

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA UNIVERZITY KARLOVY
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Homegrown Stereotyping:
The Shaping of Canadian Consciousness
through Television Broadcasting

Vypracovala: Lenka Prosečová
Vedoucí diplomové práce: Mgr. Klára Kolinská, M.A., Ph.D.

Prohlašuji, že jsem diplomovou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla v ní
všechnu použitou literaturu.

V Praze dne 25.8.2007
Junka Prokešová

Shrnutí:

Z geografického hlediska je Kanada zemí rozlehlou a klimaticky rozmanitou, s poměrně řídkým osídlením soustředěným u jižní hranice se Spojenými státy americkými. Avšak z kulturně-antropologického hlediska se jedná o zemi národnostně pestrou, o mozaiku kultur a identit, o zemi neustále se měnící a vyvíjející. Současně je Kanada zemí velmi mladou a její proměnlivá tvář formovaná přílivy imigrantů a bojem o vymezení vlastní identity (ať již vůči mateřské Anglii či nověji vůči Spojeným státům) zůstává dodnes pro většinu lidí tajemstvím, záhadou, neuchopitelným a neprobádaným teritoriem.

Tato práce je zaměřena na problematiku kanadské národní identity a její vymezování se pomocí stereotypů v médiích. Jako příkladová studie byl použit seriál *Směr Jih*, který hraje významnou roli při vytváření kanadského povědomí a formování nové kulturní identity, a který zároveň nepřímo napomáhá kulturní osvětě a vytváření lepšího a plnohodnotnějšího vztahu Kanady a Spojených států amerických. K lepšímu porozumění kanadských stereotypů objevujících se v seriálu slouží teoretický úvod práce, v němž je nastíněno pozadí historických událostí, které Kanadu formovaly, obecná problematika kanadské televizní tvorby, její regulace kanadskou vládou a problémy, kterým čelí v dnešní době.

Snahou práce bylo popsat, analyzovat a vysvětlit výraznou tendenci kanadského televizního vysílání - vytvářet a propagovat stereotypy o Kanadanech - a poukázat na pozitivní i negativní dopad těchto stereotypů ve společnosti. Seriál *Směr Jih* zde slouží jako příklad využívání stereotypů k upevnění kanadského povědomí a současně jako vzor, který nastiňuje kýžený budoucí směr vývoje kanadské dramatické tvorby.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
1. WHY DO WE (SELF)STEREOTYPE?	9
1.1 THE CANADIAN IMAGE VIS-À-VIS THREE INFLUENTIAL CULTURES: BRITISH, FRENCH AND AMERICAN	10
1.1.1 Canada and the Great Britain: the becoming of a nation	11
1.1.2 Canada and Quebec: Threat of Fragmentation.....	14
1.1.3 Canada and the United States: The Blurring of the Ingroup/ Outgroup Distinction.....	18
1.2 THE SEARCH FOR CANADA’S DISTINCTIVENESS: OTHER MYTHICAL IMAGES ...	22
1.2.1 Socialism and social welfare.....	22
1.2.2 Northernness: Subduing the South through Beauty and Natural Resources	24
2. CREATING AND STRENGTHENING SELF-STEREOTYPES: MEDIA AND GOVERNMENT	27
2.1 THE ROLE OF MEDIA IN A SOCIETY.....	28
2.2 THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATION IN CANADA	29
2.2.1. Using communication as a justification of intervention.....	30
2.3 CANADIAN GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS	32
2.3.1 Broadcasting Acts and Canadian Content Rules.....	33
2.3.2 Canadian Content Definition.....	35
2.4 AMERICANIZATION OF CANADIAN MEDIA	37
3. DUE SOUTH: THE PERFECT CANADIAN TELEVISION SHOW	42
3.1 DUE SOUTH COMES FROM ‘UP NORTH’: HOW THE SERIES WAS BORN	43
3.2 DISTINCT CANADIAN ELEMENTS IN THE SERIES.....	45
3.3 SELF-STEREOTYPING IN DUE SOUTH.....	46
3.3.1 The Royal Canadian Mounted Police.....	46
3.3.2 Canadian Multiculturalism, Bilingualism and the French Canada	48
3.3.3 The Myth of the Polite Canadian	50
3.3.4 ‘Northernness’ and the Gun Control Laws	52
3.4 (SELF)STEREOTYPES AS A MEANS OF ASSERTING IDENTITY	53
3.5 (SELF)STEREOTYPES AS A MEANS OF DEFENSE AND A TOOL OF ATTACK.....	55
3.6 THE POSITIVE ROLE OF (SELF)STEREOTYPES.....	59
CONCLUSION	61
APPENDIX	64
A. Canadian Content Rules for television broadcasting.....	64
B. Molson Beer Commercial: I am Canadian.....	66
C. I am American	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	68

Introduction

To define Canada and the Canadian nation is no easy task. From a historical perspective, Canada is a very young country: until 1949 there was no Canadian citizenship, the Canadian flag appeared as late as 1965, and it wasn't until 1967 that the Canadian national anthem could be heard. Although Canada would thereafter finally seem to have been able to establish its distinct identity in opposition to its mother country, Canadian patriotism has continued to be problematic. Despite years of efforts to form a pan-Canadian identity - characterized especially by Pierre Trudeau's attempts to institute federal bilingualism and a pan-Canadian identity rooted in liberal individualism - the existence of a self-conscious Canadian nation remains questionable. Within the Canadian Anglophone population there seems to be no unified notion of a pan-Canadian nation and thus no innate nationalism.

Furthermore, for the rest of the world, Canada remains a mystery, an "Unknown Country."¹ Arthur Lismer, a member of the Group of Seven, assessed the situation as follows: "after 1919 most creative people, whether in painting, writing or music, began to have a guilty feeling that Canada was as yet unwritten, unpainted, unsung [...]"² Indeed, efforts were made to "capture" Canada in paintings, photography, in poetry and prose, in songs, and, more recently, in films and documentaries. Similarly, students, scholars, and authors tried to penetrate into the great mystery and pass on to others what they believed to be an authentic image of their country. But the truth is that to define Canada is an impossible task: it is a land of great diversity; a mosaic of cultures, races and ethnicities; and a true entity of many faces. As Canada expert John D. Blackwell says in the introduction of a university online guide to the sources for Canadian Studies:

¹ Term used by numerous authors and scholars to denote Canada, appearing also in the title of Bruce Hutchinson's book *The Unknown Country: Canada and Her People*

² Quote retrieved from Vancouver Art Gallery web site:

http://projects.vanartgallery.bc.ca/publications/75years/pdf/Lennie_Beatrice_57.pdf

In reality, Canada is an improbable country - a land of immense geography, extreme climate, vast resources, and a small but ethnically diverse population, overshadowed by the most powerful nation on earth. No list of clichés can presume to define this collage of multilayered identities. The country is too varied, too vast, too hybrid.³

And yet, it is not rare to present the second largest country in the world as a simplified image comprising of vast pristine wilderness, Mounties and gentle, peacekeeping Canadians. Everyone seems to have a clear (though perhaps quite faulty) notion of Canada. As Blackwell rightly argues:

Mythologies and stereotypes abound concerning the Canadian landscape and people. To outsiders, Canada is a land of snow, hockey, Mounties, wildlife, untamed spaces, maple trees, peacekeepers, Tim Horton doughnut shops, universal health care, Quebec separatism, and congenial, reserved people [...]⁴

Indeed, stereotypes flourish in and out of Canada; on the internet, in books, newspapers, pamphlets, films or television programs. Representing Canadian stereotypes in visual media is not a new concept; one may come across a few ‘anti-Canadian’ episodes in the popular American television series *South Park* or *The Simpsons*, or in films, such as “*Canadian Bacon*” by the American director Michael Moore. Canada herself has produced several memorable and less memorable films and television series that draw our attention to common Canadian symbols and clichés by presenting them in an exaggerated humorous way. Unsurprisingly, many Canadian stereotypes are more faithfully caricatured by Canadians themselves and the recurrence of Canada’s tendency to stereotype itself proves that it is a significant technique in the formation of the national consciousness.

³ John D.Blackwell, “Can. Studies: A Guide to the Sources.” International Council for Canadian Studies, November 2006. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.iccs-ciec.ca/blackwell.html>

⁴ Blackwell, *ibid.*

The term 'self-stereotyping'⁵ thus has to be employed for the purpose of this study to describe the tendency of a group to stereotype itself. Canada's self-stereotyping tendencies will be studied in relation to the country's struggle for identity: indeed, through the use of self-stereotypes, Canadians seem to be making yet another effort to find some common ground and unite the country in its struggle for cultural and social survival.

The task I set before myself in this study is to examine the nature of self-stereotyping in visual media and the implications it may have for the audience as well as for the 'self-stereotyping' country in question. However, a topic of such a large scope has to be delimited. The thesis will focus, therefore, only on one type of media – probably the most powerful media in contemporary world: television. As tempting as it may be, little or no place can be given to other media, although some digressions and examples from newspapers, radio and the internet may be used.

First, it is necessary to outline and define the concept of self-stereotyping, as well as to explain the notions of *ingroup* and *outgroup*. The first chapter will therefore lay theoretical and terminological grounds for subsequent analyses, as well as apply this theoretical basis on the case of Canada, providing historical background of some of the most common Canadian stereotypes. More concretely, the ingroup/outgroup distinction will be exemplified on three major relations: Canada-Great Britain, Canada-French Canada and Canada-United States of America. The subsequent chapter will treat the role of visual media in Canadian culture, concentrating on governmental restrictions in television broadcasting and the implementation of Canadian Content rules to reinforce the diffusion of Canadian programs.

The second part of this work will consist of a case study where many of the self-stereotypes studied will be illustrated and documented on the renowned Canadian series *Due South* (1994-1998). Occurrences of known Canadian clichés,

⁵ This term is used by Bernd Simon, Brigitta Glassner-Bayerl and Ina Stratenwerth in their article *Stereotyping and Self-Stereotyping in a Natural Intergroup Context*. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Sep., 1991), p. 252-266.

stereotypes, and symbols will be analyzed to further illustrate the idea of “homegrown stereotyping.” By the end of this study, I would like to get to the very roots of Canada’s self-stereotyping behavior, and find some possible reasons for such intentional tendencies.

The reader will likewise observe that the term “(self)stereotyping” is used throughout the study. This term had to be coined for the purpose of the paper, since sometimes we refer to both meanings at the same time.

Given the large scope of the task, no notion can unfortunately be taken of the ethnical minorities within Canada. Although one might rightly suggest that these nations contribute to the colorful cultural mosaic of Canada, the topic has to be delimited in order to put emphasis on the very objective of this thesis - *to describe and analyze self-stereotyping tendencies in Canadian visual media, more specifically in the afore-mentioned Canadian series, Due South.*

1. WHY DO WE (SELF)STEREOTYPE?

According to the authors of *Stereotypes as Explanations: The Formation of Meaningful Beliefs about Social Groups*, there are three main reasons that lead us to categorize and generalize perceived information. Stereotypes are an aid to explanation, an energy-saving device and a shared group belief⁶. We cannot have an impression of a particular group of people unless we can clearly distinguish such a group from another group. What's more, stereotypes effectively save energy and time, since treating people as a group allows us to ignore all the "diverse and detailed information that is associated with individuals"⁷. Thus, instead of processing 'unprocessable' loads of information, we are inclined to make shortcuts by adopting biased and faulty views. Logically, stereotypes would have no value if not shared among other members of a particular group. It is this very feeling of shared views and quiet understanding between members of the same group that creates the grounds for stereotyping, and unfortunately in many cases even prejudice.

Why is stereotyping, and self-stereotyping, more specifically, of such an importance for the forming of a national identity? According to the Social Identity Theory developed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner in 1979, each individual partially forms his or her identity by belonging to a certain social group. As a result, one may higher his or her self-esteem by establishing and affirming a positive distinction between a social group that he belongs to - the "ingroup" – and one that he doesn't belong to - the "outgroup."⁸ Asserting an ingroup's identity in contrast to a foreign outgroup not only unites the members of the ingroup, but often leads to outgroup stereotyping. This is enhanced, moreover, by the fact that people tend to assume greater similarity among characteristics of an outgroup than of their own ingroup, perhaps due to lack of exposure to its members. This self-esteem hypothesis can be applied legitimately

⁶ Craig McGarty, Vincent Y. Yzerbyt, Russell Spears : *Stereotypes as Explanations: The Formation of Meaningful Beliefs about Social Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 2-4

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4

⁸ Emanuele Castano et al, *Protecting the Ingroup Stereotype: Ingroup Identification and the Management of Deviant Ingroup Members*, British Journal of Social Psychology, Volume 41, Number 3, September 2002, p. 366.

to nations and countries where trust and cooperation emerges among group members of the ingroup, and mistrust is felt towards the members of the outgroup.

According to Emanuele Castano's *Protecting the Ingroup Stereotype*, many of the topics concerning outgroup stereotyping have been closely studied; however, this seems not to be the case for ingroup stereotyping.⁹ This thesis will therefore try to concentrate on the latter. Applying the self-esteem hypothesis on the case of Canada and using the television series *Due South* as an example, I will try to prove that because a sense of identity is largely derived from the membership within an ingroup (in this case belonging to one country, being Canadian), the outside image of the ingroup becomes crucial to its members, as it impacts concurrently their self-perception. And, as Castano rightly argues, it is especially when the image of the ingroup is threatened - whether from inside or from outside - that the members of the ingroup feel inclined to "adopt a series of strategies to establish and maintain as positive an image as possible."¹⁰

Knowing that, I will try to relate the problematics of Canada's self-perception nowadays to some of the crucial historical events which have threatened - and, consequently, have helped to strengthen - a distinct Canadian image. The recurrent use of these historically-formed distinct images has then naturally formed the basis for self-stereotyping. What are then the common homegrown stereotypes? And what was their historical background?

