO:

GIVE Québec the normal political framework of a distinct people: a country;

HOLD all powers in order to assume our development while at the same time putting an end to the constitutional debates that divert so much of our energy;

GUARANTEE the flourishing of the French language and culture, notably by regaining the powers taken away from us by the 1982 patriation of the Constitution and by having 100% control over our immigration policy;

HAVE ACCESS to all the levers for job creation, youth training, and guaranteeing women's rights in the job market;

PROTECT our social achievements and to safeguard seniors and the poorest among us against cuts by Ottawa;

**"Honestly, if
there were a referendum
in Québec tomorrow, I
would feel unable to
come to the defense of a
country that does not
accept me with my
differences and my own
history..."**

- Senator

Claude Castonguay,

Minister under

Robert Bourassa,

July, 1994

DECIDE on our priorities and put an end to the inequities of a regime that offers us social assistance and unemployment, insurance while outside of Québec it creates jobs;

SUPPORT the small and medium-size businesses that create 90% of the jobs in Québec;

OFFER true decentralization to our regions by turning over to local and regional bodies the powers and resources necessary for their development;

RECOVER \$28 billion of our taxes and eliminate \$2.7 billion worth of waste and duplication;

PERMIT Québec to participate - by itself and for itself - in a world where the opening of markets offers tremendous possibilities and new challenges that are not available to it within an inefficient federal system.

**"It is in our economic
interest to maintain
these ties. [...] We will
not drop those economic
ties if you modify your
political status."**

- Howard Dean,
Governor of the State
of Vermont,
June, 1994

AN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL PARTNERSHIP TO:

ADD to the guarantees of access to markets available through the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Agreement, a treaty that is in the interests of both Québec and Canada to maintain and consolidate their economic ties;

DETERMINE Québec's fair share of the federal debt and ascertain jointly the details of its financing, as the YES coalition has always said it will do, even though international law points out that Canada bears the sole responsibility for it;

ENSURE the free circulation of capital by confirming Québec's choice to use the Canadian dollar and to maintain the existing financial system which allows Canadian banks to administer \$120 billion of Québec's assets;

ESTABLISH a customs union recognizing \$67 billion in purchases, without customs or borders, between Québec and Canada which will ensure the latter 400,000 jobs;

**On sharing of the debt
and on economic ties:
“They will go running
towards one another to
conclude an agreement.”**

-Robert Fairholm,
DRI-McGraw Hill,
New York,
September, 1995

CONFIRM Québec’s decision to allow dual citizenship, as Canada already does, and to maintain the free circulation of persons, notably for all Canadian companies that do business in Québec and have major installations here;

AGREE UPON joint actions in all areas of shared interest to Québec and Canada;

ESTABLISH within a new political partnership a council of ministers in which the two States, acting as equals, will decide on how the treaty is to be implemented, and an assembly of parliamentarians from the two countries who will make recommendations to the council of ministers;

"There will always be a partnership, there will always be trade relations, not many of my members question that."

- Ghislain Dufour,
Chairman of the
Conseil du Patronat,
September, 1995

CREATE a tribunal responsible for settling any differences on how the treaty will be applied;

The agreement of June 12, 1995 also provides for the creation of a committee to oversee and direct negotiations, made up of independent individuals charged with informing the public about the progress of negotiations.

A grim balance sheet

- Québec is currently deprived of its normal share of federal purchasing and investment, notably in research and development, where we receive only 18% of federal spending while Ontario receives 50%. Overall, every year we are denied \$1.5 billion -- and therefore 26,000 jobs;
- Since 1982 the federal government has cut \$12.3 billion in education and health care, without reducing our taxes. At the same time it has been imposing its policies through pan-Canadian standards which are always more restrictive;

**"Let's be clear. Québec
is asking for all powers
in the area of
professional and
manpower training and
for the budgets
pertaining to them."**

- André Bourbeau,
November, 1991

- The 1993 and 1994 reforms of the unemployment insurance system have driven 12,000 Québec families onto social assistance. The next reform, which the federal government refuses to divulge, will strike at women and the young;
- Even though Daniel Johnson has supported the consensus that Québec must repatriate all financial resources and powers related to training and manpower, Jean Chrétien still refuses, describing the request as "a whim";
- Ottawa uses its spending power to interfere in Québec's jurisdictions. The result is duplication, such as two tax forms, and contradictory policies in the sectors of regional development, housing, culture, the family, the environment, agriculture, forests, etc. A waste of \$1 000 per family per year.