1.1 The Canadian image vis-à-vis three influential cultures: British, French and American

Stereotypes are acquired in several ways, from social categorization (classification of people into groups on the basis of some common characteristics: the so-called 'ingroups' and 'outgroups'), to cognitive and motivational biases.¹¹ Historically, Canada seems to be asserting its distinct

⁹ Emanuele Castano et al, *op. cit.*, p. 366. Note that Castano's term "ingroup stereotyping" corresponds to the term "self-stereotyping" which is used in this study.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 366

¹¹ Bernd Simon, Brigitta Glassner-Bayerl and Ina Stratenwerth, *op. cit.*, p. 252-254.

image and ingroup cohesion against three major outgroups: its mother country Great Britain, its own inhabitants in Quebec, and, more recently, its neighbor, the United States of America. This subchapter will therefore treat the historical and political context of each of these three ingroup/outgroup relationships, as well as some of the reasons for possible cultural conflicts. Such a theoretical basis will serve as a backdrop for the subsequent case study. No concrete stereotypes will be mentioned at this point, as these will be treated in more detail in the practical part of this thesis.

1.1.1 Canada and the Great Britain: the becoming of a nation

Although Great Britain acquired Canada already in 1763, through the Treaty of Paris, it wasn't until the 1790's that the Anglophone population began to outnumber the original Francophone one. This turnabout was mainly the consequence of the Constitutional Act of 1791 (a British law established to accommodate the many fleeing Loyalists after the American Revolution). The basis of future Canadian population was thus formed not only by English-speaking incomers, but, more significantly, by those English-speaking incomers who fled from the United States because they wanted to remain loyal to the British King/Queen.

Professor Michael Bliss, a prolific Canadian author and historian, rightly claims in a series of articles published in the National Post under the common name "The Identity Trilogy" that historically, Canadian identity could be regarded as anglophilism.¹² Britain gave Canada much of its "un-American character" and shaped Canada politically, economically, as well as culturally.¹³ Indeed, even the Canadian welfare system, as well as the system of justice, were both modeled on those in Great Britain. Bliss also sees the Canadian involvement in the two

¹² Michael Bliss, "The End of English Canada," National Post, January 13, 2003. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.vigile.net/>. Note that the articles from the trilogy: "The End of English Canada," "Deux Nations in the Socialist North," and "The Multicultural North American Hotel," will be referred to successively by numbers 1, 2, and 3.

¹³ *Ibid.*

World Wars as an obvious proof of the tight connection between the two countries (Canada became independent from Britain already in 1931), contrasting it to the Americans' "isolationist" and "parochial" approach.¹⁴

However, according to Bliss, anglophilism declines rapidly in the 1960's, when the power of the British Empire diminishes and Britain loses its firm hold of Canada:

During the Pearson years in the 1960s, Canada had begun to shrink in importance on the world stage, its cultural and economic axes were shifting inexorably from a trans-Atlantic to a continental orientation... British Canada, the Anglo-American middle power of the North Atlantic that aspired to blend Britannic culture with American energy, was passing into history.

Many scholars also agree that beginning with the Second World War and continuing with the different social, cultural and economic developments of the 1960's, English Canada was nearing its end and the liberal, individualist ideology of the United States was taking over. Some place the end of the anglophile legacy even sooner than that. In any case, the possibility of a continuing influence of an empire on its dominion is nowadays often suppressed by Canadian historians and authors.

Nevertheless, others view the pomp around the end of anglophilism as falsely imposed. Phillip Buckner, a prominent Canadian historian, claims bitterly in the introduction of *Canada and the End of Empire* that the empire is now unjustly considered as largely irrelevant, and due to erroneously-assumed presumptions "its significance to Canadians in the past is almost completely ignored."¹⁵ Buckner believes that it is just a modern post-colonial trend to separate a country from its colonial history, to terminate the imperial connection and "to put an end

¹⁴ Bliss, 1

¹⁵ Phillip Buckner, *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005.

to the outmoded, unnecessary, and distracting colonial relationship.”¹⁶ He finds that English-speaking Canadians are ashamed to admit their participation in the British Empire, and many Canadian historians, being largely nationalist, “approach the imperial relationship as a handicap that prevented Canada from reaching its potential.”¹⁷ Emphasis is then placed on historical conflicts, various disagreements and Canada’s final liberating independence from Britain, with Britain’s role viewed as negative.

The authors of the diverse essays in the previously-mentioned compilation *Canada and the End of Empire* often try to reconstruct and redefine positively the essential historical moments in the Canada-Great Britain relationship. Buckner gives an example of the forming of the Confederation: the Confederation was “an exercise in nation-building, but it was not designed to lead to the creation of an independent and autonomous state, only to the creation of a larger and more important British colony.”¹⁸ Contemporary Canadians, according to him, often approached the events differently than we do now, retrospectively. They wanted to have their own internal affairs in their hands, but mostly without hostile feelings for Britain. And although the First World War and even more so the Second World War and the Suez Crisis weakened the ties with Great Britain, the majority of English-speaking Canadians have remained close to their mother country.

Canada is of course no longer a “British country,” mainly due to later developments, but many traditional British values linger on and we may find their remnants in the common stereotypes diffused about (and as I will try to prove, largely by) Canadians: the alleged Canadian conservatism, the country’s persisting respect for law and order and tradition, its adherence to government and institutions of democracy, its quest for high culture and efforts to differentiate itself from the United States, and even in its admiration for the Canadian Mounted Police. All of these form the historical basis of the nation and are still being employed – as will be shown later in the thesis – as a method of

¹⁶ Buckner, *ibid.*

¹⁷ Buckner, *ibid.*

¹⁸ Buckner, *ibid.*

uniting the country in its search for identity, whether by being praised, overstated, parodied, or simply viewed as a source of pride and a way to present Canada to others.

1.1.2 Canada and Quebec: Threat of Fragmentation

The anglophile vision of Canada is certainly not the one being often diffused by Canadian media. Bliss himself called his first article “The End of English Canada,” progressing in his second article (aptly called “Deux nations in the socialist North”) to the bicultural and bilingual problematics of Canada. Indeed, the image of a bilingual Canada has been proudly presented for many years, and Canadians have felt rather obliged to consider having two founding nations as an enriching experience. However, paradoxically for the Quebecois, their struggle for bilingualism and biculturalism opened the door for multiculturalism,¹⁹ and their efforts to become independent - moreover at the price of a possibly unilateral secession - have upset many long-established relations and stances.²⁰

Quebec’s strongly felt nationalism is in dire contrast to the Anglophones’ vague ideas of a Canadian nation. No wonder – it is much more ancient and springs from many historically unresolved problems. The 1995 referendum on the secession of Quebec was a culmination of years and years of Quebec’s struggle for autonomy (starting with the initial feelings of loss and defeat in the Battle of Quebec, continuing with ongoing struggles for recognition, leading to the Quiet Revolution in the 1960’s, and bitter discontentment after the Meech Lake Accord where the notion of Quebec as a “distinct society” was refused). Only an

¹⁹ The so-called “multicultural movement” emerged in the late 1960’s largely as a reaction to Quebec’s constant efforts to be recognized as a “distinct society,” and to the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism about the equal partnership of the two founding nations in Canada. The recommendations made by the commission initiated Pierre Trudeau’s efforts to implement official bilingualism in Canada and led to the 1969 Official Languages Act which recognized French as the second official language of Canada.

²⁰ The issue of Quebec’s secession is legally and administratively extremely problematic, as there is no consensus about whether a unilateral secession of Quebec from Canada would be legal. Furthermore, Francophones represent only approximately 80 percent of all Quebecers, leaving the remaining 20 percent to Anglophone minorities, ethnic groups and Native people who rather prefer to stay within Canada. Native people, being the original inhabitants, represent a special minority with a different status and different rights which need to be considered. Inside fragmentation of Quebec itself would very likely follow the already problematic secession from Canada.

extremely narrow vote (in which 94 percent of eligible voters participated) decided against secession by 50.58 percent against 49.42.²¹

Retaining Quebec in an otherwise English-speaking country is an issue which is inextricably linked to the Canadian identity, though it may not be evident at first. The presence of French-speaking Quebec yet again helps the Anglophones to assert their identity against a foreign outgroup (both positively and negatively), but what is more, the secession of Quebec would likely show the fragility and vulnerability of a unified Canada. In other words, Quebec is what holds the country together.

In his article “Will Canada Unravel?” author and expert Charles Doran enumerates the general impacts of secession that would follow Quebec’s separation, stressing especially the geographic and economic factors, and concludes that although neither the Canadian federal government, nor the rest of Canada would want further fragmentation, it is quite likely to occur.²² First and foremost, an independent Quebec would “geographically sever four provinces - Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island - from the rest of Canada.” Although transit, trade, communications and services would probably stay unaltered, the alienation from the center of power of the already distant, and – for the most part very poor - Atlantic provinces would greatly increase.²³

Following the geographic complications and the break of unity, many (now still quite repressed) economic conflicts would emerge: “[...] the rich provinces - British Columbia, Ontario, and Alberta - would no longer have incentives to subsidize the poor provinces like Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Manitoba.”²⁴ He exemplifies that:

²¹ Mary Janigan, “Quebec’s UDI and the Supreme Court,” *Maclean’s Magazine*. February 16, 1998. [Online]. Retrieved from:

<http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=M1ARTM0011519>

²² Charles Doran, “Will Canada Unravel?” *Foreign Affairs Magazine*. September 1996. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19960901faessay4227/charles-f-doran/will-canada-unravel-plotting-a-map-if-quebec-secedes.html>

²³ Doran, *Ibid.*

²⁴ Doran, *Ibid.*

[An] average Albertan pays an annual tax of \$900 to enable a province like Newfoundland [...] to remain semi-solvent and attached to the confederation [...] But in the absence of a unified country, would that resident of Alberta or British Columbia be so inclined to pay this confederation tax?²⁵

A third difficulty arises from the dominant position of Ontario as the central economic power. Western Canada has long been disadvantaged economically to support the East as well as the industrial base in central Canada. Most westerners view this as a policy conducted at their expense. Doran further states that although the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and NAFTA have diminished the impact of previous tariffs, “the feelings of political and economic dependence in the west live on.”²⁶ After the breakup, western Canada would start to demand changes. And owing to its well-off economic situation it would probably be able to attain autonomy.

More and more Canadians outside Quebec now also agree that separation would be good for Canada; their argument usually being based on the issue of Canada’s problematic and redundant administration, where huge amounts of money are spent on bilingualization and transferred from rich provinces to poor in an effort to keep Quebec inside the confederation. Bliss notes sarcastically:

So the government of Pierre Trudeau gave Canada its Official Languages Act, middle-aged civil servants tried to learn French at taxpayers’ expense, Alberta professors subscribed to *Le Devoir*, and French immersion classes flourished from Toronto to Vancouver [...]²⁷

All Canadians seemed to have been sincerely convinced that Canada’s distinctiveness really lay in “being deux nations” as Robert Stanfield, the leader

²⁵ Doran, *Ibid.*

²⁶ Doran, *Ibid.*

²⁷ Bliss, 2

of the Progressive Conservative party put it.²⁸ But the results were unconvincing: official bilingualism was successfully established perhaps only in Ottawa, Quebec proclaimed itself unilingual – using the controversial Bill 101, and the tiresome proceedings concerning the secession of Quebec have managed to greatly strengthen the pro-secessionist sentiment in Anglophone Canada, uniting and dividing the nation at the same time. Bliss sums up the efforts in the following negativistic (though probably quite realistic) manner:

It's true that most French-speaking North Americans are distinct in being Canadians (unless they insist on calling themselves Québécois), it's also true that most Canadians, the vast majority, speak fewer than a dozen intelligible words of French.²⁹

Sadly, feelings of attachment by Quebec Francophones to the rest of Canada have been weakening, as have the feelings of pride in the French dimension by the rest of Canada. Yet the presence of Quebec in an Anglophone Canada, though complicated, helps to innately create a sense of belonging in all Canadians; a sense of a distinct identity. Even the objectors would probably agree that without the Francophone factor, Canada would not be the same. Not to mention the omnipresent fear that a monolingual English-speaking Canadian resembles too much an American.

It would be very difficult for Quebec to secede without Canada's co-operation, but the possibility does exist, and the Parti Québécois continues to gather its forces for a new referendum. The year 2008 marks the 400th anniversary of the foundation of Quebec City³⁰ and the atmosphere of celebrations could further enhance feelings of solidarity and cohesion (on both sides), and strengthen the lately slightly lingering secessionist preferences. Perhaps then only secession will really show how inextricably linked the two peoples are and how significant their

²⁸ Quoted in Bliss, 2

²⁹ Bliss, 2

³⁰ "Québec 2008: Celebrating our past, building our future." *Government of Canada*. [Online]. Retrieved at <http://www.quebec400.gc.ca/apercu-overview-eng.html>

cohabitation was for all of Canada. Nevertheless, such a potential realization might come too late.

1.1.3 Canada and the United States: The Blurring of the Ingroup/ Outgroup Distinction

The 20th century witnessed a gradual process of Americanization all around the world, and resulted in subsequent negative reactions and feelings of anti-Americanism. In fact, American scholars Peter Katzenstein and Robert Keohane in their latest book *Anti-Americanism in World Politics* distinguish four different strands of anti-Americanism stances, ranging from the mild “liberal anti-Americanism” where the people in question share American values but blame the U.S. for their double standards and selfish interests; to the dangerous “radical anti-Americanism” where the U.S. is considered an enemy and extreme measures are employed against it.³¹

Canada too feels the threat of Americanization especially in relation to its own national identity. In the third identity article Michael Bliss suggests that Canada already is Americanized: not only because of the penetration of American culture, but because “Americanization went directly to the core of how Canadians wanted their own society to evolve.”³² He mentions more specifically the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms of 1982 which replaced the British tradition of parliamentary sovereignty and which resembles greatly that of the United States.

The 1980’s were indeed a period of numerous changes, both social and political. It was Pierre Trudeau who gradually realized that “the Canadian future was bound to be multicultural and pluralistic”³³ and that it would “rest on human rights, not geography, economic dogma, or cultural privilege.”³⁴ Bliss asserts that drifting away from failed experiments and falsely-imposed self-perceptions,

³¹ Qtd in Jeremy Kinsman’s “Yankee go home. And take me with you.” [Online], retrieved March 23rd, 2007 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/viewpoint/vp_kinsman/20070219.html

³² Bliss, 3

³³ Bliss, 2

³⁴ Bliss, *Ibid.*

Canada began to look for a new image: “Canadians opted to mirror the United States as another pluralistic, human rights-based North American democracy.”³⁵

Economically, the process of Americanization also continued: Britain entered the Common Market and Canada no longer resisted the economic ties to the United States and signed the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement in 1989, followed by the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994. Perhaps it was an involuntary concession (Bliss doesn’t neglect to mention that the newly established ties were an economic necessity, caused by England’s turning her back on Canada and Canada’s inability to stay economically self-sufficient); nevertheless, it tightened the relationship of the two countries and bolstered the process of Americanization. In Bliss’s view, Canada simply “accepted its North American economic destiny. Canadian politics, higher education, and high culture had also become North Americanized.”³⁶

If Canada really has been historically Americanized in its politics, economy and culture, why then do so many people refuse to admit it? And why do they fight against further Americanization? It is no secret that the relations between the United States and Canada have deteriorated in recent years, and inner tensions seem to be more omnipresent than ever. Canadian writer Lawrence E. Harrison, author of *The Pan-American Dream*, rightly argues that many problems spring from the asymmetry in the populations of the two countries: the United States have a population of 260 million people, whereas Canada only has 30 million. He states that “the asymmetry is reflected in an American tendency to take Canada for granted” and in “a Canadian tendency to be obsessed with the United States.”³⁷ Harrison further maintains that such differences in population and power tend to magnify the differences rooted in the varied histories of the two countries. Canada’s constant effort to limit the penetration of American culture and media, which will be given a separate chapter in this thesis, is likewise rooted in this asymmetry.

³⁵ Bliss, 3

³⁶ Bliss, *ibid.*

³⁷ Lawrence E. Harrison, *The Pan-American Dream: Do Latin America's Cultural Values Discourage True Partnership with the United States and Canada?*, Westview Press, 2001, p. 42

For Americans, Canada has often been seen as the 51st state, or “America, junior” as a popular American show has called it.³⁸ Such an approach is considered hugely offensive by most Canadians and leads to discontentment and a consequent inferiority complex, strengthening at the same time the pervasive anti-American sentiment in Canada. As is nicely quoted in the October 2003 issue of Maclean’s: “The 49th parallel does sometimes appear to be the boundary between self-confident and self-conscious.”³⁹ At the same time, it corresponds entirely to the before-mentioned Social Identity Theory: social categorization leads to reciprocal stereotyping where people within an ingroup form biased and faulty views of the outgroup. These faulty views enhance their sense of belonging and higher their self esteem. A vicious circle is commenced.

Canada is thus shutting away from all that is American. The fear that globalization and disappearing borders will lead to progressive Americanization and a loss of national identity is stupefying. The differing foreign policies of the two countries have also added to the negative perception of their neighbor: whereas Americans prepared for war in Iraq, Canada stayed back. Bliss remarks:

[...] we actually succumbed to old-fashioned North American isolationism [...] we would like to sit out the hard parts of the war against terrorism. We have become too diverse, too self-satisfied, too parochial to take the idea of defending ourselves seriously, or even to care very much any more about the realities of national sovereignty.”⁴⁰

Despite initial international support of the U.S., many countries have gradually become wary and distrustful. For Canada, the war with Iraq and other American endeavors represented likewise an occasion for a popular anti-American reaction, which, as will be explained later, also strengthened the pro-Canadian sentiment and a sense of collective identity.

³⁸ Quoted in Bliss, 3

³⁹ Quoted in Blackwell, *op. cit.*

⁴⁰ Bliss, 3

However, many authors and scholars have hinted that the ceaseless defining of Canada through anti-Americanism is rather disserviceable for the nation. The two countries share the same continent, use the same language, have common visions of democracy, share similar public values, and come from a comparable economic background. After enumerating the distinguishing factors of Canada, Bliss concludes that there are more similarities than differences between the United States and Canada. He reasons:

We are not significantly British, not significantly northern, not significantly socialist, not significantly bicultural to be significantly different from the United States. At best, maybe, we're a little of all of those -- small differences that do not add up to a distinction.”⁴¹

Other scholars also believe that the era of forming a specific Canadian image through the rejection of an American one should finish and the concept of “Americanization” itself should be redefined in a more positive way.⁴²

Nevertheless, surveys and polls speak clearly: Canadians do not want to join the United States. And whereas a Leger Marketing survey in October 2002 showed that 38 percent of American respondents supported the idea of annexing Canada (49 percent disagreed, 13 percent did not know) a similar survey conducted in 2001 showed that 76.5 percent of Canadians reject the same proposition (with only 19.9 percent in favor and 3.6 percent who did not know).⁴³ It may be the last painstaking attempt not to have their culture and nation disappear, in any case it is a very militant one. Canada’s relationship to the United States resembles Quebec’s relationship to Canada: a minority population fighting fiercely for its survival. And although Bliss suggests staying open to the possibility, claiming

⁴¹ Bliss, 3

⁴² The term “Americanization” has come to have many negative meanings attached to it by anti-globalists and other objectors, partly or entirely outside the realm of culture and politics. Furthermore, many countries share the American values but resent the market primacy of the USA or its past international army interferences. Therefore, economic and historical injustices are supplemented to the contemporary meaning of the word.

⁴³ CTV Article “4 in 10 Americans support annexing Canada: Poll.” Canadian Press, October 14, 2002. [Online]. Retrieved from: http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/1034541784098_126/?hub=Canada

that a serious war or crisis could change the public opinion and bring the countries closer, he himself agrees that to advocate the possibility of joining the United States is currently “wildly impractical” and it would be a “political suicide” if attempted in Canada.⁴⁴

1.2 The Search for Canada’s Distinctiveness: Other Mythical Images

Quite soon in Canada’s history it became clear that the attribute “anglophile” doesn’t represent the Canadian mentality, ideals and future aspirations. And as Canada evolved as a country, it became clear that neither does the attribute “bicultural.” It was mainly political leaders who perceived the lack of a unified national image as a drawback and they continued to search for features common to all Canadians, hoping perhaps, that by discovering a certain distinctive Canadian image and using it to promote and differentiate Canada from other countries, a national identity will be created and nationhood consciousness will be strengthened. These “failed identity experiments,” as Bliss calls them, were usually successful for a certain amount of time, but neither seemed suitable enough to unite all Canadians and represent them in the rest of the world. The eligible candidates for a common identity – apart from the previously mentioned anglophilism and biculturalism - included “socialism,” (or rather a more socialist and collectivist approach than in other countries) and the praise of Canadian unique “northernness.”⁴⁵

1.2.1 Socialism and social welfare

Socialism swept across Canada leaving behind huge Crown corporations such as Air Canada, Ontario Hydro, Canadian National Railways, etc. and a strongly-felt sensation that Canada is different from and better than the United States and other capitalist countries. Bliss refers to Canada in the 1970’s as “one of the world’s most compassionate welfare states,” adding mockingly that it would perhaps soon “give all of its people a guaranteed annual income.” However, he doesn’t see that as a significantly defining factor of the Canadian identity. On the

⁴⁴ Bliss, 3

⁴⁵ Bliss, 2

contrary, he draws a humorous parallel between the very Canadian idea of “being receptive to the world’s tired and hungry and poor” and a very similar American attitude “that many years ago inspired the French to give a certain famous statue to the United States.”⁴⁶

Other scholars are not as skeptical about the role of the welfare state for Canadians, many finding that the socialist identity constitutes the ensemble of the Canadian character and praising such collectivism. David Taras, a prolific Canadian author concerning himself largely with identity and the power of media in present-day Canada, warns that now that the welfare state is threatened, all of Canadian identity is endangered. For him, the impact of socialism is visible well into the 1980’s when Canada is still united “by a compassionate system of social caring, sweeping economic patterns, the prominent role played by the state, and well-understood and agreed-upon habits of political compromise.”⁴⁷

Taras focuses mainly on culture and education to justify the pros of the collectivist approach. Indeed, it is mainly in these domains that the advantages are the most apparent. Even Bliss recognizes the pros of collectivism by acknowledging the well-developed Canadian health care system as opposed to the American one, using yet again a witty comment:

The public values of Canada and the United States are now very similar. Health care is the exception that proves the rule (no service in the U.S. when you can't pay; no service in Canada when there is no doctor).⁴⁸

Still, for numerous reasons, socialism can no longer really serve as a clearly defining factor that would constitute a unique Canadian image: with the recession of socialism in the world it receded in Canada as well, state corporations privatized and Canada became what the United States have claimed to be for centuries – a democracy based on a compassionate society. Bliss sums it up:

⁴⁶ Bliss, 2

⁴⁷ David Taras, *Power and Betrayal in the Canadian Media*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2001, introduction.

⁴⁸ Bliss, 2

[...] our state health care monopoly survives as the last icon of the Canadian left [...] We are still good buddies with Fidel Castro, the aged Cuban dictator, but even that connection is vaguely embarrassing. No one believes socialism is the key to Canada's future.⁴⁹

Nevertheless, the Canadian collectivist character had not been formed only politically during the socialist era and what needs to be considered in a country as vast as Canada is its (often extreme) climate and great distances. These factors may have led to cordial feelings for others and to a certain strengthened community-orientation and hospitality. The image of a caring, sharing, and collectivist Canadian may have thus grown precisely from these naturally given demanding geographic conditions and it merely underwent a revival during the socialist era when there was a greater opportunity for it to be visibly manifested and enthusiastically expressed. In any case, it is an image that continues to be promoted by Canadians even when not so strongly politically-backed: fostered in the minds of the people as a national value, it is perceived yet again as a source of pride and an evident proof of the need for the continuing differentiation from the United States.

1.2.2 Northernness: Subduing the South through Beauty and Natural Resources

The last (and surely not least) “failed identity experiment” of promoting a unique Canadian image that should be mentioned, is the cult of Canadian purity and wilderness as crystallized in its “northernness.”⁵⁰ Once again, it is no coincidence that Canada is celebrating its northernness, though its population is accumulated in the south of the country, and its powerful neighbor also resides to the south of the border. The image of Canada as a frozen land, and as the great white north (the words “True North strong and free” appear even in the national anthem), is often one of the first that springs to our mind when we speak about Canada (with igloos and hockey and moose which all complement the whole). However, there are hidden efforts behind such a connotation.

⁴⁹ Bliss, 2

⁵⁰ Bliss, 2

According to Bliss, it was mainly John Diefenbaker who stood behind these efforts and who in the 1950's "elevated [Canada's] northernness into a national vision."⁵¹ Canada's North was to be cherished as a "cornucopia of priceless natural resources" with all countries, and especially the United States, eventually relying on the natural wealth hidden there.⁵² Furthermore, the cultural aspect of the North was emphasized: a whole distinct culture – the Inuit – existed there and were gradually reinvented as an essential part of Canadian heritage. The North with its mysteries and unexplored beauties became the "last great frontier... purely, clearly, truly Canadian."⁵³

But the northernness bubble eventually also burst, or rather somewhat deflated. Canada uses the beauty of its nature as a major crowd-puller, and the North certainly represents one of the last intact and virginal pieces of land on Earth, but its remoteness and cold weather discourage the common man from visiting it. As a result, tourism is insufficient and the area is hugely subsidized.⁵⁴ There are natural resources, precious metals and diamonds in the North, but no unprecedented and sensational economic boom springing from them. And the cherished Inuit culture requested to be autonomous; the territory of Nunavut separated and is now controlled by the Native people.

What has then become of the promising Canadian "northernness"? It has gradually turned into a stereotyped symbol which is present only on postcards, in jokes about Canadians, and in documentaries, and which promotes a simplified version of Canada in the world. Regardless of the vast unpopulated areas in the North, Canadians still huddle in the southern part of Canada and those who can, go for vacation in the winter months as south as possible. After naming the few assets of the North, Bliss harshly, but justifiably concludes: "[...] the North is a bust, as attractive to most Canadians as snow shovels, ear muffs and Arctic weather systems [...]" and speaks about the likelihood of the North remaining forever "frozen, empty, and largely irrelevant."⁵⁵

⁵¹ Bliss, 2

⁵² Bliss, *Ibid.*

⁵³ Bliss, 2

⁵⁴ Bliss, *Ibid.*

⁵⁵ Bliss, 2

To sum up this chapter we may say that the Canadian image has been shaped mainly by two major factors: the country's ingroup/outgroup distinction and the purely homegrown "failed identity experiments." Both these factors gave rise to self-stereotyping tendencies which will be exemplified in later chapters. Lately, the US-Canada relationship has become central for the assertion of Canada's ingroup cohesion and is the most apparent and recurrent theme in television production. Nevertheless, the other two defining ingroup-outgroup relationships have been studied as well, as they provide important clues for the proper understanding of Canadian identity and the cohesion that exists within the country.

2. CREATING AND STRENGTHENING SELF-STEREOTYPES: MEDIA AND GOVERNMENT

Canada's socialist stances, its treasured northerness, its presumed superiority over the USA and its inherent British anachronisms are all distinct aspects of the country which are perceived in the world as typically Canadian, and which, therefore, serve as a basis for stereotypes. Nevertheless, as I tried to demonstrate, preceding their exportation to the whole world have been Canada's own inconspicuous endeavors to foster such self-stereotyping images and, as I shall try to show now, also implant them in people's minds.

It has been noted before that stereotypes (and self-stereotypes accordingly) are a shared group belief, and as such they would have no value if not shared among the members of a particular group. In Canada, this "sharing" is obstructed by the size and diversity of the country, which have, likewise, made it difficult for Canadians to establish a sense of belonging and identity. However, with the advent of media, visions of Canada could be at once shared nation-wide. The images that Canada has propagated to its own people (ranging from courageous Mounties, great beer, excellent hockey players, and well-preserved nature, to enriching bilingualism, "tossed salad" multiculturalism, and even maple syrup production) have become successful and influential precisely because of their repeated massive dissemination. It is mainly through the vehicle of media (which have the power to speak to great masses of people at once) that these images have been rooted in people's minds. Media have come to play a major role in the creation and distribution of self-stereotypes - by supporting and eternalizing them in the Canadian national consciousness - and are thus essential for the proper understanding of Canada's self-stereotyping tendencies.