"Because of the
encroachment, obviously
by the federal
government, which is
costing us a fortune;
that's what is costing us
a deficit of essentially
\$30 billion a year."

- Daniel Johnson,
December, 1992

The dangers of a NO: a vacuum and collapse

During the 1980 referendum campaign, six days before the vote

Pierre Elliott Trudeau declared:

"We MPs from Québec are putting our heads on the line, because we're telling Quebecers to vote NO and we are telling you in the other provinces that afterwards we will not accept your interpreting that NO as a sign that all is well and that everything can stay as it was before. We want change, we're putting our seats on the line in order to have change."

Then came the reply: Jean Chrétien orchestrated a *coup de force* to repatriate the Canadian Constitution in 1982, despite the formal refusal of the National Assembly. Québec lost powers it had always had in the fields of language and education.

"According to the Canadian Constitution, the powers and jurisdictions of Québec are clearly inadequate and in a number of respects Québec is even penalized as far as its own development is concerned."

- Gil Rémillard,
November, 1990

This time, Quebecers have been warned:

- By voting NO: We accept that the elderly, the unemployed, and in particular women and young people would be the first victims of federal cuts;
- By voting NO: Québec turns its back on all those demands its prime ministers have so often expressed.
- By voting NO: Jean Chrétien is handed a blank cheque to crush Québec. He will continue to crush us by centralizing in Ottawa even more powers in the areas of health care, education, social assistance and manpower.

**"Québec must have control
over the relevant powers and
funds in terms of everything
pertaining to culture and the
growth of the arts on its
territory."**

- Liza Frulla,
November , 1 991

- By voting NO: We refuse to give ourselves the powers necessary to ensure our future as a French-speaking people in North America and we take the risk that within one generation, the majority of Montrealers will be English-speaking.

- By voting NO: We accept that a federal government and a parliament in which we will be increasingly a minority decides how our tax dollars will be used.

A deficit comparable with that of many countries

When it accedes to sovereignty, Québec will recoup the \$28 billion in taxes that Quebecers currently pay to Ottawa. Similarly, it will take over the spending for programmes Ottawa currently carries out in Québec. Independent actuaries Lamonde and Renaud have established that Québec's total revenues will exceed spending on programmes by \$6.4 billion. This is for the future, but Québec must also assume the past and therefore the interest on the debt.

**"In our opinion, a
(sovereign) Québec will
continue to attract
investment, in return for the
same favorable conditions it
currently enjoys, and
perhaps even better
conditions...."**

- Albert Gordon,
financier and advisor to
American Presidents,
September, 1995

The same experts set the deficit of a sovereign Québec at \$7.9 billion. Such a deficit, proportionately comparable with that of France, Belgium, the United Kingdom or Finland, will be quickly reduced by eliminating overlapping and waste to the tune of \$2.7 billion.

With a deficit in the neighbourhood of \$5 billion, Québec's deficit will be less than the \$6 billion Daniel Johnson has left behind him, for the province's finances alone.

While according to international law Canada would bear sole responsibility for the federal debt, the YES coalition has always maintained that a sovereign Québec will assume its fair share of that debt.

The Bélanger-Campeau Commission had fixed that share at 18.5%. On the basis of more recent data, independent actuaries Lamonde and Renaud establish it at 17.4%.

"To conclude, following the rating and the viewpoint of financial markets, if Québec opts for sovereignty the likeliest result is neutral to positive."

-Albert Gordon,
financier and advisor to
American Presidents,
September, 1995

In both cases, the sharing of the debt takes into account the division of assets. As the geographical allocation of federal buildings and installations has Québec at a disadvantage, this deficit of assets must be taken into consideration.

QUÉBEC'S STRENGTH

- Québec's economy ranks 17th out of 185 countries with a total production of \$161 billion. That is three times greater than Chile, which is about to become part of NAFTA.

- With a production of \$22,366 per inhabitant Québec ranks 9th in the world, at about the same level as France, Austria, and Belgium, and ahead of the United Kingdom, Australia, Sweden and Holland.

- Québec is the 16th trading power in the world, with exports of more than \$72 billion, or 45% of its total production.

- Québec is the 8th trading partner of the United States.

"There is no reason why Quebecers' standard of living should be negatively affected."

-Michel Bélanger,

banker and chairman of the

Organizing Committee of the

NO,

March, 1991

- We control powerful financial levers, such as the Caisse de dépôt et placement (\$48 billion) and the Mouvement Desjardins (\$75 billion).

- Our economy relies on small and medium size businesses which generate more than 90% of new jobs.

- Our hydroelectric resources, our forests and our mineral deposits are the envy of many countries.

- With 7.2 million inhabitants, the population of Québec is greater than that of Norway (4.5 million) and Denmark (5.1 million) and comparable with that of Switzerland (6.8 million) and Austria (7.6 million).

- Our population is highly educated and every year is further enriched by several tens of thousands of new college and university graduates.

"The sovereignty of Québec does not represent a problematical situation for us. If it does come about, we will simply say that RE-MAX is number one in another country."

- Dave Liniger,
co-founder of
RE-MAX,
September, 1995

- We have a highly qualified work force that puts its heart in its work.

- Our expertise is recognized internationally in key areas such as engineering, aerospace, computer technology, telecommunications, pharmaceutical products and transportation.

YES ... AND IT ALL BECOMES POSSIBLE

The forces for change are presenting a proposal that breaks with the political status quo that has been rejected by Quebecers. Since any reform of the federal regime that would accommodate the legitimate interests and needs of Québec is impossible, only sovereignty can answer, now and for the future, Quebecers' desire for autonomy. While they express this aspiration with persistence and conviction, they also wish to maintain flexible ties with their Canadian neighbours by maintaining a common economic space and political institutions. The partnership offer which shall be made to Canada, following a YES victory in the referendum, is inspired by values of openness and respect for two peoples called by geography and history to live side-by-side as good neighbours.

A YES on the night of October 30 will finally make it possible for Québec to attain the political status its linguistic and cultural specificity naturally leads it to. This initiative is resolutely respectful of the identity of First Nations and the anglophone community.

The Constitution of a sovereign Québec will recognize the right of First Nations to self-government on lands over which they will have full ownership, and their existing constitutional rights will be confirmed. The Constitution will also guarantee the anglophone community the preservation of its identity and institutions, notably in the fields of education, health, and social services. The constitutional measures regarding the anglophone community and the First Nations will be defined with the participation of their representatives, and it will not be possible to change the resulting provisions without following rules previously agreed to.

All of us have received the text of the proposed law defining the new political status of Québec, and the text of the agreement signed June 12, 1995. They describe a clear, modern, and open project, which appeals to the heart as well as the mind. It is with pride and enthusiasm that Quebecers will say YES to change and that the new sovereign country of Québec will soon come into being.

Appendix B: No Side Text

REFERENDUM '95

MANIFESTO OF QUEBECERS FOR THE NO

["The only answer is NO" was printed in large font across the centre of the page.]

Authorised and paid by Nathalie Bernier, Official Agent of the Committee of Quebecers
for the NO.

Printed by Le Parti libéral du Québec, 4364 Saint-Denis, Montréal (Québec) H2J 2L1

Dear Quebecer,

Like you, I am proud to be a Quebecer and proud that we are part of Canada.

On October 30th, we will be making a decision that will affect our future irrevocably. The issue of this referendum is simple: do we want Québec to separate from Canada and become an independent country?

Let's think it over carefully. In the event of a yes vote, we would cease to be part of Canada. There is no guarantee that we would be able to regain the advantageous that we had given up.

It would be irresponsible to put our young people's future on hold, to make a decision that could weaken Québec by causing a drop in employment and the value of our currency and an economic slowdown.

We have been able to develop Québec according to our own spirit, while taking our rightful place within Canada.

We are fortunate enough to be both Quebecers and Canadians.

Let's keep Québec strong!
The only answer is No!