In this chapter we shall look more closely at the role of media in forming and promoting self-stereotypes in Canada and at the unique position of the Canadian

government in the propagation of Canadian production,⁵⁶ as well as its censoring measures against the influx of American production. A brief outline of the fundamental events leading to the current state of Canadian media will be provided, as well as an analysis of the problems that media face in present-day Canada. What then is the role of media in a contemporary society? And how does that role differ in the Canadian context?

2.1 The Role of Media in a Society

One of the strongest tools in promoting and strengthening a distinct national image in our contemporary world is the use of mass media. For the general public, media serve mainly as a vehicle for communication (passing on information) and entertainment (producing cultural goods), but their impact is fundamental also in the political and cultural spheres of life. Mary Vipond, author of the book *The Mass Media in Canada*, elevates the political as well as national aspects of media's influence and defines the role of mass media in the developed world as follows:

The mass media have been assigned two main political tasks in western countries: the implantation of the values of good citizenship and the dissemination of the news, opinion and debate necessary to the proper functioning of a democratic government.⁵⁷

However, both of the goals have been slightly adjusted in the Canadian context. The Canadian media should not only implant good citizenship values, they should create and foster a national image and a sense of belonging. Vipond illuminates: "In Canada... governments have looked to the mass media to help create and express a sense of unity and identity to weld together a vast and disparate nation."⁵⁸ Media have thus been used by numerous different

⁵⁶ For the sake of this thesis, emphasis will be placed only on Canadian television production, although internet, newspapers, magazines, cinema films, different forms of publishing and radio broadcasting also belong in the domain of mass media, and are, to a large degree, comparably regulated by the Canadian government.

⁵⁷ Mary Vipond, *The Mass Media in Canada*, Third Edition Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers, 2000, p. 145

⁵⁸ Vipond, 145

governments over a large period of time as a tool serving specific cultural or political goals.

Similarly, within the Canadian context the standard role fulfilled by media of the dissemination of news and opinions has been extended, and media have become an immensely important vehicle of communication, and, consequently, a key concept in the unifying of the nation. David Taras, media expert and author of such books as *Power and Betrayal in Canadian Media* and *Rethinking the Mission of Public Broadcasting* argues that public broadcasting has “the capacity to be one of the central strands of political community; an essential link, perhaps *the* essential link, between citizens and their societies.”⁵⁹ And he adds that in a country as varied and diverse as Canada, media serve the primary function of linking people and fulfilling their need “to be able to communicate with each other as citizens.”⁶⁰ Media, therefore, transfer images, news, and opinions in the large and divided country, fulfill the function of an essential communication link, and are, furthermore, used by different governments as a tool for the unification of Canada.

2.2 The Role of Communication in Canada

The idea of communication as a means of shaping and uniting Canada is firmly based in Canada’s history and geography. Truly, since the very beginning, communication has been imperative for the proper functioning of the nation; in order to strengthen national unity, communication networks such as the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Trans-Canada Highway were built and allowed the country to be connected geographically. Later, huge communication systems such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (which is the oldest broadcasting service in Canada, established in 1936) were constructed to unite the country also socially and culturally. Communication is, of course, essential for all societies, but as Robert Fulford stated: “Communications influence all societies, but

⁵⁹ David Taras, “Does Canadian TV have a future?” Wininipeg Free Press, July 06, 2003. Retrieved at: http://www.friends.ca/Media_Monitor/termsconditions.asp

⁶⁰ Taras, *Ibid.*

Canada in particular takes its shape and meaning from communications systems.”⁶¹

Many scholars indeed consider communication (as well as communication technologies) to be a necessary component of Canadian society and an indispensable aspect of its future sustainability. Vipond goes as far as calling the Canadian obsession with communications and communication technologies a kind of Canadian technophilia: “an apparently ingrained belief in the magic power of the technology of communications to create and define the country,” and claims that Canada is a country “built by and still dependent upon, communications and communications technology.”⁶²

2.2.1. Using communication as a justification of intervention

Due to the weighty role that communication has for the preservation of Canada, media have begun to be viewed mainly as a tool of great potential and the government has found it justifiable to intervene in the domain of media on a state level. Historically, the interventions in broadcasting⁶³ were quite legitimate: airwaves were public property and their use needed to be coordinated with other countries. Vipond explains that precisely because airwaves were publicly-owned and had a limited frequency spectrum, broadcasting was not like other forms of communication and has always required more attention, supervision and even control:

These concepts of public resource and spectrum scarcity have been the principal arguments used in most countries to justify not only government allocation of frequency assignments, but intervention in general program content to fulfill goals such as ‘balance’ and ‘fairness.’⁶⁴

⁶¹ Quoted in Vipond, ix

⁶² Vipond, 180

⁶³ For the purpose of this study, only television broadcasting will be dealt with in more detail. Other forms of media can not be, unfortunately, considered.

⁶⁴ Vipond, 166

Nevertheless, due to technological progress, such an argument is no longer entirely valid. With the advance of cable, satellites, and other means of broadcasting, viewers can receive dozens of channels which no longer compete for assigned airwaves. Thus, the spectrum scarcity argument can not presently serve as an excuse for government control. Furthermore, content requirements of balance and fairness need also be readjusted; indispensable at the time when viewers received two or three channels, they now represent a historical relic. The hundreds of channels that are available provide a balance through their diversity; it is therefore not necessary to demand a balanced programming from every single channel.

Consequently, a new argument about the influence of media on people - in relation to television broadcasting - was used for the justification of governmental intervention. It is the so-called "impact theory" which claims that visual media have a stronger influence on audiences because of their "immediacy" and "pervasiveness," causing the medium to be "so powerful that it cannot be left to develop without concern for its social consequences."⁶⁵ The theory bases its arguments on the manner in which televisions communicate their message: in a direct face-to-face form, often in a family environment, inducing thus a more immediate and direct effect.

In Canada, the basis of the impact theory has served as a justification for Canadian content regulations (which will be dealt with later in this chapter), creating thus a certain Canadian "adaptation" or "extension" of the original theory, as Vipond aptly remarks. Such an adaptation then permits the Canadian government to intervene, their argument being that "because of the particular historical and geographical position of this country, special intervention is necessary in this most influential of media to protect national goals."⁶⁶

Nonetheless, opponents of the impact theory are almost as plentiful as its defenders and Vipond too quickly remarks that proofs of television effects

⁶⁵ Vipond, 167

⁶⁶ Vipond, *ibid.*

remain “debatable.”⁶⁷ And even if television was such an influential medium, is it certain that government regulation would make it more objective and democratic? As the two major pro-intervention arguments (spectrum scarcity and the impact theory) gradually weaken, the anti-intervention debate gains on force. However with little results: the government continues to impose its interventions on the public domain of media, and the question remains: is it indeed successful in its attempts to create, transmit, strengthen, and protect a distinct national image?

2.3 Canadian government interventions

Over the years, the Canadian government has repeatedly intervened on a large scale in the domain of media and communication. Vipond divides the forms of government intervention into five groups: the federal ownerships of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and the National Film Board (NFB); federal government subsidies for newspaper and magazine industries; tax concessions for cultural industries; other legislations including the copyright law; and one of the most controversial interventions: regulation of broadcasting.⁶⁸ These government interventions have not always served the Canadians as they should have, and many foreign companies and industries have been able to get around the laws and codes designed to protect Canada. Vipond finds, furthermore, that most of the government efforts have as many disadvantages as they have advantages and that “because they have utilized primarily economic rather than cultural criteria, they have fostered industry rather than identity.”⁶⁹

In this subchapter we shall look more closely at the problematics of government intervention in television broadcasting. Emphasis will be placed on the historical reasons for the creation of Broadcasting Laws, on the changing requirements and regulations of Canadian content rules for television stations, as well as other measures which lead to the repeated dissemination and consolidation of Canadian content. It is necessary to point out that such unnaturally imposed

⁶⁷ Vipond, 167

⁶⁸ Vipond, 146-178

⁶⁹ Vipond, 178

measures within Canada may lead to the slightly artificial embedding of Canadian self-stereotypes in the national consciousness and consequently perhaps even do a disservice to the nation.

2.3.1 Broadcasting Acts and Canadian Content Rules

Canada became independent from Britain officially in 1931 and was on its way to becoming a more unified and integrated country. The need for communicating a sense of identity which was felt quite strongly ever since the First World War had reached its peak. Already in the 1930's the two federally funded institutions: CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) and NFB (National Film Board) were established. As Vipond illustrates, they were created "out of a conviction that they were necessary to enable Canadians to speak to one another."⁷⁰ Media began gradually asserting a major role in Canada (as was the world-wide trend) and became an omnipresent communication device linking all regions of Canada as well as all levels of its society.

One of the first records dealing with the role of media in Canada was written by the so-called Massey Commission - a royal commission appointed by the Liberal government in 1948 - which set to write a detailed report about Canadian arts, letters and sciences.⁷¹ Their report from 1951 raised many delicate questions about the "threat of the aggressively material and secular values imported from the United States"⁷² and showed the direction that opponents of commercial and foreign media follow until now: Canadian broadcasting should not be an industry; it is "a public trust" and a "public service."⁷³

The commissioners were conscious of the influx of American programs, but not yet cautious enough. At the time, emphasis was placed especially on high culture and as Vipond notes: the commissioners' "nationalist and elitist views" prevented them from seeing the problem in its full depth. However, they were the first to point out that Americanization would indeed mean commercialization of

⁷⁰ Vipond, 153

⁷¹ Vipond, 23

⁷² Vipond, 24

⁷³ Quoted in Vipond, 23

media and that: “the only means of preventing the Americanization of Canada’s media was at least partial government ownership.”⁷⁴ Thus the trend of government regulation commenced.

The 1958 “Broadcasting Act” was the first regulatory governmental instrument which aimed at preserving Canada’s distinct national culture. The Broadcasting Act required all public and private Canadian stations to devote about 55% of their air time to Canadian programs: these programs should be written, produced, or presented by a Canadian. Furthermore, the content of the show had to be distinctly Canadian in nature, although the definition of “Canadian” was quite flexible: programs had to be basically Canadian in content and character, but credit was also given to foreign events where Canadians participated (e.g. hockey games) or events of special interest to them (baseball's World Series, etc.). Similarly, shows produced in the Commonwealth or in French-speaking countries were accepted as Canadian.

Ever since its implementation, numerous regulations had been added to modify and improve the Act, and different amendments were supplemented in the upcoming years. Nevertheless, concrete problems persisted. Vipond exemplifies two major shortcomings of the regulations: first of all, the ca. 60 percent Canadian content requirement⁷⁵ is averaged on a yearly basis, allowing stations to “jam Canadian content into the summer months when viewing is least.”⁷⁶ Moreover, although strict requirements about the broadcasting of Canadian content in prime time were added to the original Act (due to the private broadcasters’ sly transfers of Canadian production to the least-watched hours), the definition of prime time remained “overly generous,”⁷⁷ allowing stations to broadcast Canadian content from 6 p.m. to midnight. Once again, private broadcasters took advantage of such freedom, and using their 6 p.m. and 11 p.m. newscasts as prime time Canadian content, were left with only 25 percent of

⁷⁴ Vipond, 46

⁷⁵ Public broadcasting stations such as the CBC need to fulfill a quota of 75% of Canadian content a day and 80% during peak hours (7:00 to 11:00 p.m.), whereas private television broadcasters only need to comply to the requirement of 60% Canadian content yearly, with 50% Canadian content required in the peak hours.

⁷⁶ Vipond, 170

⁷⁷ Vipond, *ibid.*

Canadian material in the more lucrative time slots.⁷⁸ Vipond concludes disappointedly: “As might be expected, the suggested minimums have become maximums.”⁷⁹

The second drawback was that the Act made regulations about the quantity, but only very vaguely about the quality of Canadian programs that were to be broadcasted. These had to be “of high quality and a varied nature” but no other specific criteria were demanded. As a result, private stations turned to news, sports and cheap quiz shows to meet the requirements. Dramatic programming, which is generally much more expensive if produced in Canada, was obtained from the cheaper and more productive US market, and gradually replaced most of Canadian production. Once again, the general dilemma of television industry: whether to serve economic or cultural goals, was won rather by economic factors, and a new definition of Canadian Content was needed to finally ensure higher quality programming and to prevent the misuse of the previous vague formulations.

2.3.2 Canadian Content Definition

The need to define what belongs in the category of Canadian Content was answered in 1984 when the CRTC (Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission⁸⁰) came up with very specific criteria, such as a minimum number of points that must be obtained so that a show may be considered “Canadian,” or the fact that the producer must be Canadian and that most expenses connected with the creation of the program must be obligatorily spent on services proposed by Canadian companies.⁸¹ According to these criteria, a program must earn six points on the CRTC scale. The Canadian Heritage

⁷⁸ Vipond, 170

⁷⁹ Vipond, *ibid.*

⁸⁰ The Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission was established by Parliament in 1968 as an independent public authority which is vested with the authority to regulate and supervise all aspects of the Canadian broadcasting system. It reports to Parliament through the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

⁸¹ Marsha Anne Tate and Valerie Allen: *Integrating Distinctively Canadian Elements into Television Drama: A Formula for Success or Failure?: The Due South Experience*, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol. 28, No.1, 2003. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.cjc-online.ca/viewarticle.php?id=764>

Department,⁸² which is vested with the funding and promotion of Canadian Content, assigns the points followingly: two points for a Canadian director, two for a Canadian screenwriter, and one point each for Canadian leading performer, second lead, head of art department, director of photography, music composer and picture editor.⁸³ In the case of a television series, the points system is applied to each episode.

Furthermore, the live-action production scale is differentiated from animation-production scale and some genres are excluded altogether from the Canadian Content funding requirements: news, talk shows, games (except if directed at minors), sports, galas and awards, reality shows, pornography, advertising and many others. The list even includes a remark that the Minister of Canadian Heritage has the right to disqualify production “for which public financial support would... be contrary to public policy.”⁸⁴

But even such strict and accurate definitions are problematic. Vipond rightly argues that this definition of a Canadian Content is “a purely technical one” and that “a program produced following these guidelines need not necessarily have any identifiably Canadian references or characteristics at all.”⁸⁵ In other words, the point system places too much emphasis on technical aspects only, and little is left for the real value and quality of the programs being produced. Producers may be tempted then to artificially fulfill the given requirements, in order to receive governmental support and funding. Once again, the different governmental requirements and regulation are being circumvented in the name of economical profit.