Daniel Johnson
President of the Committee
of Quebecers for the NO

We, the women and men of Québec,

confident in our abilities, free to choose, and accountable to future generations, affirm that:

- we are proud to be both Quebecers and Canadians.
- we are proud of the progress that Québec has achieved in all areas within Canada.
- we do not want to renounce Canada, a country which is ours, whose quality of life is among the best in the world and which offers us the best chances for progress;
- a yes vote would lead directly to the separation of Québec;
- the Canadian economic union could not simply be reconstructed after being torn apart by the separation of Québec.
- we do not want the economic uncertainty that would inevitably follow a yes vote, and, in particular, the economic weakening of Québec which would result;
- in the event of a yes vote, the Government of Québec would waste years rebuilding the state, while ignoring our real challenges;
- the only way to ensure that we keep our citizenship, passport, currency, economic union and the right to work anywhere in Canada is to vote NO.

BEYOND THE REFERENDUM, we affirm that:

- Québec will remain a distinct society within Canada, notably through its language, its culture and its institutions;
- our national identity is expressed specifically through the policies and institutions we have established for ourselves within the federal system and which we want to continue to develop freely.
- in voting NO, all avenues, including the constitution, remain open to us to fulfil our aspirations.

Separation: the only issue

The issue in this referendum is separation, independence, sovereignty. It doesn't matter what you call it! In the event of a yes vote, the result would be the same: Québec would no longer be part of Canada, or of the Canadian economic union. An international border would separate us from our families, friends and fellow citizens in Ontario, New Brunswick and elsewhere in Canada. Quebecers would no longer be represented in the federal Cabinet or in Parliament. We would become foreigners in the country we have built. Those are the guaranteed consequences of a yes vote.

The offer of partnership: an empty shell

All Quebecers want to keep the Canadian economic union. And for good reason: our union includes a common currency and a single banking system; it allows Quebecers to work anywhere in Canada and goods to move freely within the country. Without this union, Québec and Canada could still deal with each other as two foreign countries, but it would be much more complicated.

The yes side is proposing to separate us from Canada, to break up the union, and at the same time make an offer to our former fellow citizens to reconstitute an economic union governed by additional political institutions. But Québec would become an independent country, regardless of the outcome of the offer.

"...there is no point in dreaming and asking for the moon. Asking for the moon is imagining that when Québec declares sovereignty we will be able to negotiate a host of economic and political changes with Canada..." - Jacques Parizeau, La Presse, December 3, 1993.

So the yes side's plan includes both a single guarantee and one grand illusion. The guarantee is that Québec would separate from the rest of Canada to become an independent country. The illusion is that Québec and what was left of Canada would manage to reach an agreement on the basis of the draft offer thrown together by the yes side.

An offer is never a guarantee of an agreement. And this draft offer in particular contains nothing that would interest Canada in re-creating an economic union with Québec. Let's take a look:

- Is it realistic to think that we could start to talk about association with Canada before even completing the tough negotiations on dividing the debt and assets, the status of Aboriginals and Inuit, and the other complex issues related to separation?
- Is it realistic to think that Canadians, on whom we had just turned our backs, would want to add another level of government on top of the provinces and the federal government?

- Is it realistic to think that Canada would allow a block of seven million people no longer living within its territory to enjoy the rights associated with Canadian citizenship, including the right to vote and the right hold a Canadian passport, without having to pay taxes to Canada in return?
- Is it realistic to think that Canada would allow a foreign country with one third of its population to obstruct it in areas as sensitive as customs and currency?

Enough tricks!

It is obvious that the offer hurriedly cobbled together by the three separatist leaders in their agreement of June 12 is neither realistic nor serious, since it has not even been discussed tentatively with the potential partner.

In the event of a yes vote, this offer has no chance of resulting in an agreement with Canada. That's why the reference to it in the referendum question is another example of trickery.

On the declaration of sovereignty:

"I think you will find it to be shrewd."

Jacques Parizeau, Journal de Montréal, November 26, 1994.

On discussing association with the rest of Canada:

"I am not the most credible person."

Jacques Parizeau, Le Devoir, April 29, 1995.

"...Quebecers must believe that once they vote yes, Québec will become sovereign regardless of Canada's reaction." -

**Lucien Bouchard,
Le Devoir, June 13,
1995.**

"The only reason I got into active politics was to achieve Québec sovereignty." -

**Jacques Parizeau,
L'Actualité, June
1989.**

Quebecers want a sure, effective economic and political union with other Canadians. Only our participation in the Canadian federation can guarantee us that.

After a yes vote, it would be too late

After a yes vote, we would not have another chance to decide against out-and-out independence after the negotiations on the partnership offer broke down. We would be caught in the machinery, but there would be no emergency brake if the economic situation were to take a serious turn for the worse.

So no one should see a yes vote as a bluff that would force other Canadians to make constitutional proposals to us. The yes side does not want to improve Canada. Voting yes is giving Jacques Parizeau a blank cheque to effect independence.

NO to a weaker Québec!

So we come back to the fundamental question: do we want to separate from Canada, YES or NO?

Let's look first at the economic consequences of separation. On the day after a yes vote, Québec would enter a period of uncertainty of unknown length. Would the break-up take place smoothly? Would the new country be financially viable? All these risks would worry international lenders. Would the Canadian dollar fall on the markets? Would Québec loans held abroad lose their value? International experience indicates that such major political changes drive interest rates up.

And there is no guarantee that they would go back to normal afterwards.

We would all have to pick up the tab. The cost of servicing Québec's debt would increase. The Government of Québec would be able to meet its obligations only by raising taxes or cutting services. Credit would cost more for all consumers.

"Nevertheless, a permanent increase in the interest rate for Québec bonds is inevitable because of the simple arithmetic of risk diversification."

Pierre Fortin, economist and economic advisor to René Lévesque, Commission examining issues relating to Québec's accession to sovereignty, Volume 4, p. 605.

*"A sovereign Québec
does not mean
goodies for
everyone." -
Lucien Bouchard,
Journal de Montréal,
June 9, 1995*

Some companies would have to suspend their investments because of the higher cost of borrowing.

In addition to these general difficulties, there would be problems for all industries that benefit from the Canadian market, such as textiles, tourism, and, of course, the dairy industry.

All this would trigger a lengthy economic slump, with the obvious consequences for jobs and the standard of living.

Loss of influence

As members of the federation, our influence in federal elections is such that the federal government must heed our interests. If we no longer had the right to vote, we would no longer have any influence on the decisions of the Canadian Parliament and government.

The proponents of separation claim that an independent Québec would negotiate with what is left of Canada on a basis of equality. But apart from the deceptive appearance of legal equality, the other negotiating party would have three times our population and three times our economic clout. We would immediately be at a disadvantage.

A huge waste of energy

Putting more people back to work, making a place for our young people, reducing the deficit, combating exclusion: these are major challenges that require total commitment on the part of the government.

Building a separate Québec would mean putting all these issues on hold. First of all, there would be a constitution to write, government departments, commissions, boards, councils and other structures of all kinds to set up, and hundreds of agreements to renegotiate. We would be stalled in a huge bureaucratic undertaking that would monopolize the government's attention and energy for a generation. In the meantime, the real Québec would have to take a rain check.

A yes vote would not end discussions with Canada. Quite the opposite: the build up of the country would involve us in disputes with our former fellow citizens on a whole host of topics we agree about today. Mistrust would feed these fruitless debates which would drag on for years.

And for What?

At the time of the Quiet Revolution, building Québec meant building the Québec state. But times have changed. Trade globalization has altered the rules of the game. With empty coffers, governments can no longer jump-start the economy with public money. So Québec's economic development no longer depends on expanding its government organization. And yet independence would involve exactly that -- a huge bureaucratic undertaking with no guaranteed improvements for citizens.

Fewer jobs, less investment, less money, less influence: that's exactly the kind of weaker Québec that we must avoid!

Canada: the result of our efforts, the guarantee of our success

We are proud of our identity as Quebecers and of our Canadian citizenship. When we travel abroad, we proudly show our Canadian passport, a symbol that we belong to a country of rights, freedoms and peace. We appreciate being able to work anywhere in Canada. We benefit from the Canadian economic union and the stability of the Canadian dollar.