Furthermore, as one upset Canadian television viewer appositely remarked, having a visibly Canadian project is now seemingly more important than having

⁸² The Department of Canadian Heritage is a governmental department responsible for national policies and programs that promote Canadian content, foster cultural participation, active citizenship and participation in Canada's civic life, and strengthen connections among Canadians.

⁸³ Retrieved from the Canadian Heritage web site: http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/ac-ca/pubs/can-con/can_con.html on June 8, 2007. Please see Index A for exact data.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ Vipond, 171

a project which appeals to the audience.⁸⁶ He summed up bitinglly the actual situation by saying that: “Rather than spend time counting beavers and hockey pucks in each script, the system needs to be reframed around quality.”⁸⁷ Indeed, the focus of the point system is placed on criteria which do not necessarily ensure the quality of the program being produced, and writers’ main concern is to make their project “Canadian.” In brief, the strict and accurate definitions of Canadian Content have evident drawbacks, and the system should be further improved.

Moreover, the problematical definition of Canadian Content and its implementation in Canadian production already treads dangerously close to the hindering of freedom of the press, and continuous attempts to endlessly specify the content requirements do not seem to be the right solution. What is more, the holding on to such accurate and technical definitions may seem as a derisory trifle in an era of expanding technology. While Canada adjusts percentages and allots CRTC points, its southern neighbor produces thousands of low-cost shows which pour over the border. Canada then faces a greater problem: how to live next to a mass-media giant without being swallowed by it?

2.4 Americanization of Canadian media

The Massey Commission’s statement that the only means of preventing the Americanization of Canada’s media was at least partial government ownership has gradually become rather an ineffectual wish than a feasible plan. The current state of Canadian broadcasting, which is predominantly Canadian-owned but constantly swamped by and filled with American content, is indeed alarming. It springs, furthermore, from many irrevocable decisions and complex historical and economical factors.

When the so-called Television Age began in the 1940’s, Canada made huge efforts to keep up with the more advanced United States. However, by 1948 there were already more than a hundred television stations licensed in the United

⁸⁶ Denis McGrath, “10 Things That Would Make Canadian TV Better.” October 22, 2006. [Online]. Retrieved at: <http://heywriterboy.blogspot.com/2006/10/10-things-that-would-make-canadian-tv.html>

⁸⁷ McGrath, *Ibid.*

States, and not one single Canadian station to counterbalance the number. Canada reacted rapidly by commissioning the CBC with the construction of two stations of its own. Soon, there was a sufficient number of stations to cover all but the most remote areas of the country. Still, discontentment persisted.

In the 1950's, about one quarter of Canada's population (those living near the American border) had access to American television stations whereas the rest of the population could only tune in to CBC. This left three quarters of the country dissatisfied. The only possible solution to such a state of affairs was to permit and support the communication links with the United States. Thus, because of the belief in freedom of the press and a tendency to foster communication, the Canadian government itself - through its supportive actions - unintentionally stood at the origin of the contemporary problems. As Vipond illustrates:

To a great extent, [the] government-fostered distribution systems have been used to carry privately induced, and often American, messages. Thus Canada has found itself in the anomalous position of having one of the most highly developed mass-media systems in the world, which serves to a considerable extent as a conduit for the distribution of non-Canadian cultural goods.⁸⁸

The import of American content and the opening up to American television stations has led to much concern about the future of Canadian programs. In June 2003, the Canadian Heritage Department issued a report on the state of Canadian visual media in the 21st century called "Canadian Content in the 21st Century in Film and Television Productions: A Matter of Cultural Identity." The report pointed at the continuing lack of high quality, uniquely Canadian programs, especially English-spoken dramas, and a lack of support and funding for the development of such programming.

David Taras, in an article titled "Does Canadian TV have a future?" explains that apart from independent production and several genres such as French-language

⁸⁸ Vipond, xi

drama, children's programs, some news coverage, documentaries and sports, the Canadian production has been completely replaced by an American one.⁸⁹ He also points at the fact that Canada indeed lags behind in quality drama production and laments:

... there is the painful and embarrassing question of why English Canada, almost alone in the world, is unable to create prime-time dramatic programming that stirs the imagination and wins the loyalty of its citizens. If the Finns, Dutch, Japanese, Australians and Brazilians can do it, why can't we?⁹⁰

Furthermore, the opening of Canada to the American market and to other foreign markets through cable and digital TV technologies has led to a substantial increase of channels being offered to Canadian viewers, i.e. to the potential reception of hundreds of channels by one single viewer. As Taras rightly reasons: "Finding Canadian content in a forest of 100 channels is already difficult. Try 400 or 800 or 1200."⁹¹

Other technological conveniences shall most probably have the same effect: the more competition among the channels, the lesser the chance of somebody tuning in to a Canadian one. Moreover, the trend in television watching is to give the viewer as much choice and freedom as possible. With the advent of PVRs,⁹² which allow viewers to wholly customize their television schedules by bypassing advertising and programs of lower interest for them, Canadian content requirements seem to be losing their power.

Paradoxically then, it is technology and communication – the key concepts of the building of Canada – which now contribute to its disintegration. In addition to that, such technological and economical advantages come at a social and cultural

⁸⁹ Taras, "Does Canadian TV have a future?"

⁹⁰ Taras, *ibid.*

⁹¹ Taras, *ibid.*

⁹² PVR's – personal video recorders – are advanced digital VCR's which store programs on a large-capacity hard disc, allow the viewer to pause live TV, rewind a show that they are watching for up to 60 minutes, replay scenes from TV programs that are running at the moment, avoid commercials, and easily and effectively form their viewing schedules.

toll which may be much graver than would seem at first sight. Taras mentions an interesting theory, or rather a personal surmise, of his colleague, the Canadian story-writer and producer David Barlow, who believes that the yielding of Canadian media to another nation comes at a very high price:

An interesting phenomenon occurs when a country looks to a foreign culture for its popular entertainment over a long period of time. If a society consistently chooses the dramatic fantasies of another culture, they come to believe that their own reality is not a valid place on which to build their dreams. Their reality simply isn't good enough for dreaming.⁹³

For Barlow, the Canadian inability to produce quality programming is viewed as the toll paid by Canadians when they let other cultures occupy their “imaginative space.”⁹⁴ American programs have thus not only flooded the Canadian market, they have permeated the national consciousness and replaced Canadian dramatic fantasies with those of another culture. The solution perhaps doesn't lie in setting quotas on the amount of American and Canadian content on TV; nor does it lie in forbidding American media to enter the Canadian market. The possible answer is rather the stimulation of quality Canadian production and the arousing of national interest in media.

Indeed, as consumers of cultural products, Canadians are quite passive. Vipond rightly suggests that: “[Canadians] must be persuaded that the mass media are vital to the national interest, and worthy of attention, money and perhaps even some sacrifices.”⁹⁵ In other words, Canadians need to be made more aware of the negative consequences of the imported American production. Taras too agrees with the need for such an arousal of national interest, using mainly the argument of the “increasingly sensational, desperate and bizarre” programming trend on television, which pours to Canada through private broadcasters mainly from the United States. He sees the solution in a thorough transformation of Canadian production which will have to adjust itself to the new era:

⁹³ Quoted in Taras

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ Vipond, 184

In this new world, Canadian programs will have to be exciting, innovative and imaginative -- they will have to touch the nerve endings of the audiences... The simple reality is that in the next few years, Canadian television is going to have to reinvent itself if it is going to survive.⁹⁶

Unless many reforms take place and much commitment is made to create quality Canadian content, Canada will probably lose its unequal battle with the colossal mass-media power on the other side of the border. The task is not easy and as Taras underlines: "In the end, much will depend on the skill and talent and passion of our entrepreneurs, creators and performers. But much will also depend on the vision and courage of the government."⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Taras, "Does Canadian TV have a future?"

⁹⁷ Taras, *Ibid.*

3. DUE SOUTH: THE PERFECT CANADIAN TELEVISION SHOW

Over the years, many television programs have struggled to fulfill the strict government requirements for Canadian content. For most of them, accomplishing the minimum had become their maximum achievement, and Canadian features were practically supplemented as a necessity. Moreover, Canada has always struggled with having a relatively small market which is flooded by cheap American production; funding its own programming was generally much more effortful. Because of these economic factors, most television shows produced in Canada are primarily intended to air in the more lucrative United State market and often intentionally suppress visibly Canadian elements. Nevertheless, some TV productions managed to overcome all these problems: to find sufficient funding, to promote distinctive Canadian features, to succeed in foreign (principally American, but after initial success even European) markets, and at the same time appeal to Canadians themselves.

The television show *Due South* (1994 – 1999) is an excellent example of such a program: it draws from the ingroup/outgroup distinctions which exist in the Canada-USA, Canada-Great Britain and Canada-French Canada relationships; yet, at the same time, it proposes a unique view of manifestly Canadian elements. The time is now ripe to examine the series in more detail, paying close attention to its self-stereotyping content, and drawing from quotes from individual episodes to illustrate specific clichés which will help us gradually arrive at a more global view of the problematics of homegrown stereotyping.

The first part of this analysis will concentrate on the distinct Canadian elements present in the show, be it character names, plot devices or other interesting ‘Canadiana’. Then, all major self-stereotypes which permeate through the series will be discussed. Logically, the self-stereotypes in question become much more visible if studied against the backdrop of another culture; for example the self-stereotype of an overly polite Canadian may be emphasized in comparison to Americans’ alleged rudeness. Knowing that Canada asserts itself mainly against three influential cultures: British, French Canadian and American, it would be

tempting to categorize Canadian self-stereotypes into these three categories. However, given the inevitable and frequent cultural overlaps, it would be very imprecise to force such a strict categorization. As a result, no particular division will be made; instead, short cultural notes will accompany selected self-stereotypes.

3.1 Due South comes from 'Up North': How the Series was Born

Due South is a Canadian-made television program that aired on CTV between 1994 and 1999 and comprised 67 episodes. The idea for the series “about a Mountie or a trapper or somebody who comes from way up north to big city USA⁹⁸” was conceived by a Canadian producer named Robert Lantos together with the then-president of the American CBS television network, Jeff Sagansky. The Canadian producer-to-be, Paul Haggis, was more than reluctant to write a script for the pilot episode of the new series, since he found the idea to be strangely reminiscent of the blockbuster movie *Crocodile Dundee*.⁹⁹ However, Haggis eventually consented to the idea, for he sensed the great potential such a series would present in the portrayal of the numerous Canadian stereotypes in an American background. The series was born.

The premise is indeed simple - a young Royal Canadian Mounted Police Constable from the Northwest Territories, Benton Fraser (played by Paul Gross), comes to the Canadian Consulate in Chicago in hopes of tracking down the killers of his father. Once there, he is paired up with an Italian-American police detective Ray Veccio, and together they set out to solve a number of puzzling cases. Fraser's loyal companion is a deaf, lip-reading wolf named Diefenbaker. Soon, a strong bond forms between the overly polite and moralistic Mountie and his cynical and streetwise American counterpart. The show's success was accomplished mainly through the use of inventive dialogues, and the solid

⁹⁸Paul Haggis in an interview from November and December 1999: text retrieved from the website <http://home.hiwaay.net/~warydbom/duesouth/haggischat.htm>

⁹⁹Marsha Ann Tate, *Subverting Stereotypes from London, Ontario, to Los Angeles, California: A Review and Analysis of Paul Haggis's Televisual Oeuvre*, Pennsylvania State University, 2005, pg. 11

performances of the lead actors, who helped to create memorable and well-rounded characters.

Due South may be regarded as a police drama; however, the omnipresent self-mocking Canadian stereotypes and some rather far-fetched fantasy plot elements and characters (such as Fraser's supernatural investigative talents or the presence of the ghost of Fraser's father) make the series fit likewise into the 'comedy' category.

At this point it is necessary to underline that *Due South* became the first Canadian-produced series to appear on an American television network in prime time¹⁰⁰. It was a highly rated show in Canada, but did not do so well in the United States; and, as a result, had been cut off financially during the first two seasons. With the help of international financing, the show was eventually revived in Canada as well as in the United States. All in all, the series has been sold to over 40 countries around the world,¹⁰¹ finding a niche in the foreign market, and inspiring the creation of fan clubs and fan sites all over the world.

Moreover, the show did not gain its popularity only among the general viewing public. The efforts of the producer, cast and crew have been officially rewarded numerous times: the series has been nominated for 53 Gemini nominations,¹⁰² and has won a total of 15 awards over its four-season run, including Best Dramatic Series and Best TV Movie.¹⁰³ It thus accomplished the yearned-for dream of the creation of a recognizably Canadian English-spoken quality dramatic program.

¹⁰⁰Craig Turner, *Toronto Film Company Gets "Southern Exposure,"* Los Angeles Times, September 18, 1994, Part D, pg. 1

¹⁰¹Tara O'Shea, *The Due South Frequently Asked Questions*, [online], retrieved March 4th, 2007 from http://www.loony-archivist.com/dsouth/ds_faq.htm#5.0. *Due South* has been renamed in different countries in the following ways: *Uppdrag Chicago* (Sweden), *Chicago Kalder* (Denmark), *Tandem de choc* (France), *Oppdrag Chicag* (Norway), *Ausgerechnet Chicago* (Germany), *Chicagon ratsupoliisi* (Finland), *Směr Jih* (Czech Republic) and many others.

¹⁰² Author's note: The Canadian Gemini awards are an equivalent of American Emmy awards

¹⁰³ William Rydbom and elyse Diskenson, "Due South Awards and Honors,"

3.2 Distinct Canadian Elements in the Series

Being filmed entirely in Canada¹⁰⁴ and by an almost completely Canadian cast and crew, *Due South* satisfied largely the CRTC's requirement for a Canadian program. Not only that, it proved to be a showcase of Canadian culture; abounding with distinctively Canadian elements and in-jokes.