Canada is also the country where Québec women and men have distinguished themselves in business, the arts, science and sports. It is the country with the best quality of life in the world, according to the UN, and the country in which we have succeeded in our efforts to live in French.

We have never ceased to develop within Canada. We have increased our level of education, built major financial institutions and gained control of our own economy. We have built a modern, French-speaking society, enriched by its cultural and linguistic diversity. For 128 years, Canada has not stopped us from fulfilling ourselves. On the contrary: it has been the guarantee of our success.

Our solidarity with more than one million Francophones in the other provinces allows us vigorously to affirm our leadership within the international French-speaking community.

We also benefit from solidarity among Canada's regions. Equalization is designed to share risks and ensure equal opportunities across the country. This year alone, equalization is worth \$3.8 billion for Québec. It has become a cornerstone of our union.

Separation would put an end to these benefits. Because the revenues of an independent Québec would not be enough to pay for all the services we have now, we would be forced to make cuts. The only alternative would be to let the deficit skyrocket, which is just as unacceptable.

Finally, beyond our material interests, Canada is also the country that we have discovered, built and transformed, and which truly belongs to us. It is a great country which Francophones have settled from East to West, and which many Quebecers have governed. It is a country in which we share values of freedom and respect for minorities. Canada is part of every Quebecer's heritage--and we don't want to give it up!

Our best option for the future

Now let's think about the future. In economic terms,, our participation in Canada brings us invaluable advantages. United, Québec and the rest of Canada are a substantial power. We have done well in multilateral trade negotiations. We can open up new Asian markets for our exports, thus creating jobs at home. Together, we are members of the most important international forums: the G7, the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation Council (APEC). Once separated, we would no longer have the same clout or the same influence.

Beyond the referendum

Our two legitimately elected governments will still be responsible for defending our interests.

We want them to focus on our real concerns. We should all dedicate our talents, our intellect and our energy to meeting today's challenges. And that would be the real outcome of a clear vote against separation.

We also expect our two governments to work together to enhance their overall effectiveness. They will have to continue to reduce duplication. The way in which the provision of public services is divided between the governments will have to be reexamined in the public interest. Unless there is a clear benefit in acting otherwise, a given service should be provided by the government level closest to the public.

We expect the current government of Québec to co-operate with its partners and avoid fruitless squabbling.

Finally, we want the federal government to continue its efforts to simplify and deregulate transfers to the provinces.

Québec's place in Canada

Because of our history and our Francophone majority, we are a genuine national community. We are a distinct society within the Canadian federation. In particular, our identity is expressed through our common language, our culture and our institutions. Our identity is not being challenged and does not depend on this referendum or on constitutional debates.

Two recent attempts to amend the Canadian constitution have been unsuccessful. While we regret that it has not been possible to resolve this important problem, we do not conclude that we have to separate because of that.

Indeed, we have affirmed our distinct identity within the Canadian federation. We have passed legislation to affirm the place of the French language and we have succeeded in making it our common tongue, while respecting diversity and minority rights. We have gained control over immigration. We have withdrawn, with compensation, from a number of federal programs in order to set up made-in-Québec programs tailored to our needs: the Québec Pension Plan, student loans and grants, family allowances.

We want to continue our process of self-fulfilment: to build institutions in our own image and to choose our own policies in complete freedom. The Government of Québec must have full autonomy in its areas of jurisdiction. No changes must be made to relations between the Government of Québec and the Government of Canada without Québec's participation and approval. That is the spirit of federalism we believe in.

But we also want to work together with our Canadian partners. Propose solutions to common problems. Develop with them a fair and prosperous country founded on common values and interests. The Government of Québec must play its full role as a major partner in the federation.

Let's keep our options open

Under Québec law, a referendum can refer to only a single option: the one proposed by the government. Those are the rules of the game. By voting NO, we would be rejecting only the option of separation. A NO vote would not mean rejecting any position whatsoever on the Canadian constitution. We would be keeping open all the other possible avenues to change, including the administrative and constitutional ones. The important point is that we be able to fulfil our own aspirations and those of future generations.

Federalism: the way of the future

Throughout the world, federalism makes it possible for different peoples to join forces on major economic issues, while respecting their diversity and their autonomy in the cultural and social spheres. It is one of the most advanced forms of government.

We have a choice to make. We can withdraw into a nation-state, or we can participate in a modern, winning formula -- federalism -- while continuing to affirm our distinct identity.

We, the women and men of Québec ...

We are proud of our Québec identity and our Canadian citizenship.

We are convinced that the draft offer thrown together by the yes side is unrealistic, and that the bottom line of the referendum is simply the separation of Québec.

We want to avoid a weaker Québec and the painful consequences of separation for our jobs and our standard of living.

We are free to choose, proud of our democratic and tolerant society, and confident in our ability to meet the challenges of the future as a united country.

This referendum profoundly affects our future. All Quebecers must exercise their right to vote on October 30.

We are inviting them to vote NO, in order to reject separation and to keep the future open.

The Choice We Must Make

This referendum is about whether or not we separate from Canada. The question speaks of sovereignty and of partnerships and agreements. But beyond the smoke and mirrors, we know that the only sure result of a yes vote would be that Québec would no longer be part of Canada.

Québec would become an independent country, with new international borders on all sides. We would no longer be part of the Canadian economic and political union. We would no longer be citizens of the Canada we helped build.

The Proposed Partnership -- an Illusion

The separatist forces know Quebecers want to maintain the Canadian economic union. So the separatists have shrouded their option in a fog of confusion. They are selling the illusion that by merely undertaking to make an "offer" of an economic and political "partnership", we will somehow continue to enjoy the full benefits of the economic union we have today. However, nothing could be more uncertain.

A yes vote is a one-way ticket to separation. There will be no chance to reconsider. The break-up of Canada would already be under way.

NO to a Weaker Québec

Separation would exact a heavy economic price. A lengthy period of uncertainty would begin the day after a yes vote. Would separation unfold as painlessly as its proponents suggest? Would an independent Québec state be able to meet its obligations to its citizens and lenders? What would happen to our dollar and to interest rates? What would happen to those who depend on Canadian markets, and those who benefit from federal programs and services?

Quebecers have always exerted substantial influence and leadership in the Parliament of Canada and in the federal government. Separation means a loss of representation for the defence of our interests.

As part of Canada, we have opened markets, signed agreements and participated in the most exclusive and effective forums in the international community, such as the G7. As a separate country, these doors would be closed.

Separation would result in countless arguments over issues which currently are not in dispute. With all the acrimony following the break-up, these sterile debates could go on for years.

Beyond the Referendum

Beyond the referendum, both our governments have a duty: to serve and protect our interests. We call on them to devote their time and energy to meeting our real needs. We also expect them to co-operate in increasing their overall efficiency, reducing overlap and re-examining the distribution of responsibilities between them.

The Place of Québec in Canada

Québec is a distinct society within the Canadian federation. Our history, our francophone majority, our culture, our laws and our institutions are testimony to this.

Two recent attempts to amend the Canadian constitution were not successful. While an important issue, this regrettable situation does not justify the break-up of Canada.

Québec has flourished within Canada. We believe the government of Québec must control its areas of responsibility and be a willing party to any change in its relationship with the federal government.

We want to work together with our fellow Canadians to find solutions to our common problems. We wish to continue building a fair and prosperous country based on our common values and mutual interests.

By voting NO, we are rejecting separation, not abandoning any constitutional position. All other avenues, be they administrative or constitutional, remain open to respond to our needs and those of future generations.

Québec in Canada: our Best Bet for the Future

According to the United Nations, Canada has achieved one of the world's highest standards of living. Here 'm Québec, we have developed a modern system of education and founded world-class businesses and institutions. Individual Quebecers have distinguished themselves in all walks of life.

Canada has proven that diversity and distinctiveness can be retained while building and sharing our country together.

Ours is also a country of rights and freedoms, one in which Quebecers and other Canadians share basic values such as cooperation, moderation, tolerance and respect for minorities.

We are proud Quebecers and proud Canadians. That is why we will vote NO.

The complete text is available on request in other languages from the
Committee of Quebecers for the NO at
1-800-957-2966 or (514) 350-4000.