The examples are countless, but let us start with the character names, since they often allude to important Canadian figures. Fraser's dog Diefenbaker is named after John Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada (1957 – 1963). A print journalist which appears in two episodes is named after William Lyon Mackenzie King, a Canadian Prime minister who served (with two interruptions) from 1921 until 1948. Another character's name, Esther Pearson, is a clear allusion to Lester B. Pearson, yet another Canadian Prime Minister (1963 – 1968). If we continue in the line of Canadian Prime Ministers, we have also a character named Laurier (after the former Prime Minister Sir Wilfred Laurier) and Louise St. Laurent (whose name alludes to the former Prime Minister Louis Stephen St. Laurent). Frobisher, a reappearing *Due South* character, is presumably named after the explorer Sir Martin Frobisher, who explored the northern areas of what is now Canada in search of the Northwest Passage. Last but not least, the main character himself, Benton Fraser, carries the name of the explorer Simon Fraser.

Other Canadian references permeate the show: there are allusions to the Group of Seven, to Canadian currency, to Bilingualism, to Inuit culture (folklore, Inukshuks, masks, soapstone carvings and other art artifacts), to the Canadian gun control law, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (uniforms, musical ride, duties and responsibilities) and many others.¹⁰⁵ The Canadian pronunciation of words such as 'lieutenant' or 'schedule' is stressed as well. Many important questions, such as the Quebec question or the aboriginal rights question are touched upon throughout the series, and one

¹⁰⁴For practical purposes, the series was filmed almost entirely in Toronto instead of Chicago.

¹⁰⁵Marsha Ann Tate and Valerie Allen, *Due South and the Canadian Image: Three perspectives*, p. 25.

episode also makes a comment about the massive influx of American films into Canada, which prevents Canadians from being able to compete with their foreign rivals on the Canadian market.

In its original soundtrack, *Due South* showcased many talented Canadian musicians, such as the jazz singer Holly Cole, singer and songwriter Sarah McLachlan, Newfoundland folk group Figgy Duff or one of the most famous Canadian First Nations music groups, Kashtin. A song or two were also sung by the lead actor, Paul Gross, himself.

As demonstrated above, the show may indeed be viewed as an encapsulation of Canada: humorously self-stereotyped Canadian culture packed for the pleasure as well as enlightenment of the viewing audience.

3.3 Self-Stereotyping in Due south

After an introductory subchapter about *Due South*'s premises and its Canadian content, let us now proceed to the analysis of several of the fields of self-stereotyping present in the show. The self-stereotypes chosen are the ones most frequently employed in the series: Mounties, politeness, northerness or the Canadian gun control laws. There are certainly others, but a representative selection had to be made for the sake of brevity.

3.3.1 The Royal Canadian Mounted Police

The first self-stereotype under study is likewise the most prominent one – that of a “Mountie” or Mounted Police Officer. The Mounties represent Canada around the world and remain a truly enduring symbol, often pictured on a horse in their traditional red jackets and broad-brimmed hats. Founded as the North West Mounted Police in 1873 (renamed to The Royal Canadian Mounted Police in 1920) to police the vast western plains, the Mounties soon became a symbol of Canada and soon enough a source of (self)stereotyping. Used to promote tourism

on postcards and souvenirs,¹⁰⁶ and appearing in hundreds of Hollywood films in the first decade of the 20th century,¹⁰⁷ they were mostly portrayed as heroic, virtuous, chivalrous and physically strong and handsome young Anglo-Saxon men.

It is not surprising that *Due South*'s producer Paul Haggis used the Mountie as a representation of Canada: "What I wanted to put in the show was the Mountie that all American[s] believe is all of Canada [...]"¹⁰⁸ Similarly, in *Imaging Canada: The Singing Mountie and Other Commodifications of Nation*, Christopher Gittings asserts that:

The parodic difference of *Due South* is located in the series' removal of the stereotypical heroic Mountie from the overdetermined faux snowscapes and wilderness of Hollywood's Canada, and re-placement of him in an urban American social terrain where his clichéd difference stands in for and is read as "real" Canadian identity by naïve American audiences.¹⁰⁹

Paul Higgins has thus created the fastidious, morally pure, politically correct, and overly polite Benton Fraser, who, once in Chicago, provokes various reactions from the American characters he encounters. Being confronted with questions such as "What are you, a flying boy scout or something?" or "So what's your story? You work in a circus?" Fraser is daily exposed to comments on his attire as well as his gentlemanly behavior. He is also mocked for the attention he pays to the state of his uniform; all buttons must be buttoned and polished; no threads sticking out; his clothes must always be clean and ironed. In the episode *They Eat Horses, Don't They?*, a female character says with regard to Fraser's uniform: "I want to give him a hug, but I'm afraid I'm going to wrinkle him."

¹⁰⁶ Marsha Ann Tate, Valerie Allen, *Due South and the Canadian Image: Three Perspectives*, Pennsylvania State University, pg. 5

¹⁰⁷ According to Christopher Gittings and his article *Imaging Canada: The Singing Mountie and Other Commodifications of Nation*, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1998, "the genealogy of these images of the Canadian Mountie in the "Great White North" can be traced... to Hollywood cinema's production of 575 films set in Canada between 1907 and 1956."

¹⁰⁸ Quoted in Marsha Ann Tate, Valerie Allen, *Due South and the Canadian Image: Three Perspectives*, pg. 7

¹⁰⁹ Christopher Gittings, *op. cit.*

It should be underlined that the concept of an order-maintaining, courageous and “spotless” Mounted Police Officer goes hand in hand with Britain’s law-abiding and order-loving philosophy mentioned in the first chapter of this thesis. Unsurprisingly, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is very British in its legacy: it was organized similarly to a British cavalry regiment and the typical red attire that identifies the Police Officers follows a standard British military pattern.¹¹⁰ The image of a Mountie as a representative of Canada then exemplifies a self-stereotype which springs from the remote times of Canada’s colonial past.

3.3.2 Canadian Multiculturalism, Bilingualism and the French Canada

As was noted in the introduction to this work, Canada is a colorful mosaic of diverse cultures. Nonetheless, it was not until the 1963 report by the *Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism* was written and the *Multicultural Act* of 1988 was passed that the bilingual and subsequently multicultural nature of Canada was officially recognized. The complexity of these two concepts often ignites serious political and cultural discussions throughout Canada; but is – unsurprisingly - mocked and parodied in *Due South*.

The best summary of Canada’s uneasy situation concerning the number of languages and cultures comes from the Canadian Mounted Police Officer Benton Fraser himself:

In Canada, we have more than a passing familiarity with confusion. We're comprised of 10 provinces and 2 territories¹¹¹ communicating across 6 time zones in 2 official languages. The English don't understand the French, the French don't understand the English, and the Inuit, quite frankly, couldn't give a damn about either of them. Added to the equation is the Assembly of First Nations, with a total of 633 separate Indian bands speaking 180 sub-dialects among their 50 linguistic groups. And as if that

¹¹⁰ “North-West Mounted Police Uniform,” *Royal Canadian Mounted Police*, retrieved at http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/history/nwmp_uniform_e.htm

¹¹¹ Author’s note: since 1999 Canada comprises of 10 provinces and 3 territories; Nunavut became the third territory of Canada as of April 1st, 1999.

weren't enough, there are some fishermen on the east coast with a remarkably whimsical accent [...] (from the episode "Chinatown")

The sentence "The English don't understand the French, the French don't understand the English" aptly summarizes the shortcomings of the bilingual policy. Bilingualism is likewise parodied in the episode "An invitation to Romance," which includes a humorous scene from the Canadian Consulate:

Canadian Government Receptionist: (speaks on the phone) Canadian Consulate, Consulat du Canada, Good Afternoon, Bonjour, please hold, attendez, s'il vous plaît...

The receptionist puts the person on hold and answers other phone calls with the same English and French greeting. She finally returns to the first person and resumes the conversation:

Thank you for holding, merci pour attendre...I'm sorry, I don't speak French, je ne parle pas Français.

The show's Canadian hero, Benton Fraser, gives a brief lesson on bilingualism to his American detective counterpart when they arrive to the Toronto airport:

Airport announcements in English and French

Ray: So this French-English thing. They do it all the time?

Fraser: Yes.

Ray: You mean, like, hello-allô, what's happening-que pasa? I mean, wow, it's going to take us twice as long to get anything done.

Fraser: It's not in everyday speech, Ray. It's just in official announcements and the like.

[...]

Well, it's kind of a complex issue, Ray. You know, suffice it to say that we adopted a policy of multiculturalism as opposed to the melting pot of your American model. You know, it might be instructive, and just a little bit of fun too, to pick up a copy of the Royal Commission's report on the official bilingualism on our way downtown.

Ray: A little bit of fun, eh?

Although there are no lengthy allusions to Quebec and the Quebec separatist question in the series, there are several risible references to it. For example, in one episode we see a close-up on a Canadian car with a bumper sticker that reads “My Canada Includes Quebec.”¹¹² Ironically, the car belongs to a dangerous Canadian mob.

Due South thus becomes one of the rare series which provides a humorous feedback on the diverse Canadian governmental measures, be it multiculturalism, bilingualism or anti-separatism. It doesn't present them as utter failures, nor does it undermine their implementation; it simply draws attention to them and treats them in a flip viewer-friendly manner.

3.3.3 The Myth of the Polite Canadian

One of the most common Canadian self-stereotypes is the notion of politeness: Canadians consider themselves to be very civil and respectful people and are presented as such in most Canadian-produced programs. Although the notion of politeness may be a little out-of-date for the younger generation of Canadians (as is proven by the Canadian beer giant Molson's offensive attack against such clichés through the creation of a short spot called “Canadians Are Polite?!” where several young men and women talk about the fact that they *don't* think Canadians are polite, reserved and passive¹¹³), it is not so for *Due South*, where the main character is portrayed not only as an overly polite individual, but what's more, as somebody totally incapable of rudeness and bad manners.

To illustrate the extent of politeness in *Due South*, the creator of the website *Real Due South* counted the number of “Thanks,” “Thank you,” “Thank you kindly” and “Thank you very much” uttered by Fraser in the first two seasons of the series. It was 16, 63, 77 and 4, respectively.¹¹⁴ Similarly, Fraser frequently opens

¹¹² From the episode “The Man Who Knew Too Little”

¹¹³ Other such anti-stereotyping commercials exist; these will be treated in more detail in the subchapter (*Self*)stereotypes as a means of defense and a tool of attack.

¹¹⁴ “Real Due South: *He's So Polite*,” [online], retrieved March 5th from <http://www.realduesouth.net/Statistic-Polite.htm>

doors to women, helps elder citizens, and lets others pass before him, maintaining that there is no limit to “good etiquette.” This is all contrasted with his American partner Ray’s rudeness and lack of good upbringing.

In the humorous episode *Some like it red*, Benton Fraser goes undercover as a woman at an all-girl Catholic school to find a missing girl. At one point, he is confronted by two spiteful schoolgirls in the school corridor:

Wanda: We’re on to you, Miss [Fraser].

Tiffany: Totally.

Wanda: We see the way you’re always opening doors for women.

Tiffany: And the way you’re, like, incredibly tall.

Wanda: And polite.

Tiffany: Totally!

Wanda: We hear the way you talk.

Tiffany: For sure. You know, you can’t fool us.

Fraser doesn’t breathe a word: he fears that his male identity is uncovered.

Wanda: We should have known right from the start.

Tiffany: ... You’re a *Canadian*.

As noted above, Fraser is incapable of either rudeness or any other loud and disrespectful behavior. In *One Good Man*, Benton and Ray go to the City hall to register a dispute in hopes of saving the apartment building Benton lives in from a ruthless investor. Before his turn arrives, Benton turns to Ray:

Benton: I won't be making a fuss?

Ray: Of course you will; that's the whole point.

Benton: Ah. (*pauses, shocked*) I won't have to raise my voice, will I?

Ray: Look, there's no polite way to dispute, you just jump right in there.

Benton: I see. Okay.

Ray: Let's go.

Benton: (*approaches reception desk*) I demand... well no, I don't... I... I respectfully request... um... well, no, actually, just speaking strictly for myself... Ray...?

Such excessive correctitude may seem on the verge of incapability, nonetheless, it is his polite manners, innocence and school-boy charm that make the character of Fraser appeal not only to the female characters in *Due South*, but to audiences worldwide.

3.3.4 'Notherness' and the Gun Control Laws

Since almost all episodes of *Due South* take place in Chicago (or Toronto, more precisely), there is but a limited number of wilderness scenes from Canada. It is mainly in the pilot episode that we are presented with images of beautiful snow-covered landscape somewhere in the Northwest Territories. Apart from that, there are frequent verbal allusions to the pristine and dangerous Canadian nature. The show's protagonist Benton Fraser has astounding tracking and wilderness survival abilities, and often tells stories about the lessons he had learned in his youth, involving nature, animals and the Inuit.

Consequently, the self-stereotype of 'notherness' in the series is represented by a perfect familiarity with the laws of nature and survival in harsh conditions. At the same time Fraser's wilderness know-how is being mocked several times during the series. In the episode *Body Language*, Ray is curious about Canadian bachelor parties:

Ray: So what do you guys do for bachelor parties up there?

Benton: Well, at the only one I've ever attended, Ray, a prize was awarded for the best impression of the mating call of a bull-moose.

Ray: Yeah, don't tell me you won.

Benton: All right.

In the same way, in the episode *The Deal*, Fraser narrates the story of an old scar to a female colleague of his:

Elaine: How d'you get [the scar]?

Benton: I - I'd rather not say. (*Elaine gives him a look*) Someone struck me. With a sea otter.

Elaine: Hm. I guess that's what happens in a country with gun control.

Benton: Oh, I believe he shot the otter first.

Elaine: Hm. That's just cruel.

Benton: Well yes, but you see strictly speaking he did adhere to the law, because swinging a live otter is illegal in the territories.

The latter quote brings into light yet another self-stereotype used in abundance in *Due South*: Canada's supposed lack of criminality and the gun control law. In the episode *The Mask*, Ray exclaims: "The Canadian? The Canadian is the killer? Oh, that is **so** un-Canadian!" Similarly, when Ray asks for details about a group of armed men that are pursuing him, he is told that it is the Canadian mob. However, he cannot bring himself to believe it, and mocks the nature of Canadian criminality:

Ray: There's no such thing [as a Canadian mob]!

Benton: On the contrary, Ray, organized crime is a growing problem in Canada.

Ray: Oh yeah, what are we talking about here? Conspiracy to commit jaywalking? Organized littering?

Other quotations are of a similar nature and would serve the purpose of this study; however, this chapter was meant to provide representative samples from the stereotypes studied to illustrate the 'essence' of the series. To sum up, *Due South's* charm lays mainly in the verbal exchanges between the two partners – Ray and Benton. These exchanges reveal more self-stereotyped 'Canadians' than first meets the eye, and it is through careful study of the individual episodes that one can fully appreciate the work of the series' producer and creative team.

3.4 (Self)stereotypes as a means of asserting identity

Due South serves mainly as a showcase of Canadian culture, but because of its being set in the United States, it does not refrain from stereotyping the American culture as well. The series indeed incorporates numerous clichés and stereotypes connected with Canada and the United States, all disguised in humor. If one studies them closely, it becomes clear that the Canadian self-stereotypes generally make Canadians look good (though perhaps a little dull and arid), whereas the stereotypes about Americans are mostly negative and non-flattering. According to Seymour Lipset, the author of *Continental Divide: The Values and*

Institutions of the United States and Canada, “Canada has been and is a more class-aware, elitist, law-abiding, statist, collectivity-oriented, and particularistic (group-oriented) society than the United States.”¹¹⁵ The common stereotypes connected with Canada are then the following: Canadians are polite, passive, restricted, respectful, law-abiding, caring towards the less fortunate, tolerant, moderate and beloved by other countries. They are inclined to see themselves as an exemplary, peacekeeping,¹¹⁶ multicultural nation.

As for the Americans, in general there seem to be many more negative stereotypes: Americans are often viewed as boastful, arrogant, wasteful, ignorant of other countries and cultures, insensitive, lazy, loud, obnoxious, rich, rude, and snobbish. Many people would earnestly name these characteristics without knowing personally a single American person. Likewise, almost all examples of violence, crime, impertinence, ignorance and ruthlessness in *Due South* are committed by Americans (this is, however, quite logical, as it is a crime series which takes place in Chicago), but the characteristics are manifested in ordinary people’s behavior as well. In addition to that, detective Vecchio’s foxy but often unscrupulous investigative methods are in dire contrast to the Canadian constable’s proper conduct.

Clearly, the depiction of Canada and the United States in the series varies greatly. Can it be that Canadians create negative stereotypes about the United States, while, at the same time, viewing their own self-stereotypes as quite positive? Is it possible that Canadian self-stereotypes are indeed diffused by Canadians themselves because they represent a source of pride and a linking element in our modern era? This might be a logical answer knowing that Canadians assert their identity against their powerful southern neighbor and consider any existing dissimilarities very significant. As explained earlier, such behavior would once again fit into the *self-esteem hypothesis*: a distinction is created between the ingroup (Canada) and the outgroup (the United States) to

¹¹⁵ Seymour Lipset, *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*, Routledge, 1990, p. 250.

¹¹⁶The notion of “peace, order and good government” or POG for short is also mentioned by Terese Loeb Kreuzer and Carol Bennett in *How to move to Canada: A Primer for Americans*, St. Martin’s Griffin, NY, 2006., p. 2.

reinforce the ingroup cohesion. Moreover, because the ingroup feels threatened by the outgroup, different measures are established to maintain its self-esteem and promote a positive ingroup image.

To bolster the self-esteem even further, one begins to cling to the positive ingroup values (i.e. in the case of Canada national values such as politeness, respect, tolerance...), and prefers to distance oneself from the negatively perceived outgroup characteristics (violence, arrogance, laziness, rudeness, ignorance, and others). The feeling of shared views and a quiet understanding among members of one group further enhances the solidarity within the group. Since stereotyping is an energy-saving device which functions on the process of simplification and bias, clichés and stereotypes are easily created and later tenaciously clung to. The outgroup affirms the cohesion of the ingroup: the “us” and “them” is born.

Due South then presents distinct elements of what it means to be Canadian and contrasts them against an American background, creating thus a feeling of solidarity and understanding among Canadians. It serves the much welcomed role of an implicit link among Canadians, which helps to strengthen national consciousness and reinforce a sense of identity. However, by using a different country in opposition to which such sense of identity is established, it may indirectly bolster feelings of antipathy against that very country. What then are the possible negative effects of using (self)stereotypes in television programs? And does *Due South* contribute to their reinforcement?

3.5 (Self)Stereotypes as a means of defense and a tool of attack

The previous subchapters have suggested that Canadian self-stereotypes have the substantial function of uniting Canada and helping it assert its identity. Unfortunately, the use and profusion of (self)stereotypes in television may also have severe negative consequences. *Due South* is a series which tends to maintain a certain balance in its treatment of Canada and the US, largely thanks to the fact that the appearing stereotypes aim against both nations and are often exaggerated to the point when they become humorous and absurd. Furthermore,

Vecchio and Fraser complement each other; their relationship is - in its own way - very harmonious, and their distinct investigative methods and personality traits represent an asset in their co-operative efforts. Similarly, Fraser brings positive changes to the American society, but at the same time he learns many essential lessons which make him a more complete and better person. Vecchio too gains considerable profit from the experience and the two form an inseparable team. As a result, the show contributes rather to the strengthening and harmonizing of the Canada-US relationship, than to its disintegration. It is in fact one of the rare television productions in which Canada meets America and vice versa. Nevertheless, this is not always the case in television broadcasting.

An outstanding contemporary example that can not be left unnoticed when speaking about television and its use of (self)stereotypes to endorse Canada's ingroup cohesion is the Canadian Molson Beer commercial "My name is Joe and I am Canadian." Known under its shorter name "The Rant," it first aired during the Oscar Award Ceremony broadcast in March 2000.¹¹⁷ During the two-minute spot, a young man named Joe proclaims that he "is not a lumberjack or a fur trader"; he doesn't "live in an igloo, eat blubber or own a dog sled"; he speaks "English and French, not American"; he believes in "peacekeeping, not policing; diversity, not assimilation," and he considers the beaver to be a "a truly noble animal."¹¹⁸ He goes on to explain some distinctly Canadian words, mentions the pronunciation of "z," which differs from American English, but also straightens pronunciation misconceptions about Canadian English. At the end of the speech, he shouts in an almost fanatic frenzy that Canada is "the second largest land mass, the first nation of hockey and the best part of North America." After exclaiming passionately that his name is Joe and he is Canadian, he adds a polite and quiet "thank you."

The commercial had unprecedented success and was received with pride, appreciation, and laughter among Canadians. Furthermore, it made its mark not only at a general public level, but also among learned authors, scholars and

¹¹⁷ From the archives of CBC television at http://archives.cbc.ca/IDC-1-69-1395-8738/life_society/beer/

¹¹⁸ For full version, please see Appendix B

politicians. Erin Manning, author of numerous books and articles about the multilayeredness of Canadian identity, considers the role of the Molson Beer commercial in her article “Liberty, Loyalty, and Identity in the Canadian Founding” and she claims that as a “nationalist centerpiece” the commercial has already found a secure place within the nation and can thus be perceived as “one instance in a long tradition of nationalist events in Canada.”¹¹⁹

Indeed, the commercial was even discussed by the Minister of Canadian Heritage Sheila Copps at the International Press Institute World Congress in Boston on May 1, 2002, in relation to Canadian national identity,¹²⁰ and several other politicians made references to it in their speeches. The frequent airing of the commercial, as well as its sequels later on, led to the strengthening of the notion of what it means to be Canadian, and the commercial soon enjoyed a cult-like status in Canada.

However, the commercial posed two major problems. First of all, in order to accept the commercial’s message, one would have to be in accord with the commercial’s terms of what it means to be Canadian.¹²¹ As Manning rightly suggests, one would have to “adhere to the notion that ‘being Canadian’ is exemplified by a white, male, beer-drinking, hockey-watching average Joe.”¹²²

Second of all, the commercial is based mainly on the simplified dichotomous relationship between Canada and the United States, and what is more, it presents the relationship in very negative terms. By making fun of Americans’ erroneous and wholly misleading perceptions of Canada, it quite openly expresses feelings of anti-Americanism. Such stances have facilitated its reception among

¹¹⁹ Erin Manning, “Liberty, Loyalty, and Identity in the Canadian Founding,” May 30, 2003, [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.ubcinternational.ubc.ca/downloads/Canadian.pdf> p. 4

¹²⁰ Robert M. MacGregor, “I Am Canadian: National Identity in Beer Commercials.” *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol 37, No. 2, 2003. P. 282

¹²¹ According to Manning, the commercial defines “Canadian” by drawing from a simple pattern of inclusion and exclusion, and the complex cross-cultural colorfulness of Canada is neglected. The many parodies that emerged in reaction to the “I am Canadian” commercial prove that the commercial over-simplified Canada’s varied nature. They include: “I am not Canadian, I am Quebecois”; “I am Irish” (as well as Jamaican, Filipino, Italian, Indian, Chinese, Pakistani...); and also “I am a Newfie” (Albertan, Manitoban, British Columbian...).

¹²² Manning, 9

Canadians and have added to its popularity, but at the same time, the repeated transmissions of the commercial - linking patriotism, anti-Americanism, hockey and beer - have greatly contributed to the reinforcement of anti-Americanism in Canada. An infamous example would be the ironic written version of the original commercial called "I am American," which appeared soon after the airing of "The Rant." Its text was parallel to the Canadian version, but extremely biased against the United States.¹²³ It was merely one of the many instances of anti-Americanism which brewed in Canada. In the same line, other sequels of the Molson Beer commercial - inspired by the huge success of their predecessor - began to be filmed.

The "I am Canadian" commercial thus commenced a sweeping course of events, at the end of which we can now find numerous Molson Canadian beer commercials, and a strengthened feeling of anti-Americanism among most Canadians. Furthermore, the sequels are increasingly critical of the United States of America; one contains a young seductive American woman who is appealing to her Canadian counterpart¹²⁴ only until she opens her mouth and a set of brown rotten teeth is revealed. Another commercial shows a young man who is willing to walk for hundreds of miles from the USA to bring Canadian beer - clearly, American beer is undrinkable. Another contains an evidently feebleminded American party-girl who demands from an unknown Canadian man whether he knows "Glen from Canada," without knowing or giving any further specifications except that he works in an office and plays hockey. Other anti-American examples in the commercials follow the same line: American hockey players fake illness not to have to play against the Canadian team; an American administrative worker insults his Canadian colleague only to be very simply outwitted by him; Canadians are shown to have landed on the Moon before Americans; etc.

¹²³ The opening lines of the would-be American version claimed: "I'm not particularly intelligent, open-minded, or generally well-liked..." and the end finished with the fanatic exclamations that "The United States is the only country in the world; the first nation of ignorance, and the best part of South America!" For full version see appendix.

¹²⁴ Not surprisingly, the Canadian character is largely self-stereotyped himself: he is a young, healthy, attractive male with strong white teeth and a Canadian flag sewn on his backpack.

Apart from the fact that the sequels are often very humorous, they represent a source of palpable danger: given their frequent transmissions during popular programs – hockey games especially – their impact on the viewing audiences grows at an immense speed. What is more, they represent a wrong path in Canada's attempts to define its identity. Canada should prove that it is not, contrary to what Lawrence E. Harrison claimed, obsessed with the United States, and that it need not attack its southern neighbor to create a sense of Canadian solidarity and pride.

3.6 The positive role of (self)stereotypes

In contrast to the radical reinforcement of (self)stereotypes in the Molson Beer commercials, the series *Due South* offers an alternative and more moderate conception. In *Due South and the Canadian Image*, Tate and Allen rightly suggest that the premise of the show was not to reinforce the existing stereotypes of the Canadian, the American, and the Mountie. By exaggerating the commonly held attitudes and assumptions, the producers wanted merely to change these erroneous perceptions. The idea is simple: if the Canadian spectators find the Canadian in the show too stereotyped, they may eventually come to the conclusion that the Americans in the series are too stereotyped as well. This finding may shed a new light on Canadian culture, and the relationship between the United States and Canada.

If we are to name the biggest merit of *Due South*, it would surely be its educational value. It is not only a showcase of Canadian culture, but it also inherently warns against stereotyping and generalizations. Although the show originally aimed for other markets than just the Canadian one (it was conceived partly as an export item for the United States and suits the taste of an American audience), its hidden messages were perhaps best discovered by Canadians. Christopher Gittings from the *Canadian Journal of Communication* claims that: “In the case of *Due South*, Canadian cultural producers sell an American-made

image of the Canadian nation back to the United States; however, it is an ironic image re-visioned from a Canadian perspective.¹²⁵”

Nevertheless, if the self-esteem hypothesis mentioned previously was applicable here, Canada does not perhaps sell an American-made image back to the United States as maintains Gittings; instead it sells its own image in the guise of an American-made image. Based on all the previous findings it becomes clear once again that Canada indeed contributed to the consolidation of the stereotyped (yet still mostly flattering and charming) image of itself. Judging from the popular reaction to the show, it is clear that a television series like *Due South* is not only the proof that many (self)stereotypes are promoted by Canadians themselves, but that they can serve as a means of cultivation, of potential improvement of Canada’s relationship with the USA, and an indispensable source of national pride.

¹²⁵ Christopher Gittings, *op. cit.*

Conclusion

Although the various points raised by the topic of the present study could be further explored and studied, the time has now come to bring this work to an end. The objective of the study was to get to the roots of Canada's self-stereotyping tendencies in television programming, draw attention to their motives and possible consequences, and illustrate their relevance through their role in the award-winning Canadian series, *Due South*.

It should be underlined that this work does not pretend to have fully embraced as vast a topic; it merely analyzed the historical basis for the most visible and easily observable Canadian self-stereotypes, examined their effective implementation through governmentally-regulated quotas and demonstrated their occurrences in a case study. In order to stay within the limits delineated in the *Introduction*, several topics had to be treated only superficially, be it the contents of the governmental acts, their cultural and social contexts, or Canada's reception of the previously discussed series *Due South*.

Other topics, such as the acceptance of the government regulations by the diverse ethnicities within Canada and the general role of ethnic minorities and Native people in the formation of Canadian self-stereotypes, could not be, for the sake of space, addressed at all. Therefore, further studies concerning the varied nature of Canada and the self-stereotypes that might spring from such a diversity, are still called for.

The following paragraphs will review briefly the various findings.

At the beginning of this thesis the reader may have observed a certain reluctance in the attempts to describe Canada. Canada had been called "a mystery," "an improbable country," "an unknown country," "a land of many faces"; and the task of defining it was presented as impossible. Indeed, Canadians themselves encounter many difficulties in their quest for attributes that would comply with their perception of Canada without oversimplifying it. Likewise, when trying to establish a sense of identity and assert its ingroup cohesion, Canada is often at a loss.

Looking unrelentingly, but rather without success, for the singular linking element of Canada, one has to agree with the Canadian author Mary Vipond who concludes her findings about Canada's identity by turning to the familiar jocular notion that "The common thread in our national culture is quite simply our never-ending search for identity."¹²⁶ However, there seems to be one significant source which recently serves the majority population as a basis for ascertaining its cohesion, and which thus helps create a strengthened national consciousness. Indeed, unable to find a common ground which would link such a vast and disparate country, Canada asserts itself most often within the problematic relationship with the United States.

As was exemplified, anti-Americanism springs from many complex historical and economical factors and indirectly leads to the consolidation of contradictory values in Canada. It serves the positive role of uniting the nation, of helping it create its distinct image and promote it proudly to the rest of the world; at the same time, it may represent a wrong direction in Canada's attempts to assert itself and may divert it from an appropriate course of action.

In response to the increasingly obtrusive influence from the United States, the Canadian government has felt compelled to intervene in several levels in the domain of culture, and has imposed strict measures to protect the Canadian media from possible cultural threats. Nevertheless, the rigorous implementation of such restricting measures has sometimes paradoxically led to the disregard of quality as the essential factor of Canadian production. The inability to produce quality Canadian programming has subsequently contributed to the increased need for American production and has further added to the vicious circle. The question that needs to be addressed at present is whether the adherence to accurate technical quotas doesn't suppress rather than endorse the skill, talent, and imagination of rising Canadian authors, producers, entrepreneurs and performers.

¹²⁶ Vipond, ix

The complexity of all these factors creates an uneasy situation for Canadian cultural production. This is why the Canadian series *Due South* excels so much in comparison to other television endeavors: not only does it satisfy largely the governmental requirements; it promotes distinctive Canadian features, illustrates the problematics of (self)stereotyping, and at the same time appeals massively to Canadian (and other) audiences. The series presents a multilayered approach in its treatment of “Canadiana” and its messages – often deep and thought-provoking – are hidden in a humorous and entertaining guise.

Furthermore, it is one of the rare depictions of a harmonious Canada-United States relationship, and as such it contributes greatly to the much-needed improvement of the two countries’ cohabitation. In the same line, it sheds a new light on various issues by pointing to, and by exaggerating falsely-created (self)stereotypes. Without a doubt, the series serves as a warning against the misuse of (self)stereotypes, and contributes to the enlightenment of the viewing audience.

Producing such quality dramatic production has, moreover, an immensely important effect in the vast and disparate country: it serves as a source of pride and unity, replacing the historical relics of presently insufficient distinct Canadian images. Canadians can at last realize that they do not need to promote themselves only through the depiction of Mounties on postcards, beavers or maple leaves on cups and plates, and beautiful natural scenery on calendars and posters. Indeed, as John Colebourn of Canada’s online journal *The Province* says, “Canada can be so much more than moose and Mounties.”¹²⁷ And he is right. Hundreds of years of immigration shaped Canada’s identity like almost no other country; why then not promote, Mounties and Maple Leaves apart, all the outstanding cultural achievements, progressive social attitudes, and unique perspectives on life that contemporary Canada has to offer?

¹²⁷ John Colebourn, *Canada Can Be So Much More Than Moose and Mounties*, *The Province*, 2006, [online], retrieved February 15th from <http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=7a42dc66-eb0d-4254-b487-e1b3b5e04d1a&k=21301>

Appendix

A. Canadian Content Rules for television broadcasting

Live-Action

A live-action production of any length must earn six points, based on the following key creative people qualifying as Canadian:

Director	2 points
Screenwriter	2 points
Highest paid actor	1 point
Second highest paid actor	1 point
Head of Art Department	1 point
Director of photography	1 point
Music composer	1 point
Picture editor	1 point

Two mandatory criteria must be respected:

1. Director or Screenwriter must be Canadian, and
2. the highest or second highest paid actor must be Canadian.

In the case of a television series the points system is applied to each episode.

Animation

An animation production must earn six points, based on the following key creative people qualifying as Canadian, or the location where the function is performed is in Canada:

Persons

Director	1 point
Scriptwriter and storyboard supervisor	1 point
First or second voice (or 1st or 2nd leading performer)	1 point
Design supervisor (art director)	1 point
Music composer	1 point
Picture editor	1 point

Locations where functions are performed

Layout and background	1 point
Key animation	1 point

Assistant animation/In-betweening	1 point
-----------------------------------	---------

Persons and Location where function is performed (i.e. the camera operator must be Canadian and the work must be performed in Canada)

Camera operator	1 point
-----------------	---------

Three mandatory criteria must be respected:

1. director or scriptwriter and storyboard supervisor must be Canadian,
2. key animation must be performed in Canada, and
3. or second voice (or first or second leading performer) must be Canadian.

In the case of a television series the points system is applied to each episode.

Producer Requirement

The producer (i.e. the individual who controls and is the central decision-maker of the production from beginning to end) must be a Canadian. Provision is made for the extension of a courtesy Executive Producer credit to non-Canadians under certain specific conditions, such as when the non-Canadian arranges for financing and/or assists with the foreign distribution of the production.

Cost Requirements

The cost requirements provide that

1. 75% of total amounts paid in the production services category is paid to Canadians, and
2. 75% of all expenses incurred in the laboratory and post-production work category is incurred for services in Canada.

Production Requirement

The production must be completed within two years after the end of the taxation year in which the principal photography began. There must be an agreement to have the production shown in Canada in the two years following its completion.

The following genres will not qualify as Canadian productions for the purpose of the Canadian Film or Video Production Tax Credit:

1. news, current events or public affairs, weather or market reports
2. talk shows
3. games, questionnaires or contests (except if directed primarily at minors)
4. sports
5. gala or awards
6. production that solicits funds
7. reality television
8. pornography
9. advertising
10. produced for industrial, corporate or institutional purposes
11. primarily stock footage (except if documentary), and
12. production for which public financial support would, in the opinion of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, be contrary to public policy.

B. Molson Beer Commercial: I am Canadian¹²⁸

Hey, I'm not a lumberjack, or a fur trader...
I don't live in an igloo or eat blubber, or own a dogsled...
and I don't know Jimmy, Sally or Suzy from Canada,
although I'm certain they're really really nice.

I have a Prime Minister, not a president.
I speak English and French, not American.
And I pronounce it 'about', not 'a boot'.

I can proudly sew my country's flag on my backpack.
I believe in peace keeping, not policing,
diversity, not assimilation,
and that the beaver is a truly proud and noble animal.
A toque is a hat, a chesterfield is a couch,
and it is pronounced 'zed' not 'zee', 'zed' !!!!

Canada is the second largest landmass!
The first nation of hockey!
and the best part of North America

My name is Joe!!
And I am Canadian!!!

¹²⁸ MacGregor, Robert M.: *I Am Canadian: National Identity in Beer Commercials*, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 2003, pg. 277.

C. I am American

I'm not particularly intelligent, open-minded, or generally well-liked.

I don't live in a clean place, I don't eat nutritiously very often, and I don't drive well.

I don't know Shakespeare, Da Vinci or Gutenberg.

Although I'm certain they weren't American.

I drink beer...not good beer. I don't use utensils when eating.

I believe in guns for settling disputes, not discussions.

And I pronounce it AIN'T, not AREN'T.

I can proudly sew my country's flag on my backpack

...until I go anywhere, and what's the point in doing that.

Burger King IS fine dining. Cracker Jack IS a vegetable and WWF wrestling is real.

The UNITED STATES is the ONLY country in the world,

The FIRST nation of ignorance, and the BEST part of South America!

My name is Johnny Bob Jimmy Joe Ray...

...AND I AM AMERICAN!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

All four seasons of episodes from *Due South* taped on videocassettes
Molson Beer commercials

Secondary Sources:

Blackwell, John D.: "Can. Studies: A Guide to the Sources." International Council for Canadian Studies. November 2006. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.iccs-ciec.ca/blackwell.html>

Bliss, Michael. "The End of English Canada," "Deux Nations in the Socialist North," and "The Multicultural North American Hotel," National Post, January 13, 14, 15, 2003. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.vigile.net/>

Buckner, Phillip. *Canada and the End of Empire*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005.

Castano, Emanuele et al, *Protecting the Ingroup Stereotype: Ingroup Identification and the Management of Deviant Ingroup Members*, British Journal of Social Psychology, Volume 41, Number 3, September 2002.

Colebourn, John. *Canada Can Be So Much More Than Moose and Mounties*, The Province, 2006. [Online]. Retrieved February 15th from <http://www.canada.com/theprovince/news/story.html?id=7a42dc66-eb0d-4254-b487-e1b3b5e04d1a&k=21301>,

Craig McGarty, Vincent Y. Yzerbyt, Russell Spears : *Stereotypes as Explanations: The Formation of Meaningful Beliefs about Social Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Doran, Charles. "Will Canada Unravel?" *Foreign Affairs Magazine*. September 1996. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19960901faessay4227/charles-f-doran/will-canada-unravel-plotting-a-map-if-quebec-secedes.html>

Gittings, Christopher Gittings. *Imaging Canada: The Singing Mountie and Other Commodifications of Nation*, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol. 23, No. 4, 1998.

Harrison, Lawrence E. *The Pan-American Dream: Do Latin America's Cultural Values Discourage True Partnership with the United States and Canada?*, Westview Press, 2001.

Hostager, Todd J.: *Ingroup/Outgroup Dynamics in Lost: Threats To, And Opportunities For, Continued Human Existence*, 2007. [Online]. Retrieved at <http://losthematheory.com/freewill.aspx>.

Janigan, Mary. "Quebec's UDI and the Supreme Court," *Macleans Magazine*. February 16, 1998. [Online]. Retrieved at: <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=M1ARTM0011519>

Kinsman, Jeremy. "Yankee go home. And take me with you." [Online]. Retrieved March 23rd, 2007 from http://www.cbc.ca/news/viewpoint/vp_kinsman/20070219.html

Lipset, Seymour: *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*, Routledge, 1990.

MacGregor, Robert M.: *I Am Canadian: National Identity in Beer Commercials*, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 2003.

Manning, Erin. "Liberty, Loyalty, and Identity in the Canadian Founding," May 30, 2003. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.ubcinternational.ubc.ca/downloads/Canadian.pdf>

McCullough J. J.: *Canadian Self-Image : How Canadians See Themselves*, retrieved February 2nd, 2007, at http://www.filibustercartoons.com/canguide_cliches.php

McGarty, Craig, Yzerbyt, Vincent Y., Spears, Russell: *Stereotypes as Explanations: The Formation of Meaningful Beliefs about Social Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

McGrath, Denis. "10 Things That Would Make Canadian TV Better." October 22, 2006. [Online]. Retrieved at: <http://heywriterboy.blogspot.com/2006/10/10-things-that-would-make-canadian-tv.html>

"North-West Mounted Police Uniform," *Royal Canadian Mounted Police*. [Online]. Retrieved at http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/history/nwmp_uniform_e.htm

O'Shea, Tara: *The Due South Frequently Asked Questions*. [Online]. Retrieved March 4th, 2007 from http://www.loony-archivist.com/dsouth/ds_faq.htm#5.0

"Québec 2008: Celebrating our past, building our future." *Government of Canada*. Retrieved at <http://www.quebec400.gc.ca/apercu-overview-eng.html>

Seymour Lipset, *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*, Routledge, 1990.

Simon, Bernd, Glassner-Bayerl Brigitta and Stratenwerth, Ina: *Stereotyping and Self-Stereotyping in a Natural Intergroup Context*. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Sep., 1991), pp. 252-266

Taras, David. "Does Canadian TV have a future?" *Wininipeg Free Press*, July 06, 2003. Retrieved at: http://www.friends.ca/Media_Monitor/termsconditions.asp

Taras, David. *Power and Betrayal in the Canadian Media*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2001

Tate, Marsha Ann and Allen, Valerie: *Due South and the Canadian Image: Three Perspectives*, Pennsylvania State University, 2004. [Online]. Retrieved at: <http://www.personal.psu.edu/mat1/DSARCSppr.pdf>

Tate, Marsha Anne: *Subverting Stereotypes from London, Ontario, to Los Angeles, California: A Review and Analysis of Paul Haggis's Televisual Oeuvre*, Pennsylvania State University, 2005.

Tate, Marsha Anne and Allen, Valerie: *Integrating Distinctively Canadian Elements into Television Drama: A Formula for Success or Failure?: The Due South Experience*, Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol. 28, No.1, 2003. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.cjc-online.ca/viewarticle.php?id=764>

Turner, Craig. *Toronto Film Company Gets "Southern Exposure,"* Los Angeles Times, September 18, 1994.

Unknown author: "Real Due South: *He's So Polite.*" [Online]. Retrieved March 5th from: <http://www.realduesouth.net/Statistic-Polite.htm>

Vipond, Mary. *The Mass Media in Canada*, Third Edition Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers, 2000.

"4 in 10 Americans support annexing Canada: Poll." Canadian Press: CTV. October 14, 2002. [Online]. Retrieved from: http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/1034541784098_126/?hub=Canada